

Cicero Illustratus:

John Toland and Ciceronian Scholarship in
the Early Enlightenment

KATHERINE EAST

Thesis submitted to the Department of Classics, Royal Holloway, University of London, for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Declaration of Authorship

I, Katherine East, hereby declare that this thesis and the work presented in it is entirely my own. Where I have consulted the work of others, this is always clearly stated.

Signed:

Date:

ABSTRACT

In 1712 the radical intellectual John Toland wrote a treatise entitled *Cicero Illustratus*, which proposed a new edition of Cicero's complete works. In this text Toland justified and described his plans; as a result such varied issues as the Ciceronian tradition in eighteenth century culture, the nature of scholarship in this period, and the value of Ciceronian scholarship to Toland's intellectual efforts were encompassed. In spite of the evident potential of *Cicero Illustratus* to provide a new perspective on these issues, it has been largely neglected by modern scholarship. This thesis rectifies that omission by establishing precisely what Toland hoped to achieve with *Cicero Illustratus*, and the significance of his engagement with Ciceronian scholarship. The first section of the thesis addresses *Cicero Illustratus* itself, discovering Toland's aims by evaluating his proposals against both the existing Ciceronian editorial tradition and his immediate scholarly context. This reveals that Toland used his engagement with scholarship to simultaneously construct authority for his professed rehabilitation of the real Cicero, and for himself as an interpreter of this 'real' Cicero. The second section of this thesis demonstrates the broader purpose of this exploitation of erudition; it allowed Toland to construct Cicero as a vital weapon in his radical discourse on politics and religion. The active role of the Ciceronian tradition in the formation of Toland's radical thought thereby demonstrated, this thesis contributes to the intellectual history of this period. It will both support narratives in modern scholarship which emphasise the on-going influence of humanist scholarship on modern thought, and challenge readings of the early Enlightenment which emphasise its rejection of tradition by demonstrating the importance of the classical tradition to the work of one of its foremost thinkers.

For my Parents

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	i
Abbreviations.....	ii
List of Primary Works Cited	iv
The Complete Editions of Cicero, 1498-1724	xxi
Introduction	1
Section One: Editing Cicero	40
Introduction to Section One.....	41
Chapter One: Presenting the Author	52
Chapter Two: Establishing the Text.....	101
Chapter Three: Understanding the Text	155
Conclusion to Section One	204
Section Two: Tolandian Ciceronianism	209
Introduction to Section Two	210
Chapter Four: Ciceronianism and Republican Discourse.....	217
Chapter Five: Ciceronianism and Priestcraft	268
Conclusion to Section Two.....	320
Conclusion	322
Bibliography	325
Appendix: Translation of <i>Cicero Illustratus</i>	366

Acknowledgements

The completion of this thesis would not have been possible without the immensely valuable support of my supervisors, Professor Jonathan Powell and Professor Justin Champion. Jonathan Powell's guidance during the translation of *Cicero Illustratus* was vital to the project, while his careful supervision and attentive consideration of my work has repeatedly earned my deep gratitude. I would also like to thank him and his family for showing me a great deal of kindness during my time at Royal Holloway. Justin Champion's supervision has been similarly invaluable, consistently directing my research to exciting new questions and easing my introduction to a fascinating area of study, one which I will continue to pursue, stimulated by his enthusiasm. I would particularly like to thank him for the fact that no matter how discouraged I might be, I always left his supervisions with a renewed excitement and passion for my research. I have been extremely fortunate with both of my supervisors, and shall remain very grateful to them.

I would like to express my thanks to the Arts and Humanities Research Council for the financial support provided by their doctoral award, together with the Department of Classics at Royal Holloway, both for granting me that award and for its on-going assistance across the period of my research.

Finally, the greatest debt I owe is to my family, without whom this truly would not have been accomplished. To my mother, for always believing in me and driving me on; to my father, for all the many immeasurable ways in which he has supported me; and to my sister, for keeping me laughing throughout it all.

Abbreviations

BL The British Library

Works by John Toland

CI *Cicero Illustratus*
Collection *A collection of several pieces of Mr. John Toland, now first
publish'd from his original manuscripts: with some memoirs
of his life and writings*

Works by Cicero

Ac. *Academica*
Ad Att. *Epistulae ad Atticum*
Ad Fam. *Epistulae ad Familiares*
Ad QFr. *Epistulae ad Quintum Fratrem*
Arch. *Pro Archia*
Brut. *Brutus*
Clu. *Pro Cluentio*
De Orat. *De Oratore*
Div. *De Divinatione*
DND *De Natura Deorum*
Dom. *De Domo Sua*
Fin. *De Finibus*
Flac. *Pro Flacco*
Font. *Pro Fonteio*
Har. *De Haruspicum Responsis*
Inv. *De Inventione*
Leg. *De Legibus*

<i>Man.</i>	<i>Pro Lege Manilia</i>
<i>Marc.</i>	<i>Pro Marcello</i>
<i>Mur.</i>	<i>Pro Murena</i>
<i>Off.</i>	<i>De Officiis</i>
<i>Parad.</i>	<i>Paradoxa Stoicorum</i>
<i>Part.</i>	<i>Partitiones Oratoriae</i>
<i>Phil.</i>	<i>Philippica</i>
<i>Pis.</i>	<i>In Pisonem</i>
<i>Planc.</i>	<i>Pro Plancio</i>
<i>Prov.</i>	<i>De Provinciis Consularibus</i>
<i>Rab.Perd.</i>	<i>Pro Rabirio Perduellionis</i>
<i>Rep.</i>	<i>De Republica</i>
<i>Rhet.Her.</i>	<i>Rhetorica ad Herennium</i>
<i>Sest.</i>	<i>Pro Sestio</i>
<i>Tusc.</i>	<i>Tusculanae Disputationes</i>
<i>Vat.</i>	<i>In Vatinius</i>
<i>Verr.</i>	<i>In Verrem</i>

Notes

The names of editors of Cicero will be in their Latinised form, unless otherwise indicated.

List of Primary Works Cited

Aristotle, *The Politics*, ed. H. Rackham, London: Heinemann, 1932.

Arnobius, *The seven books of Arnobius adversus gentes*, ed. H. Bryce and H. Campbell, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1871.

Augustine, *City of God, books I-III*, ed. G. E. McCracken, London: Heinemann, 1957.

The City of God against the Pagans, ed. R. W. Dyson, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Bayle, P., *The dictionary historical and critical of Mr. Peter Bayle*, London, 1734-1738.

Bentley, R., *Remarks Upon a late Discourse of Free-Thinking: in a Letter to F. H. D. D. by Phileleutherus Lipsiensis*, London, 1713.

ed., *Q. Horatius Flaccus, ex recensione et cum notis atque emendationibus Richardi Bentleyi*, Cambridge, 1711.

Blount, C., *Anima Mundi: or, an Historical Narration of the Opinions of the Ancients, concerning Man's Soul After this Life: According to the unenlightened Nature*, London, 1679.

Bruni, L., *Opere letterarie e politiche*, ed. P. Viti, Torino: UTET, 1996.

[Cicero, M. T.], *Ad C. Herennium, de ratione dicendi*, ed. H. Caplan, London: Heinemann, 1967.

- Cicero, M. T., *Brutus; Orator*, ed. G. L. Hendrickson and H. M. Hubbell,
London: Heinemann, 1939.
- De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum*, ed. H. Rackham, London: Heinemann,
1914.
- De Inventione; De Optimo Genere Oratorum; Topica*, ed. H. M. Hubbell,
London: Heinemann, 1960.
- De Officiis*, ed. W. Miller, London: Heinemann, 1913.
- De Oratore III; De Fato; Paradoxa Stoicorum; De Partitione Oratoria*, ed.
H. Rackham, London: Heinemann, 1960.
- De Oratore, books I-II*, eds. E. W. Sutton and H. Rackham,
London: Heinemann, 1959.
- De Senectute; De Amicitia; De Divinatione*, ed. W. A. Falconer, London:
Heinemann, 1923.
- In Catilinam I-IV; Pro Murena; Pro Sulla; Pro Flacco*, ed. C. Macdonald,
Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- Letters to Friends*, ed. D. R. Shackleton Bailey, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard
University Press, 2001.
- Letters to Quintus and Brutus; Letter fragments; Letter to Octavian;
Invectives; Handbook of Electioneering*, ed. D. R. Shackleton Bailey,
Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2002.

On the Nature of the Gods; Academics, ed. H. Rackham, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951.

On the Republic; On the Laws, ed. C. W. Keyes, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1928.

Philippics 1-6, ed. D. R. Shackleton Bailey, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2009.

Philippics 7-14, ed. D. R. Shackleton Bailey, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2009.

Pro Archia; Post Reditum in Senatu; Post Reditum ad Quirites; De Domo Sua; De Haruspicum Responsis; Pro Plancio, ed. N. H. Watts, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1923.

Pro Caelio; De Provinciis Consularibus; Pro Balbo, ed. R. Gardner, London: Heinemann, 1958.

Pro Lege Manilia; Pro Caecina; Pro Cluentio; Pro Rabirio Perduellionis, ed. H. G. Hodge, London: Heinemann, 1927.

Pro Publio Quinctio; Pro Sexto Roscio Amerino; Pro Quinto Roscio Comoedo; De Lege Agraria I-III, ed. J. H. Freese, London: Heinemann, 1930.

Pro Sestio; In Vatinius, ed. R. Gardner, London: Heinemann, 1958.

Pro T. Annio Milone; In L. Calpurnium Pisonem; Pro M. Aemilio Scauro; Pro M. Fonteio; Pro C. Rabirio Postumo; Pro M. Marcello; Pro Q. Ligario; Pro Rege Deiotaro, ed. N. H. Watts, London: Heinemann, 1953.

The Letters of Cicero, ed. E. S. Shuckburgh, London: George Bell and sons, 1908-1909.

Tusculan Disputations, ed. J. E. King, London: Heinemann, 1945.

Clarke, S., *A Discourse Concerning the Unchangeable Obligations of Natural Religion, and Truth and Certainty of the Christian Revelation*, third edition, London, 1711.

Cocmannus, T., *M. Tullius Cicero De Oratore ad Q. Fratrem. Ex MSS. recensuit Tho. Cockman è Coll. Univ. A. B.*, Oxford, 1706.

Collins, A., *A Discourse of Free-Thinking, Occasion'd by The Rise and Growth of a Sect call's Free-Thinkers*, London, 1713.

Corradus, S., *Quaestura Partes Duae quarum altera de Ciceronis vita et libris item de ceteris Ciceronibus agit altera Ciceronis libros permultis locis emendat numquam antea extra Italiam edita*, ed. I. A. Ernesti, Leipzig, 1754.

Cudworth, R., *The True Intellectual System of the Universe: The First Part; wherein, all the Reason and Philosophy of Atheism is Confuted; and Its Impossibility Demonstrated*, London, 1678.

Daillé, J., *A treatise concerning the right use of the Fathers, in the decision of the controversies that are at this day in religion*, London, 1675.

Davies, J., *M. Tullii Ciceronis Tusculanarum Disputationum Libri V. Ex recensione Joannis Davisii, Coll. Regin. Cantab. Socii. Cum Ejusdem Commentario*, Cambridge, 1708.

Dio, *Roman History*, ed. E. Cary, London: Heinemann, 1914.

Dryden, J., *The Life of Plutarch* in *Plutarch's Lives in eight volumes. Translated from the Greek. To which is prefixed, the life of Plutarch, written by Mr. Dryden*, London 1749.

Fabricius Marcoduranus, F., *Historia Ciceronis per consules descripta et in annos LXIV. distincta* in Orellius, I. C. and Baiterus, I. G., eds. *Onomasticon Tullianum, Part I: continens Tullii Ciceronis vitam historiam litterariam*, Zurich, 1836, pp. 1-109.

Fabricius, J. A., *Bibliotheca Latina Sive Notitia Auctorum Veterum Latinorum, quorumcunque scripta ad nos pervenerunt, distributa in libros IV*, fourth edition, Hamburg, 1712.

Felicius Durantinus, C., *Utriusque iuris periti, libri duo: Unus, de Exilio M. Tullij Ciceronis. Alter, De eius glorioso reditu*, ed. Cochlaus, J., Leipzig, 1535.

Felton, H., *A dissertation on reading the classics, and forming a just style. Written in the year 1709, and addressed to the right honourable, John Lord Roos, the Present Marquis of Granby*, London, 1713.

Harrington, J., *The Commonwealth of Oceana and A System of Politics*, ed. J. G. A. Pocock, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Hobbes, T., *Behemoth; or an epitome of the Civil Wars of England, from 1640, to 1660*, London, 1679.

Leviathan, ed. J. C. A. Gaskin, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Hotman, F., *Francisci Hotomani commentariorum in orationes M. T. Ciceronis volumen primum*, Paris, 1554.

Huet, D., *Lettre de Mr. Morin de l'Academie des Inscriptions à Mr. Huet ancien Evêque d' Avranches, touchant le Livre de Mr. Tollandus Anglois, intitulé, Adeisidaemon, & Origines Judiciaeæ Mémoires pour l'Histoire des Sciences & des beaux-Arts*, 1709, pp. 1588-1618.

James, T., *A Treatise of the Corruption of Scripture, Councils, and Fathers, by the Prelats, Pastors, and Pillars of the Church of Rome, for maintenance of Popery and irreligion*, London, 1612.

Juvenal, *Juvenal and Persius*, ed. G. G. Ramsay, London: Heinemann, 1918.

Lactantius, *Divine Institutes*, ed. A. Bowen and P. Garnsey, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2003.

Landus, H., *Cicero relegatus et Cicero revocatus. Dialogi festiuissimi.*, Lyon, 1534.

Le Clerc, J., *Joannis Clerici Ars Critica, in qua ad studia Linguarum Latinae, Graecae et Hebraicae via munitur; Veterumque emendandorum, et Spuriorum Scriptorum a Genuinis dignoscendorum ratio traditur*, London, 1698.

Parrhasiana, or, Thoughts upon several subjects, as criticism, history, morality, and politics, trans. anon., London, 1700.

Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura*, ed. M. F. Smith, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Macchiavelli, N. *The Discourses*, ed. B. Crick, London: Penguin Books, 1970.

The Prince, ed. P. Bondanella, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

- Maresius, R., *Rolandi Maresii Epistolarum philologicarum liber primus*, Paris, 1650.
- Middleton, C., *The history of the life of Marcus Tullius Cicero*, London, 1741.
- Milton, J., *Complete prose works of John Milton. Vol. IV, 1650-1655*, ed. D. M. Wolfe, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966.
- Ioannis Miltoni Angli Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio contra Claudii anonymi, alias Salmasii, Defensionem regiam*, London, 1651.
- Molesworth, R., *An Account of Denmark, with Francogallia and Some Considerations for the Promoting of Agriculture and Employing the Poor*, ed. J. A. I. Champion, Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2011.
- Nedham, M., *The excellencie of a free state*, London, 1767.
- Patricius, A., *Fragmentorum Ciceronis Tomi IIII. Cum Andreae Patricii adnotationibus*, Venice, 1561.
- Plato, *Republic I-V*, ed. C. Emlyn-Jones and W. Preddy, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2012.
- Plutarch, *Lives*, ed. B. Perrin, London: Heinemann, 1914-1926.
- Preyssius, C., *M. T. Ciceronis vita et studiorum rerumque gestarum historia ex eius ipsius libris testimoniisque potissimum observata atque conscripta per Chrp. Preyss. It. oratio de imitatione Ciceroniana eodem auctore*, Basel, 1555.
- Quintilian, *The Orator's Education*, ed. D. A. Russell, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001.

- Ramus, P., *Ciceronianus*, Paris, 1557.
- Rapin, R., *Instructions for History: with a Character of the most Considerable Historians, Ancient and Modern*, trans. J. Davies, London, 1680.
- Scholia in Ciceronis Orationes Bobiensia*, ed. P. Hildebrandt, Leipzig: B. G. Teubneri, 1907.
- Seneca, *De otio; De breuitate vitae*, ed. G. D. Williams, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- The Suasoriae of Seneca the Elder*, ed. W. A. Edward, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1928.
- Sigonius, C., *Fragmenta Ciceronis variis in locis dispersa Caroli Sigonii diligentia collecta et scholiis illustrata*, Venice, 1559.
- Simon, R., *A critical history of the Old Testament*, London, 1682.
- Spinoza, *Theological-Political Treatise*, ed. J. Israel, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Swift, J., *A tale of a tub. Written for the universal improvement of mankind. To which is added, an account of a battle between the antient and modern books in St. James's Library*, ninth edition, Dublin, 1756.
- Sylvius, F., *M. T. Ciceronis Orationes, Cum doctorum omnium, qui in eis in hunc usque diem elaborauerunt, Commentariis, in vnum volumen collatis. Quibus accessere non pauca, nunc primùm nata et edita*, Paris, 1536.
- Tacitus, *The Annals books I-III*, ed. C. H. Moore, London: Heinemann, 1962.

Temple, W., *Miscellanea. The second part. In Four Essays. I. Upon Antient and Modern Learning. II. Upon the Gardens of Epicurus. III. Upon Heroick Virtue. IV. Upon Poetry*, London, 1705.

Tindal, M., *Christianity as Old as the Creation: or, The Gospel, a Republication of the Religion of Nature*, London, 1730.

Toland, J., *Two Essays sent in a letter from Oxford, to a nobleman in London. The first concerning some Errors about the Creation, General Flood, and the Peopling of the World. In two parts. The second concerning the Rise, Progress, and Destruction of Fables and Romances. With the State of Learning*, London, 1695.

Christianity not Mysterious: or, a treatise shewing, that there is nothing in the Gospel contrary to Reason, nor above it: and that no Christian Doctrine can be properly call'd a mystery, London, 1696.

A Defence of Mr. Toland, in a Letter to Himself, London, 1697.

An Apology for Mr. Toland, in a Letter from Himself to a Member of the House of Commons in Ireland; written the day before his Book was resolv'd to be burnt by the Committee of Religion. To which is prefix'd a Narrative containing the Occasion of the said Letter, London, 1697.

ed. *Discourses concerning Government, by Algernon Sidney*, London, 1698.

The Life of John Milton, Containing, besides the History of his Works, Several Extraordinary Characters of Men and Books, Sects, Parties, and Opinions, London, 1698.

The Militia Reform'd; or an easy scheme of Furnishing England with a constant land-force, capable to prevent or to subdue any Foreign Power; and to maintain perpetual Quiet at Home, without endangering the Publick Liberty, London, 1698.

Amyntor: or, a defence of Milton's Life. I. A general Apology for all Writings of that kind. II. A Catalogue of Books attributed in Primitive Times to Jesus Christ, his Apostles and other eminent Persons: With several important Remarks and Observations relating to the Canon of Scripture. III. A Complete History of the Book, Entitul'd, Icon Basilike, proving Dr. Gauden, and not King Charles the First, to be the author of it: With an Answer to all the Facts alleg'd by Mr. Wagstaf to the contrary; and to the Exceptions made against my Lord Anglesey's Memorandum, Dr. Walker's Book, or Mrs. Gauden's Narrative, which last Piece is now the first Time publish'd at large, London, 1699.

ed. Memoirs of Denzil Lord Holles, Baron of Ifield in Sussex, from the year 1641 to 1648, London, 1699.

Memoirs of Edmund Ludlow Esq; Lieutenant General of the Horse, Commander in Chief of the Forces in Ireland, One of the Council of State, and a Member of the Parliament which began on November 3, 1640, Switzerland, 1699.

Clito: A Poem on the Force of Eloquence, London, 1700.

ed. The Oceana of James Harrington, and his other works; Som whereof are now first publish'd from his own manuscripts. The whole Collected,

Methodiz'd, and Review'd, with an Exact Account of his Life prefix'd, by John Toland, London, 1700.

Anglia Libera: or the Limitation and Succession of the Crown of England explain'd and asserted; as grounded on His Majesty's Speech; The Proceedings in Parliament; The Desires of the People, The Safety of our Religion; The Nature of our Constitution; The Balance of Europe; And The Rights of all Mankind, London, 1701.

The Art of Governing by Partys: particularly, in Religion, in Politics, in Parliament, on the Bench, and in the Ministry; with the ill Effects of Partys on the People in general, the King in particular, and all our foren Affairs; as well as on our Credit and Trade, in Peace or War, &c., London, 1701.

Paradoxes of State, Relating to the Present Juncture of Affairs in England And the rest of Europe; Chiefly grounded on his Majesty's Princely, Pious, and most Gracious Speech, London, 1702.

Vindicius Liberijs: Or, M. Toland's Defence of himself, Against the late Lower House of Convocation, and Others; Wherein (Besides his Letters to the Prolocutor) Certain Passages of the Book, Intitul'd, Christianity not Mysterious, are Explain'd, and others Corrected: with a Full and clear Account of the Authors Principles relating to Church and State; And a Justification of the Whigs and Commonwealthsmen, against the Misrepresentations of all their Opposers, London, 1702.

Letters to Serena: containing, I. The Origin and Force of Prejudices. II. The History of the Soul's Immortality among the Heathens. III. The Origin of

Idolatry, and Reasons of Heathenism. As also, IV. A Letter to a Gentleman in Holland, showing Spinosa's System of Philosophy to be without any Principle or Foundation. V. Motion essential to Matter; in Answer to some Remarks by a Noble Friend on the Confutation of Spinosa. To all which Prefix'd VI. A Preface; being a Letter to a Gentleman in London, sent together with the foregoing Dissertations, and declaring the several Occasions of writing them, London, 1704.

An Account of the Courts of Prussia and Hanover; Sent to a Minister of State in Holland by Mr. John Toland, London, 1705.

Socinianism truly Stated; being an Example of fair Dealing in all Theological Controversys, To which is prefixt, Indifference in Disputes: Recommended by a Pantheist to an Orthodox Friend, London, 1705.

The Memorial of the State of England, in Vindication of the Queen, the Church, and the Administration: design'd to rectify the mutual Mistakes of Protestants, and to unite their Affections in Defence of our Religion and Liberty, London, 1705.

Oratio Philippica Ad excitandos contra Galliam Britannos; Maxime vero, Ne de Pace cum Victis praemature agatur: Sanctiori Anglorum Concilio exhibita, Anno a Christo 1514. Incerto Autore, Qui Gallorum ungues non resecandos, sed Penitus evellendos esse voluit. Nunc primum publica luce, Diatriba praeliminari, et Annotationibus donavit Joannes Tolandus, London, 1707.

Adeisidaemon, sive Titus Livius a superstitione vindicatus. In qua Dissertatione probatur, Livium Historicum in Sacris, Prodigiiis, et Ostentis Romanorum enarrandis, haudquaquam fuisse credulum aut superstitiosum; ipsamque Superstitionem non minus Reipublicae (si non magis) extiosam esse, quam purum putum Atheismum. Annexae sunt ejusdem Origines Judiciae, Hagae-Comitis, 1709.

Mr. Toland's Reflections on Dr. Sacheverell's Sermon Preach'd at St. Paul's, Nov. 5 1709. In a Letter from An English-Man to An Hollander, London, 1710.

The Jacobitism, Perjury, and Popery of High-Church Priests, London, 1710.

High-Church Display'd: being a Compleat History of the Affair of Dr. Sacheverel, In its Origin, Progress, and Consequences. In several Letters to an English Gentleman at the Court of Hanover. With an Alphabetical Index, by which at one View any Particular in the Doctor's History and Tryal may be found, London, 1711.

Cicero Illustratus, Dissertatio Philologico-Critica: sive Consilium de toto edendo Cicerone, alia plane methodo quam hactenus unquam factum, London, 1712.

Her Majesty's Reasons for Creating the Electoral Prince of Hanover a Peer of this Realm: Or, the Preamble to His Patent as Duke of Cambridge, London, 1712.

An Appeal to Honest People Against Wicked Priests: Or, The very Heathen Laity's Declarations for Civil Obedience and Liberty of Conscience, contrary

to the Rebellious and Persecuting Principles of some of the Old Christian Clergy; With an Application to the Corrupt Part of the Priests of this present Time, publish'd on Occasion of Dr. Sacheverell's last Sermon, London, 1713.

Dunkirk or Dover; or, The Queen's Honour, The Nation's Safety, The Liberties of Europe, and The Peace of the World, All at Stake till that Fort and Port be totally demolish'd by the French, London, 1713.

Characters of the Court of Hannover: With A Word or Two of Some Body else, which No Body has yet Thought on, London, 1714.

Reasons for Naturalizing the Jews in Great Britain and Ireland, On the same foot with all other Nations. Containing also, A Defence of the Jews Against All vulgar Prejudices in all Countries, London, 1714.

The Funeral Elogy and Character, of her Royal Highness, the late Princess Sophia: With the Explication of her Consecration-Medal. Written Originally in Latine, translated into English, and further illustrated, by Mr. Toland, London, 1714.

The Art of Restoring, or, the Piety and Probity of General Monk, In bringing about The Last Restoration, Evidenc'd from his own Authentic Letters: With a Just Account of Sir Roger, Who runs the Parallel as far as he can, London, 1714.

The Grand Mystery Laid Open: namely, by dividing of the Protestants to weaken the Hanover Succession, and by defeating the Succession to extirpate the Protestant Religion. To which is added, The Sacredness of Parliamentary Securities: Against those, Who wou'd indirectly this Year, or

more directly the next (if they live so long) attack the Publick Funds, London, 1714.

The State-Anatomy of Great Britain. Containing a Particular account of its several Interests and Parties, their bent and genius; and what each of them, with all the rest of Europe, may hope or fear from the Reign and Family of King George. Being a Memorial Sent by an intimate friend to a Foreign Minister, lately nominated to come for the Court of England, London, 1717.

The Second Part of the State Anatomy, &c. Containing A short Vindication of the former Part, against the Misrepresentations of the Ignorant or the Malicious, especially relating to our Ministers of State and to Foreigners; with some Reflections on the design'd Clamor against the Army, and on the Suedish Conspiracy. Also, Letters to his Grace, the late Archbishop of Canterbury, and to the Dissenting Ministers of all denominations, in the year 1705-6, about a General Toleration, with some of their Answers to the Author: Who Now offers to Publick Consideration, what was then transacted for Private Satisfaction; together with a Letter from their High-Mightinesses the States-General of the United Provinces, on the same Subject, London, 1717.

Nazareus: Or, Jewish, Gentile, and Mahometan Christianity. Containing The history of the antient Gospel of Barnabas, and the modern Gospel of the Mahometans, attributed to the same Apostle: this last Gospel being now first made known among Christians. Also, the Original Plan of Christianity occasionally explain'd in the history of the Nazarens, wherby diverse Controversies about this divine (but highly perverted) Instituto may be

happily terminated. With The relation of an Irish Manuscript of the Four Gospels, as likewise a Summary of the antient Irish Christianity, and the reality of the Keldees (an order of Lay-religious) against the two last Bishops of Worcester, London, 1718.

Pantheisticon. Sive formula Celebrandae Sodalitatis Socraticae, In Tres Particulas Divisa; quae Pantheistarum, sive Sodalium, Continet I, Mores et Axiomata: II, Numen et Philosophiam: III, Libertatem, et non fallentem Legem, Neque fallendam, Cosmopoli, 1720.

Tetradymus. Containing I. Hodegus; or the Pillar of Cloud and Fire, that guided the Israelites in the Wilderness, not Miraculous: but, as faithfully related in Exodus, a thing equally practis'd by other nations, and in those places not onely useful but necessary. II. Clidophorus; or of the Exoteric and Esoteric Philosophy, that is, of the External and Internal Doctrine of the antients: the one open and public, accommodated to popular Prejudices and the establish'd Religions; the other private and secret, wherein, to the few capable and discrete, was taught the real truth stript of all disguises. III. Hypatia; or the history of a most beautiful, most virtuous, most learned, and every way accomplish'd Lady; who was torn to pieces by the Clergy of Alexandria, to gratify the pride, emulation, and cruelty of their Archbishop Cyril, commonly but undeservedly stil'd Saint Cyril. IV. Mangoneutes: being a defense of Nazarenes, address'd to the right reverence John lord Bishop of London; against his Lordhsip's Chaplian Dr. Mangey, his Dedicator Mr. Patterson, and (who ought to have been nam'd first) the reverend Dr. Brett, once belinging to his Lordship's Church, London, 1720.

The Danger of Mercenary Parliaments, London, 1722.

Pantheisticon: or, the Form Of Celebrating the Socratic-Society. Divided into Three Parts. Which Contain, I. The Morals and Axioms of the Pantheists; or the Brotherhood. II. Their Deity and Philosophy. III. Their Liberty, and a Law, neither deceiving, nor to be deceived, trans. anon, London, 1751.

Dissertations Diverses, ed. L. Mannarino, Paris: Honoré Champion, 2005.

A collection of several pieces of Mr. John Toland, now first publish'd from his original manuscripts: with some memoirs of his life and writings, ed. P. Des Maizeaux, London, 1726.

Trenchard, J., *An Argument Shewing, that a Standing Army Is inconsistent with A Free Government, and absolutely destructive to the Constitution of the English Monarchy*, London, 1697.

Ursinus, F., *Fulvii Ursini in omnia opera Ciceronis, Notae*, Antwerp, 1581.

Valerius Maximus, *Memorable doings and sayings*, ed. D. R. Shackleton Bailey, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2000.

Wilkins, J. (1675) *Of the Principles and Duties of Natural Religion: Two Books*, London, 1675.

Wotton, W., *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning*, London, 1694.

The Complete Editions of Cicero, 1498-1724

Publication Date	Reference	Primary Editor(s)	Title
1498	Minutianus (1498)	Alexander Minutianus	<i>M. Tullii Ciceronis opera. Mediolani impressit Alex. Minutianus redemptura Guilelmorum fratrum.</i>
1502-1523	Aldus (1502)	Aldus Manutius and Andreas Naugerius	<i>M. T. Ciceronis Epistolae Familiares, 1502. M. T. Ciceronis epistolarum ad Atticum, ad Brutum, ad Quintum fratrem, libri XX. Latina interpretatio eorum, quae in ipsis epistolis graece scripta sunt, 1513. M. T. Ciceronis Rhetorica, 1514. M. T. Ciceronis Orationes, 1519. M. T. Ciceronis de philosophia, 1523. Venetiis, in aedibus Aldi et Andreae Soceri.</i>
1511	Ascensius (1511)	Iodocus Badius Ascensius	<i>M. Tullii Ciceronis Opera rhetorica, oratoria et forensia; Orationes et de petitione consulatus; Opera epistolica; Opera philosophica. Parisiis, in aedibus Ascensianis 1511.</i>

1528	Cratander (1528)	Michael Bentinus	<i>M. Tullii Ciceronis omnia quae in hunc usque diem extare putantur opera, in tres secta Tomos, et ad variorum, vetustissimorumque codicum fidem diligentissime recognita ac ultra omnes hactenus visas aeditiones locis aliquot locupletata, Ex inclyta Germaniae Basilea, per And. Cratandram 1528.</i>
1534	Hervagius (1534)		<i>M. Tullii Ciceronis opera quae sedita sunt hactenus omnia in tomes distincta quattuor, ad diversorum et vetustissimorum Codicum collationem ingenti cura recognita multisque locis ultra superiores aeditiones restitutis. Basileae, ex off. Hervagiana 1534.</i>
1534-1537	Victorius (1534)	Petrus Victorius	<i>M. Tullii Ciceronis opera omnium quae hactenus excusa sunt castigatissima nunc primum in lucem edita. Venetiis, in officina Lucae Antonii Iuntae 1534-1537.</i>
1538-1539	Stephanus (1538)	Petrus Victorius	<i>M. Tullii Ciceronis opera. Parisiis, ex off. Rob. Stephani 1538-1539.</i>

1540	Gryphius (1540)	J. M. Brutus	<i>M. Tullii Ciceronis opera ex Petri Victorii castigationibus. Hic accesserunt castigationum eiusdem Victorii explicationes ac Ioach. Camerarii annotationes. Lugduni, Seb. Gryphius 1540.</i>
1540	Sturm (1540)	Johann Sturm	<i>M. Tullii Ciceronis editio post Naugerianam et Victorianam emendata a Io. Sturmio. Argentorati, apud Wendelinum 1540.</i>
1540	Camerarius (1540)	J. Camerarius	<i>Opera Marci Tullii Ciceronis quotquot ab interitu vindicari summorum virorum industria potuerunt cum veterum exemplarium, tum recentiorum collatione restituta. Ex recognitione Ioachimi Camerarii Pabergensis elaborata: cuius et locorum aliquot praecipuorum annotationes subiunguntur. Basileae, ex off. Hervagiana 1540.</i>
1540-1546	Manutius (1540)	Paulus Manutius	<i>Epistolae ad Familiares diligentius, quam quae hactenus exierunt, emendatae. Pauli Manutii Scholia, quibus et loci familiarum epistolarum obscuriores explanantur, et castigationum, quae in iisdem epistolis factae sunt, ratio</i>

redditur, 1540. *Epistolae ad Atticum, ad M. Brutum, ad Q. fratrem*, 1540. *Philosophia*, 1541. *Rhetorica, corrigente Paulo Manutio*, 1546. *Orationes*, 1546. Venetiis, apud Aldi filios.

1543-1544	Stephanus (1543)	Robertus Stephanus (Étienne)	<i>M. Tullii Ciceronis Opera</i> . Parisiis, Rob. Stephanus 1543-1544.
1543-1547	Colinaeus (1543)	Colinaeus (Simon de Colines)	<i>M. Tullii Ciceronis Opera</i> . Parisiis, Sim. Colinaeus 1543-1547.
1546-1548	Gryphius (1546)	J. M. Brutus	<i>Marcus Tullii Ciceronis Opera</i> . Lugduni, Seb. Gryphius 1546-48.
1555	Stephanus (1555)	Paulus Manutius	<i>Opera M. Tullii Ciceronis</i> . Parisiis, apud Carolum Stephanum, Typographum Regium 1555.
1562	Boulierius (1562)	J. Boulierius	<i>M. Tullii Ciceronis Opera. Accessere Petri Victorii castigationes, harum explicationes: Paulique Manutii, et Ioachimi Camerarii, atque Hieronymi Ferrarii</i>

			<i>Adnotamenta. Omnia quidem studio Ioannis Bouilierii emendata. Lugduni, apud Io. Frellonium 1562.</i>
1566	Lambinus (1566)	Dionysius Lambinus	<i>M. Tullii Ciceronis opera omnia, quae exstant, a Dionysio Lambino Monstroliensi ex codicibus manuscriptis emendata et aucta. Eiusdem Dionysii Lambini annotationes, seu emendationum rationes singulis Tomis distinctae. Index rerum et verborum memoria digniorum copiosus et locuples, singulis Tomis adiectus. Et fragmenta omnia, quae exstant, a viris doctis non ita pridem undique collecta. Lutetiae, apud Bernardum Turrisanum 1566.</i>
1570-1571	Brutus (1570)	J. M. Brutus	<i>M. Tullii Ciceronis opera a Ioan. Michaele Bruto emendata. Accesserunt breves animadversiones ex doctissimorum hominum commentariis, quibus ita loci permulti explicantur, ut vulgo receptae lectionis ubique ratio habeatur. Lugduni, apud Antonium Gryphium 1570-1571.</i>
1584	Ursinus (1584)	Fulvius Ursinus	<i>Opera omnia quae exstant, a Dionysio Lambino Monstroliensi ex codicibus manuscriptis emendata. Eiusdem</i>

Diotsii Lambini Annotationes seu emendationum rationes postremae. Fulvii Ursini Romani Notae. Fragmenta omnia Ciceroniana a Lambino et aliis collecta: Consolatio, Ciceronis a nonnullis adscripta. Indices longe omnium copiosissimi. Postremo, ut facilius et commodius haec editio ad Nizoli Thesaurum referri possit, margini appositi sunt numeri, quibus huius editionis cum vetere Aldina consensus hac in parte reperiatur. Genevavae, in officina Sanctandreana 1584.

1588

Gothofredus (1588) Dionysius Lambinus
and Dionysius
Gothofredus

M. Tullii Ciceronis opera omnia. Praeter hactenus vulgatam Dion. Lambini editionem, accesserunt D. Gothofredi I. C. Notae: in quibus Variarum lectionum prope infinitarum: Synopses generales et speciales singulis vel libris vel paginis adiectae; Ciceronis loca praecipua et difficiliora, inter se primo, aliis deinde authoribus, Grammaticis, Rhetoribus, Poetis, Historicis, Iurisconsultis maxime collata: ut et Formulae, quae ad ius, leges, senatus consulta et actiones pertinet, explicatae. Lugduni, sumptibus Sibyllae a Porta 1588.

- | | | | |
|------|-----------------|-----------------|---|
| 1588 | Scot (1588) | Alexander Scot | <i>M. Tullii Ciceronis opera omnia variis Dion. Lambini et aliorum doctissimorum quorumque virorum Lectionibus opera Alex. Scot, Scoti, ad marginem illustrata et in sectiones Apparatus Latinae locutionis respondentia. Acc. D. Lambini et F. Ursini emendationum rationes singulis tomis distinctae. Lugduni, sumptibus Io. Pillehotte 1588.</i> |
| 1590 | Wechel (1590) | Paulus Manutius | <i>M. Tullii Ciceronis opera omnia, quae exstant. Editio ad Manutianam et Brutinam conformata. Cum Annotationibus et castigationibus, quae ex variis doctorum virorum scriptis selectae, suis quaeque Tomis adiectae sunt. Francofurti, apud heredes Wechel 1590.</i> |
| 1618 | Gruterus (1618) | Janus Gruterus | <i>M. Tullii Ciceronis opera omnia quae exstant. Ex sola fere Codd. Mss. fide emendata studio atque industria Iani Gulielmii et Iani Gruteri. Additis notis et Indd. accuratiss. consectis. Hamburgi, ex bibliopolio Frobeniano 1618.</i> |

1642	Elzevir (1642)	Janus Gruterus	<i>M. Tullii Ciceronis opera cum optimis exemplaribus accurate collata.</i> Lugduni Batavorum, ex officina Elzeviriana 1642.
1658-1659	Blaeu (1658)		<i>M. Tullii Ciceronis Opera.</i> Amstelaedami, Blaeu 1658-1659.
1661	Schrevelius (1661)	Janus Gruterus and Cornelius Schrevelius	<i>M. Tullii Ciceronis opera omnia cum Gruteri et selectis variorum notis et indicibus locupletissimis accurante Cornelio Schrevelio.</i> Amstelodami, apud L. et D. Elzevirios et Lugduni Batavorum apud Hackium 1661.
1684-1699	Graevius (1684)	I. G. Graevius	<i>M. Tullii Ciceronis opera omnia cum notis variorum cura I. G. Graevii.</i> Amstelaedami, Elzevir. et Blaeu 1684-1699.
1684-1689	Delphin (1684)		<i>M. Tullii Ciceronis orationes interpretatione et notis illustravit P. Carolus de Merouville ad usum Delphini,</i> Parisiis, Thierry et Benard 1684; <i>Ad familiares Epistolae interpr. et notis illustr. Phil. Quartier in usum Delphini,</i> Parisiis, Dionys. Thierry et vidua Sim. Benard 1685; <i>M. Tullii Ciceronis omnes qui ad artem oratoriam pertinet libri</i>

interpretatione ac notis illustravit Iac. Proust ad usum Delphini, Parisiis, vidua Claudii Thiboust 1687; Opera philosophica cum interpretatione et notis Fr. l'Honoré ad usum Delphini, Parisiis 1689.

1692 Gronovius (1692) Jacobus Gronovius *M. Tullii Ciceronis opera quae exstant omnia ex Mss. Codd. emendata studio atque industria Iani Gulielmii et Iani Gruteri, additis eorum notis integris nunc denuo recognita ab Iacobo Gronovio. Cuius ubique adiectae sunt emendationes, petitae partim ex libris Mss., partim ex animadversionibus virorum doctorum; etiam orationibus illustratis accessione Asconii Peditani et veteris Scholiastae nunquam antea editi. Lugduni Batavorum, apud Petrum van der Aa 1692.*

1724 Verburgius (1724) Isaac Verburgius *M. Tullii Ciceronis opera quae supersunt omnia cum Asconio et Scholaste veteri ac notis integris P. Victorii, Io. Camerari, F. Ursini et selectis P. Manutii, D. Lambini, Iani Gulielmii, Iani Gruteri, I. F. et Iac. Gronoviorum, I. G. Graevii et aliorum quam plurimorum, qui aliquam*

Ciceronus operum partem animadversionibus illustraverunt. Isaacus Verburgius collegit, disposuit, recensuit, varr. lectt. ubique apposuit. Paginas Aldinae Editionis quas Nizolius et alii sunt secuti, una cum Alexandri Scot sectionibus Apparatus Latinae locutionis respondentibus ad utentis commodum ubique diligenter notavit. Cum Indicibus accuratissimis insigniter auctis. Amstelodami, apud Wetstenios 1724.

INTRODUCTION

I. Introducing *Cicero Illustratus*

When in 1712 the radical intellectual John Toland composed a proposal for a new edition of Cicero's complete works, which he entitled *Cicero Illustratus*, he claimed to have formed a plan "perfectioris omni ratione, quàm unquam hactenus, editionis faciundae"¹ It was an audacious declaration, and one which Toland attempted to justify across the pages of *Cicero Illustratus* with both enthused claims for the necessity of this new edition, and extensive elaborations of this intention to deliver the most perfect edition ever to be achieved. In the course of these deliberations *Cicero Illustratus* embraces an impressively capacious range of themes: the history of Ciceronian scholarship, the role of the Ciceronian tradition in contemporary culture, the appropriate conduct of textual scholarship, and the political, intellectual, and cultural ramifications of these topics. In spite of the apparent simplicity of the subject of the treatise, the breadth of material and the significance of the queries encompassed is striking. The work is also notable for the particular qualities Toland was able to bring to such a discussion, mingling throughout the text passages of rhetorical hyperbole concerning himself and his subject, positive statements of the means by which his aims would be met, and colourful passages of polemic directed against his rivals and predecessors in all the fields of scholarship addressed. Any

¹ *CI* p. 4: "for carrying out the creation of an edition more perfect in every way than ever before. I will transcribe quotes from *Cicero Illustratus* exactly as they appear in Toland's text; passages of neo-Latin quoted from elsewhere in Toland's corpus, and works by other authors, will be moderately adapted (for example, ligatures will be separated).

sense that *Cicero Illustratus* was a straightforward description of how a new edition of Cicero's works might be completed is swiftly dismissed by Toland's handling of the material.

In spite of the evident possibilities of the text, it has been markedly neglected in the fields to which it has the most potential to contribute, including studies of John Toland, the reception of Cicero, the history of scholarship, and the history of ideas. One explanation for this inattention may be Toland's failure to bring his project to fruition; the edition he proposed was never made. *Cicero Illustratus* had been addressed to the Protestant hero Prince Eugene of Savoy in the hope that financial support would be forthcoming from the eminent general, but it evidently failed to convince. Another possible reason for the extent to which *Cicero Illustratus* has been overlooked is the difficulty of cataloguing it as a work; it encompasses such a range of scholarly questions that it is difficult to categorise it within a specific field of scholarship. It can be read as a work on Cicero, as a work by John Toland, and as an example of the literary culture of the period, but unless all of these features are considered together, the full merit of *Cicero Illustratus* will be unrealised. It is for this reason that this thesis will begin by defining precisely what kind of text *Cicero Illustratus* constitutes.

II. The author: John Toland's radical project

The author of *Cicero Illustratus*, John Toland, represents one of the most elusive, controversial, and intriguing intellectual figures of the early Enlightenment. The efforts of this man to penetrate the scholarly consciousness of England and the continent saw him disseminate an impressive variety of works, from political tracts to historical studies to works of biblical scholarship and more. It is necessary to

locate *Cicero Illustratus* within this body of work, and within Toland's intellectual endeavours, if the ramifications of its authorship are to be fully appreciated.

i. *Cicero Illustratus* in Toland's life and works

John Toland was a man whose life was defined by controversy.² From his youth he demonstrated a propensity for questioning and challenging accepted beliefs, when he abandoned the Catholic faith he was born into in his native Ireland in favour of Protestantism. A description of this decision he provided in later life divulged the basis of his conversion: "for being educated, from my Cradle, in the grossest Superstition and Idolatry, God was pleas'd to make my own Reason, and such as made use of theirs, the happy Instruments of my Conversion"³ Toland's commitment to Protestantism saw him pursue his education with the support of Presbyterian sponsors, taking him from Glasgow to Edinburgh, to Leiden, where he was able to associate with Friedrich Spanheim, Jean Le Clerc, and Benjamin Furly, and finally to Oxford.⁴ During this period Toland's views veered increasingly towards heterodoxy, a development noted by a correspondent while he studied in Oxford: "the character you bear in Oxford is this; that you are a man of fine parts,

² Toland advised, in the epitaph he composed for himself, that "if you would know more of him search his writings" (BL Add 4295 f. 77). In addition to this, much material on Toland's life can be found in the account written by Pierre Des Maizeaux to preface the *Collection* of his unpublished works produced posthumously in 1726. There are useful modern biographical accounts in Sullivan (1982) pp. 1-50; Champion (2003) pp. 1-22; Kearney (1997) pp. 207-220; Daniel (1984) pp. 5-13; Brown (2012). An important bibliographic account of Toland's life is that by Carabelli (1975).

³ Toland, *Christianity not Mysterious*, p. ix.

⁴ Des Maizeaux (1726) pp. v-xi.

great learning, and little religion⁵ This perception of Toland was only confirmed when in 1696 he produced *Christianity not Mysterious*, his most famous, and controversial, work. Its fundamental argument was that no aspect of true Christianity should be inaccessible to human reason, a claim which challenged vital tenets of the established Church. The reaction this work provoked was predictably violent; polemical responses flew from the printing presses, and condemnation by Church and state bodies saw copies of his book burned, and Toland expelled from his homeland.⁶ His reputation was in ruins.

Toland's situation demanded a redirection of his efforts. In need of new connections to replace those who had abandoned him following *Christianity not Mysterious*, including John Locke and William Molyneux, Toland attempted to alleviate some of the toxicity of his reputation by making his services available to several leading figures among the Country Whigs.⁷ The relationships which resulted gained Toland work acting in an editorial capacity, producing new editions of several prominent republican works of the seventeenth century.⁸ In addition, he wrote numerous polemical tracts articulating the Country Whig stance on significant

⁵ *Collection* II.295-298. In Oxford in 1694 he produced "The fabulous death of Atilius Regulus" printed in the *Collection* II.28-47, and *Two Essays* (1695).

⁶ Des Maizeaux (1726) pp. xv-xxvi. See Carabelli (1975) for a full record of the responses to *Christianity not Mysterious*. Toland attempted to defend himself with *An Apology for Mr. Toland* (1697) and *A Defence of Mr. Toland* (1697).

⁷ In particular Toland forged relationships with Shaftesbury, Robert Molesworth, and Robert Clayton; cf. *Collection* II.318-326 and Champion (2003) p. 3.

⁸ Des Maizeaux (1726) pp. xxvi ff. Toland produced *The Life of John Milton* (1698), and a defence of that work *Amyntor* (1699); *Discourses concerning Government, by Algernon Sidney* (1698); *Memoirs of Denzil, Lord Holles* (1699); *Memoirs of Lieutenant General Ludlow* (1699); *The Oceana of James Harrington* (1700). See Worden (2001) pp. 86-121 on Toland's editorial project.

political developments, including the Standing Army controversy, the Act of Settlement, and the increasing dominance of party politics.⁹ *Anglia Libera* (1701), in which Toland celebrated the Act of Settlement's confirmation of the Hanoverian Succession, rehabilitated his standing sufficiently to win him a position as secretary on the embassy to Hanover accompanying Lord Macclesfield, intended to present the Act to the Electress Sophia of Hanover.¹⁰ In this period, when work as a propagandist primarily occupied Toland, he forged a particularly profitable relationship with Robert Harley. It was for Harley that Toland edited Harrington's *Oceana*, and composed *The Memorial of the State of England* in 1705, in response to *The Memorial of the Church of England* by High Church Tories Counsellor Pooley and Dr Drake.¹¹ In addition, during his time on the continent Toland undertook some limited espionage on behalf of Harley. In spite of these labours, Toland was not rewarded with any tangible position or status, a situation which increasingly frustrated him.

The period in which Toland wrote *Cicero Illustratus* was consequently one of disillusionment. Exasperated by his continuing lack of status, Toland returned to the continent in 1707, where he resumed his more controversial intellectual endeavours. While in Holland in 1709 he produced *Adeisidaemon* and *Origines Judiciae*, two works of Latinate scholarship which set out to challenge accepted traditions in Christianity concerning the authority of the clergy and the history of Moses for a

⁹ *The Danger of Mercenary Parliaments* (1698); *The Militia Reform'd* (1698); *Anglia Libera* (1701); *The Art of Governing by Partys* (1701); *Paradoxes of State* (1702); *Vindicius Liberior* (1702); *The Memorial of the State of England* (1705).

¹⁰ Des Maizeaux (1726) pp. xlii-lvi.

¹¹ Des Maizeaux (1726) pp. lvii-lxi. Toland also wrote *Oratio Philippica* (1707) on Harley's behalf.

European wide audience in the Republic of Letters. When Toland returned to England in 1710 he was confronted with a vastly different political landscape. The trial of Sacheverell had inaugurated an overwhelming Tory electoral victory, and Toland's erstwhile sponsor Harley had joined forces with Rochester and the Tories in the ministry, replacing Godolphin and the Whig Junto and assuming the position of Chancellor of the Exchequer. Toland was utterly disconcerted by the political developments of the period, and directed his attentions to literary engagement with contemporary events.¹² The trial of Sacheverell, and the resultant return to power of the High Church sympathising Tories, provoked a succession of works attempting to illustrate the threat to the state posed by these developments.¹³ Toland was also deeply exercised by the efforts of the Tory government, including Harley, to reach peace agreements with France to end the War of the Spanish Succession, a move which Toland judged to be a threat to the Protestant liberties of the entire continent, and the Hanoverian Succession, so important to the protection of those liberties.¹⁴ *Cicero Illustratus* was composed in the midst of these political preoccupations, published just weeks after peace talks had begun on the 29th January 1712. While Toland was driven by his political disillusionment to engage increasingly with scholarship, as *Adeisidaemon*, *Origines Judiciae*, and his efforts at translating Pliny in 1711 demonstrate, he had by no means forsaken his political voice, a fact which

¹² Toland eventually renounced his association with Harley in *The Art of Restoring* (1714).

¹³ *The Jacobitism, Perjury, and Popery of High-Church Priests* (1710); *Reflections on Dr. Sacheverell's Sermon* (1710); *High Church Display'd* (1711); *An Appeal to Honest People against Wicked Priests* (1713).

¹⁴ *An Account of the Courts of Prussia and Hanover* (1705); *Her Majesty's reasons for creating the Electoral Prince of Hanover a peer of this Realm* (1712); *Dunkirk or Dover* (1713); *Characters of the Court of Hannover* (1714); *The Funeral Elogy and Character, of her Royal Highness, the Late Princess Sophia* (1714).

must be borne in mind when considering the importance of *Cicero Illustratus* to Toland.

There did remain in Toland's life one more shift in his political engagement. In 1714 the Tory government collapsed, and the Whigs, with whom Toland had been re-forging his connections, were returned to power. In addition, the Hanoverian Succession, which Toland had so fervently advocated, finally took place, with George I ascending to the throne. Closely associated with the new political regime and presented with an opportunity whereby his goals might be received favourably, Toland produced a series of works advocating toleration, and political and religious reform.¹⁵ Toland's most notable contribution to the politics of this period was the Whig manifesto *The State-Anatomy of Great Britain*, published in 1717, in which he made a series of recommendations and justifications for radical reforms, some of which would come about in the ministry of Stanhope. It was, however, not to last. In 1720 Toland lost what money he possessed in the collapse of the South Sea Company. Destitute, his health failed, and he died penniless and all but friendless in March 1722.

This necessarily brief and schematic survey of Toland's life demonstrates an important feature of his works: they, and he, remained politically engaged throughout his life. Even when he was seemingly excluded from the political sphere between 1710 and 1714, Toland continued to produce literature with a notable political emphasis. In spite of the scholarly subject matter of *Cicero Illustratus*, it would be short-sighted to evaluate it as a piece of scholarship alone. The nature of John Toland's works demands a broader appraisal.

¹⁵ *Reasons for Naturalizing the Jews* (1714); *The Second Part of the State Anatomy* (1717).

ii. John Toland's radical philosophy

The details of Toland's life offer only one perspective on his works; a full appreciation of them must encompass the ideals which consistently influenced and directed his ideas. In the most essential terms, Toland was a radical. This was manifested in the political sphere by his Commonwealth and Erastian determination to see the power of Church and Crown limited, and by his commitment to the defence of liberty and the prevention of absolutist rule above all other considerations. The importance of these radical commitments to his actions was stated explicitly in one letter, in which he declared that "I do all this, its true, from the unalterable love I bear to Liberty"¹⁶ These ideals inspired his particular political commitments, such as his support for the Hanoverian Succession, judging it to be vital to the protection of Protestant liberties both at home and on the continent. His involvement with radical Whigs like the Third Earl of Shaftesbury and Sir Robert Molesworth emanated from a shared belief in liberty and hostility to arbitrary rule. Hostility to clerical power and to the secular influence of the Church, and the resultant inhibition of toleration, also featured prominently throughout his works and actions, driven by the belief that these constituted the main enemies to the freedom of the Commonwealth.

Toland's radicalism extended beyond the public sphere and into the philosophical; his literary contributions in this field marked him out as a primary advocate of the authority of reason, particularly in theology. Across the course of his career Toland produced several philosophical works intended to provide an intellectual basis for the radicalism of his responses to the established Church, particularly by

¹⁶ *Collection* II.428-430.

championing a natural and rational religion. These beliefs have seen him identified as a Deist, a Pantheist, a Socinian, an Atheist, and more besides.¹⁷ As early as 1695 he had composed the *Two Essays*, which provided a rational reading of the Creation and the rise of fables, challenging both as sources of influence for the Church. This was quickly succeeded by the controversial *Christianity not Mysterious*, which became such a notorious case for the rationalisation of religion. On his return from the continent in 1704, he continued constructing his philosophical case in his *Letters to Serena*, in which he used the history of religion together with metaphysical arguments to expose various aspects of the established Church as the results of priestly imposture. Toland's belief in a rational religion received its fullest exposition in his *Pantheisticon* in 1720, in which he imagined a Pantheistic society, and explained the metaphysical and moral premises of their natural religion.¹⁸ Toland's public and philosophical works were therefore united in their willingness to challenge established authority, and to propose alternatives to the primary sources of that authority.

Integral to these radical aspects of Toland's thought was his use of scholarship; throughout his life Toland deployed works of biblical and classical scholarship to reinforce the controversial elements of his arguments.¹⁹ Toland in particular engaged with biblical criticism, attempting to make the case that the Bible had been

¹⁷ On Toland as a Deist see Wigelsworth (2009) pp. 20-30, 75-82, 143-147; Hudson (2009) pp. 84-98; Sullivan (1982); Biddle (1976). For the modern case that Toland was an atheist see Berman (1992) pp. 255-272.

¹⁸ *Tetradymus* was also published that year, containing four essays which continued these themes.

¹⁹ Champion (2003) pp. 3, 190-212; Kearney (1997) pp. 209-210; Ligota and Quantin (2006) p. 10; cf. Sullivan (1982) pp. 46-47 for his dismissal of Toland's scholarship.

contaminated by apocryphal and spurious material. In 1699 Toland wrote *Amyntor* to defend the claim made in his *Life of John Milton* that *Eikon Basilike* was a forgery composed by Charles I's chaplain, and included within it a catalogue of what he considered to be apocryphal elements of the New Testament. This interest in apocryphal writings and their impact on Christian deception manifested itself again during his time on the continent between 1707 and 1710, with his probable involvement with the composition and dissemination of the *Traité des Trois Imposteurs*, and the works *Adeisidaemon* and *Origines Judiciae*, together with an extension of the catalogue begun in *Amyntor*, composed for Prince Eugene and Baron von Hohendorf. In his work *Nazarenus*, published in 1718, these studies would reach their conclusion, when Toland embedded an account of the *Gospel of Barnabas* within wider biblical criticism. Toland also exhibited particular interest in Celtic scholarship, developing works throughout his life which dealt with the Celtic language, history, and belief systems.²⁰ Classical scholarship was present throughout these works; its function will be dealt with in the second section of this thesis. Erudition, for Toland, was a valuable weapon in his arsenal to further his radical efforts.

It is therefore necessary when examining *Cicero Illustratus* to remain aware of the importance of the author's radical philosophy to his work. Toland's radical beliefs were a driving force behind his politics and his literary works, and scholarship played a significant role in their construction and authorisation. Once more, with

²⁰ See *History of the Druids* and *A Critical History of the Celtic Religion* both published in the *Collection*.

Toland as its author, *Cicero Illustratus* cannot be assumed to be simply a work of scholarship without the potential for more extensive objectives.

iii. Toland studies

While Toland's commitment to radical principles is evident, his precise location within the sphere of radical thought has proved elusive, causing efforts to identify Toland's intellectual position precisely, and thus the nature of his contribution, to dominate Toland studies. One school of thought, prevailing for much of the twentieth century, diminished Toland's radicalism, locating him on the margins of orthodoxy. Victorian rationalist Leslie Stephen's work in 1876 proved particularly influential in perpetuating this reading; his brief survey of Toland and his work, primarily polemical in its tone, sought to demonstrate that the importance of Toland was minimal, as his thought, and the thought of the heterodox Deists, differed little from that of the rational Anglican.²¹ This reading of Toland's works received a renewed expression in 1982 by Robert Sullivan in *John Toland and the Deist Controversy*. This study of Toland's life, the first of its kind in English, also argued that Toland's thought did not diverge substantially from more orthodox approaches. In the 1970s a series of works appeared attempting to rehabilitate Toland. This was particularly so in Italian and French scholarship, where appreciation for Toland has been much easier to come by than in England.²² Margaret Jacob's work developed

²¹ Stephen (1876) pp. 101-111.

²² Brykman (1995); Carabelli (1975); Sabetti (1976); Giuntini (1979).

these insights by identifying Toland as among those radicals whose ideology developed in reaction to the growing influence of Newtonian philosophy.²³

For all these scholars, the effort to locate Toland's thought in the scheme of radicalism relied on identifying his particular sources and influences. The arguments of Stephen and Sullivan depended on emphasising the extent to which Toland simply regurgitated existing thinking, in particular the writings of the Deists. Earlier Paul Hazard defined Toland's works as derivative, identifying sources including Fontenelle, Bayle, Van Dale, Hobbes and in particular Spinoza.²⁴ Hazard's criticism of Toland emanates in large part from this perception of his limited contribution: 'he was a born mischief-maker and scandal-monger, puffed up with vanity, fond of creating an uproar, very cock-a-hoop when fortune favoured, yet not averse to being pelted at because the brick-bats at least made a clatter about him as they fell'²⁵ For those who argued that Toland must be counted among the more extreme radicals, his sources remained fundamental to their arguments. Margaret Jacob, for example, argued that Toland had used the thought of Giordano Bruno to form his own philosophy.²⁶ Jonathan Israel emphasised the influence of Spinoza on Toland, in accordance with his general thesis on the importance of Spinozism to the Radical Enlightenment.²⁷ Gerard Reedy argued for the influence of the Socinians on Toland,

²³ Jacob (1981), particularly pp. 152-154.

²⁴ Hazard (1953) pp. 176-181.

²⁵ Hazard (1953) p. 177.

²⁶ Jacob (1969) pp. 316-324; cf. Giuntini (1979) on Bruno's influence.

²⁷ Israel (2001) pp. 609-614; cf. Iofrida (1983) on Spinoza's influence.

particularly in the methodology he adopted for *Christianity not Mysterious*.²⁸ Perhaps in response to this scholarly obsession with the influences on Toland's thought, the 1990s saw several works appeared which focussed on judging Toland's contribution according to its immediate context.²⁹

It is the work of Justin Champion which has done most to rehabilitate Toland by shifting the emphasis away from attempting to locate his beliefs on the radical spectrum, instead focussing on their public function and significance.³⁰ He has argued that the obsession in scholarship with Toland's religious ideology, separated from his public and political works, has failed to appreciate what Toland was attempting to achieve. Toland was above all else a public writer, and is therefore best understood in the context of political debate. Champion has successfully demonstrated that Toland's writings and thought, in their public, philosophical, and scholarly manifestations, were directed towards fundamentally political goals: republicanism, and the war on priestcraft. This approach to Toland's works offers a platform for insight into the purpose and significance of *Cicero Illustratus*. As a work by Toland it must be examined with his broader project in mind, which as the survey of his works and life demonstrated involves maintaining an awareness of the public functions of his works and the radical philosophy underwriting them.

²⁸ Reedy (1977) pp. 285-304. See also Biddle (1976) pp. 411-422 on Locke's influence on *Christianity not Mysterious*.

²⁹ Cherchi (1994); Daniel (1984); Evans (1991).

³⁰ Champion (2003).

III. The Subject: Ciceronian scholarship in the early Enlightenment

A work of seventy-three pages, published by John Humfreys, *Cicero Illustratus* is, first and foremost, a work on Cicero: on his life, his works, the tradition surrounding him, the influence of scholarship on that tradition, and the value which Toland feels can be placed on Cicero in the context of the eighteenth century. Toland's engagement with these issues illuminates a period of Ciceronian scholarship which has for a long time been overlooked.

i. Defending Ciceronianism

As is appropriate when pursuing financial support, Toland took care to emphasise the necessity of the project he proposed. In the introductory chapters of *Cicero Illustratus* the case for a new edition of Cicero's works is constructed from arguments delineating the value of Cicero and those works to contemporary culture. This inevitably involved epideictic rhetoric in a manner familiar from innumerable sympathetic treatments of Cicero, as Toland championed his subject with exclamations emphasising his immense eloquence, his peerless grasp of philosophy, and the flawless personal virtue he displayed, particularly in his political conduct.³¹ Beneath such formulaic rhetoric, a more cogent vision of Cicero's particular assets manifests itself, encapsulated in Toland's exclamation "quàm insigne probi civis et optimi philosophi exemplar!"³² The merit of Cicero, in Toland's view, is the extent of his achievements in both the literary and the political fields, and it is this combination of feats in his scholarly and public life that Toland chooses to

³¹ For examples, see *CI* pp. 3-4, 10, 12-14.

³² *CI* p. 19: "what a remarkable example of a good citizen and of an excellent philosopher!"

emphasise to illustrate Cicero's importance. Toland presented a Cicero dressed for his own times.

Toland makes the case that vast swathes of contemporary political, philosophical, and literary knowledge emanated from the great figures of antiquity, and that among these figures, there were none whose influence exceeded that of Marcus Tullius Cicero, "quod in historia Philosophorum et doctrina tradendâ, in Politicorum speculationibus et exercitiis, ac (quod primum memorare debueram) in origine, progressu, et perfectione Eloquentiae, Romanis omnibus tam extantibus quàm extinctis immensum antecellat, est proculdubio verissimum"³³ Not only are Cicero's works an invaluable storehouse of such material, but his own life and conduct represent an unparalleled example of political conduct. Toland recalls Cicero's advancement through the political ranks in spite of his status as a *novus homo*, praises his immense knowledge of civil matters as displayed in his speeches and actions, and commends his exemplary use of eloquence to guide the people to appropriate action.³⁴ Also recounted in vivid detail is the occasion of Cicero's glorious return from exile, used as an illustration of the devotion Cicero inspired by his service to the Republic.³⁵ This is the value Toland claims for Cicero: his works and his life constitute sources of inspiration for the conduct of a contemporary eighteenth century public life.

³³ *CI* p. 10: "since in delivering the history and instruction of Philosophers, the theory and practice of Politics, and (which I ought to have mentioned first) the origin, progression, and perfection of Eloquence, he immeasurably excelled all prominent Romans extant as well as lost, it is most true without doubt" cf. *CI* pp. 9-10.

³⁴ *CI* pp. 16-19.

³⁵ *CI* pp. 19-20.

The necessity for a new edition of Cicero's works went beyond the merit Toland perceived in a full grasp of the Ciceronian tradition, to address the problematic state in which that tradition existed. Toland's edition would correct the damage done to Cicero's reputation, which had in recent years diminished the influence Cicero had, and should, exert over the minds of young men. He directs the blame for this apparent decline in Cicero's standing in two primary directions: educational practice, and the conduct of men who hold public office.³⁶ Men who acted in a public capacity, such as lawyers and officials, attempted to claim association with Cicero, an association which caused extensive damage to Cicero's reputation, as *hoc apud imperitos facit, ut verbosus, impudens, venalis, et litigiosus habeatur, eadem odiosâ imputatione, qua rabulae forenses et cavillatores, dignissimis Patronorum Advocatorumque vitae conditionibus indignissimè abutuntur*³⁷

Damage was inflicted on the Ciceronian tradition by educators in two ways: the cruelty with which they accompanied their teaching ensured the association of Cicero with that pain, and their method of teaching, which focused exclusively on linguistic and stylistic matters, inhibiting the full appreciation of the virtues of Cicero's works.³⁸ Toland despaired of a generation of boys who would find nothing of value in Cicero's works besides a collection of words: *haec ergo et reliqua ejusdem opera, non digniori fine ab aliis leguntur, quàm ut verborum inde copiam, tanquam ex repertorio quodam, depromant; quod plurimos induxit, ut nihil in iis*

³⁶ *CI* pp. 11-12.

³⁷ *CI* p. 11: *his makes it the case among the ignorant, that he is held wordy, impudent, venal, and litigious, with the same offensive imputations, by which wrangling advocates and quibblers, most undeservingly abuse the most honourable condition in life of Advocates and Patrons*

³⁸ *CI* pp. 15-16.

praeter verba reperiri censerent³⁹ Those aspects of the Ciceronian tradition so valuable to Toland had been obscured by the conduct of his immediate predecessors and contemporaries, making the task he had set himself all the more vital. Cicero, and all that could be learnt from him, must be rescued for future generations.

Toland's final point enforced the necessity of his proposed edition: the Ciceronian tradition must be rehabilitated, so that it might resume its rightful place as a source of instruction and inspiration for young men embarking on public careers. In this way, Toland's planned work takes on a greater significance, revealing itself as a public service, rather than merely an intellectual exercise. These works were written for one purpose, and they should be returned to that purpose: *æoque etiam animo, ut eadem commodiora prorsus et utiliora iis, in quorum gratiam conscripta sunt, officiosus reddam; Principibus scilicet viris et Nobilibus, Philosophis etiam, Politicis, Judicibus, et omnibus quibuscunque Magistratibus*⁴⁰ Toland leaves behind these introductory chapters to confront the main content of his proposal, his plans for tackling his editorial responsibilities, which will be discussed in the first section of this thesis. He does not, however, leave behind the pledge made in those first chapters, that he wishes to rescue the true value of Cicero's works from the linguists and the lawyers and whoever else he identifies as a threat. This edition was

³⁹ *CI* p. 15: *ætherefore these and the rest of his works, are read by others for no more worthy end, than to bring forth from them an abundance of words, just as out of a catalogue; which persuaded many to think that there was nothing to find in them besides words*

⁴⁰ *CI* p. 20: *æand also with this in mind, so that I should be careful to render his works more beneficial and convenient to use, for those for whose benefit they were composed; that is, evidently for the Chief and Noble men, also Philosophers, Politicians, Judges, and all Magistrates whosoever*

intended, first and foremost, to make Cicero accessible once more to those who would most benefit from his instruction.

ii. Locating the early modern Cicero

Toland's perturbation at the role Cicero played in the educational system was not without merit; throughout the seventeenth century Cicero's most prominent role in English contemporary culture was indeed educational.⁴¹ A series of translations and texts were produced specifically designed to facilitate the form of linguistic training so distasteful to Toland.⁴² The formation of these editions was influenced by a method particularly favoured by educators in both Latin and English in this period, that of 'double translation' which encouraged the reader to translate back and forth between Latin and English. Editions of Cicero's works were produced to encourage this process. For example, John Brinsley's edition of *De Officiis* in 1616 provided a grammatical translation to aid the process of translating between the two languages. Another was the work produced by Dr Webbe in 1627 entitled *Lessons and Exercises out of Cicero Ad Atticum*, in which, similarly to Brinsley's effort, passages of Cicero were arranged in columns to encourage the grammatical understanding of the text. The process of rendering the text suitable for this form of education was

⁴¹ Miller (1963) pp. 163-174; Nelson (1952) pp. 119-143; Clarke (1965) p. 90.

⁴² *Three bookes of duties to Marcus his Sonne turned out of Latine into English by Nicholas Grimalde. Whereunto the Latin is adioined.* London, 1553; *A treatise of the figures of grammer and rhetorike cet. Whereunto is ioyned the oration which Cicero made to Caesar...sette foorth by Richarde Sherrye.* London, 1555; *The first book of Tully's offices trsl. into English by Mr. Brinsley.* London, 1616; *Lessons and exercises out of Cic. ad Attic. after the method of Dr. Webb.* London, 1627; (Lloyd, Hugh) *Phrases elegantiores ex Caesaris commentariis, Cicerone aliisque Oxonii,* 1654.

indicative of the tendency to reduce Cicero's works to their linguistic basis, as described by Toland.

In addition to this linguistic training, the educational system encouraged learning through *imitatio*, particularly in order to enhance the students' comprehension of rhetoric.⁴³ In Brinsley's edition, one column of translation existed not for grammatical instruction, but so that the student might practise the declamation of Cicero's words, thereby enhancing their own oratorical competence. This was a particularly notable feature of a translation of *De Officiis* produced by Nicolas Grimalde in 1553.⁴⁴ Grimalde expressed the purpose of his translation to be the rendering of Ciceronian eloquence accessible to the unlearned reader, so that they might, through *imitatio*, learn to enhance their words with such oratorical skills as they acquired from the text. Grimalde said of his efforts 'chiefly for our unlatined people I have made this latin writer, english: and have now brought into light, that from them so long was hidden: and have caused an ancient writing to become, in a maner, new againe'⁴⁵ The appreciation demonstrated here of the need to make Ciceronian eloquence more broadly accessible proved influential in the seventeenth century, as an increasing number of translations of Cicero's works became available.⁴⁶ The Ciceronian tradition Toland confronted was indeed heavily

⁴³ Freedman (1986) pp. 227-254; Corbett (1971) pp. 243-250; Nelson (1952) pp. 119-143; Miller (1963) pp. 163-174.

⁴⁴ O'Gorman (1990) pp. 13-29.

⁴⁵ Grimalde, *Three books of duties* Cij.

⁴⁶ *M. T. C. Offices in three books trsl. into English by Roger L'estranger*, 1633; *Tusculan Questions*, 1633; *Cato Major of old age a poem in four parts by John Denham*, 1648; *Cicero against Catiline in four invective orations – by Chrp. Wase*, 1671; *Of old age trsl. by Austin*, 1671; *Three books touching the nature of the Gods done into english*, 1683; *The oration of Cicero for M. Marcellus done into*

influenced by a preoccupation with the educational function of Cicero's language and style.⁴⁷

In the eighteenth century Cicero's role in Anglophone culture shifted. There was less need for his works in the educational sphere, as the vernacular was increasingly influential and Latin was consequently if not in decline, at least of less elevated status.⁴⁸ Instead, it was Cicero the man who became a significant feature on the cultural landscape, the enthusiastic production of translations of Cicero's works across the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries having made Cicero himself ever more accessible. This interest in Cicero as an historical character is reflected in a flood of studies of his life which appeared in the eighteenth century.⁴⁹ The most important and enduring of these was that produced by Conyers Middleton in 1741.⁵⁰ The version of Cicero presented by Middleton was generous in its praise,

English, 1689; *Cicero's Laelius*, 1691; *Five books de Finibus or concerning the last object of desire and aversion trsl. into engl. by Samuel Parker*, 1702; *Essays on old age and friendship, Paradoxes and Scipio's dream trsl. into english by Samuel Parker*, 1704; *Discourse on old age trsl. by Wilson*, 1710; *Five books of Tusculan disputations*, 1714.

⁴⁷ See Skinner (2008) p. 3 and (1996) on the influence of Ciceronian rhetoric in the education of Hobbes.

⁴⁸ Clarke (1965) pp. 95-98.

⁴⁹ *A view of the life of Cicero and of his performances*, by George Mackenzie, 1711; *Observations on the life of Cicero* by George Lord Lyttleton, 1733; *The character and conduct of CICERO considered from the History of his life* by Conyers Middleton, by Colley Cibber, 1747; *Some strictures on CICERO'S conduct and character*, by N. Hooke, 1764; *The history of M.T. Cicero and Remarks on his character*, by Adam Ferguson in his *History of the Progress and Termination of the Roman Republic*, 1783.

⁵⁰ Middleton, *The History of the life of Marcus Tullius Cicero*, in two volumes; cf. Young (2012) pp. 235-265 and Trevor-Roper (2010) pp. 71-119. Conyers Middleton (1683-1750) was an enthusiastic classicist, a great admirer of Cicero, and a heterodox writer.

constructing him as a source for appropriate moral behaviour, ‘since how much soever people may differ in their opinion of his conduct, yet all have constantly agreed in their judgment of his works, that there are none now remaining to us from the Heathen world that so beautifully display and so forcibly recommend all those generous principles that tend to exalt and perfect human nature; the love of virtue, liberty, our country, and of all mankind’⁵¹ The reverence displayed for Cicero the man by Middleton was indicative of a trend in English culture across the eighteenth century. This development in the Ciceronian tradition resonated in the eighteenth century political sphere, as prominent political figures invoked Cicero and other Roman Republican figures as analogies for themselves or their colleagues.⁵² The enthusiasm with which editions, in both English and Latin, of Cicero’s works dealing with the appropriate conduct of statesmen were produced is further testament to the extent to which he was recognised as a model for civic conduct.⁵³ This was a superficial attachment to Cicero and Rome, seeking to employ an idealised version of these traditions to exploit the resulting historical authority.

This outline of the presentation of a Ciceronian tradition in seventeenth and eighteenth century England confirms the pertinence of Toland’s criticisms of his

⁵¹ Middleton, *History of the life of Cicero* p. xxxii.

⁵² Browning (1982) pp. 210-256 on the influence of Cicero on the Court Whigs; cf. Ayres (1997) pp. xiii-xvii, 1-21 and Rawson (1975) p. 304.

⁵³ *De oratore cum interpr. ac notis, quas in usum Delphini edidit Iac. Proust*, Oxoniae 1714; *De oratore ex Ms. emendavit notisque illustravit Zachar. Pearce*, Cantabrigiae 1716; *De officiis libri tres. Cato maior, Laelius, Paradoxa, Somnium Scipionis*, Oxoniae 1717; *De officiis libri tres cum notis Io. Minelli*, Londini 1722; *De oratore trsl. into english by G.P.*, 1723; *De legibus tres*, Cantabrigiae 1727; *Opera philosophica ex recens. et cum notis Io. Davisii*, Cantabrigiae 1736; *De oratore trsl. into english by Will. Guthrie*, 1742; *The Morals of Cicero*, 1744; *De officiis... Zacharias Pearce*, Deacanus Wintoniensis, London 1745; *De officiis libri tres. Cato maior et Laelius*, London 1753.

contemporaries. It would also appear to underscore his claim to offer something new to Ciceronian scholarship, or at least to reinvigorate a previous incarnation of that tradition. *Cicero Illustratus* represents a fresh outlook on the role the Ciceronian tradition could play in the early Enlightenment.

iii. Ciceronian scholarship

Toland's proposed edition gives a perspective from which it is possible to correct an omission in the current scholarship on the Ciceronian tradition. In chronological terms, scholarly accounts of Ciceronian influence tend to focus on the early to middle seventeenth century, and the middle to late eighteenth century, neglecting the very period into which *Cicero Illustratus* falls, the transition from the seventeenth to the eighteenth centuries. The Ciceronian tradition in the late medieval period and the Renaissance inevitably receives greater attention, particularly with respect to the pre-eminent role of Ciceronian eloquence in rhetorical education.⁵⁴ The enthusiasm with which Ciceronian texts were hunted and utilised by humanist scholars makes the Ciceronian tradition a prominent feature of the development of Renaissance thought and scholarship.⁵⁵ The place of Cicero in Enlightenment thought has also received some limited attention.⁵⁶ The period between, however, in which the transition between the humanist scholarship of the Renaissance and the rational thought of the Enlightenment took place, remains heavily underdeveloped by scholars of the Ciceronian tradition.

⁵⁴ Cox and Ward (2011).

⁵⁵ Baron (1966) pp. 446-452; Pfeiffer (1976) pp. 15, 26, 84; Reynolds and Wilson (1991) pp. 122-163.

⁵⁶ Fox (2007); Gawlick (1963).

In addition to this chronological gap, there is a significant lacuna in the considerations of the different literary areas in which Ciceronian influence might be discerned. The evident emphasis on Cicero as an educational resource in England, as a model for linguistic and stylistic development, has received the most attention.⁵⁷ The interest in Cicero's linguistic influence is also felt in the extensive scholarly interest in the development of the debate on 'Ciceronianism' its progress, and its eventual conclusion.⁵⁸ Cicero's political, philosophical, and intellectual contribution, all areas emphasised by Toland, have received scant attention. Cicero's impact in these topics tends to be subsumed into considerations of other features of the classical tradition, such as the influence of the Roman Republic, or the nature of seventeenth century classical republicanism.⁵⁹ Cicero's philosophical influence has also yet to be examined extensively. Günter Gawlick's article on the role of Cicero in the Enlightenment encompasses the nature of his impact on the English Deists, indicating a significant place for Cicero in an important intellectual development in early modern England, which remains to be developed fully.⁶⁰ The arguments outlined here suggest the probable broader importance of Ciceronian thought to the intellectual culture of the early Enlightenment.

One notable exception to these omissions of scholarship on the Ciceronian tradition is the work of Zieliński in 1929, *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte*. This work is an extensive survey of the influence of the Ciceronian tradition, tracing from

⁵⁷ Clarke (1965); Bolgar (1954) p. 365; Pfeiffer (1976) p. 53; Rawson (1975) p. 303.

⁵⁸ Dellaneva (2007) pp. x-xx; Bolgar (1954) pp. 266-268, 329-330; Pfeiffer (1976) pp. 30, 43.

⁵⁹ Millar (2002); Lintott (1999) pp. 233-255; Skinner (1978) I.xiv-xv, (1987) pp. 126-128.

⁶⁰ Gawlick (1963).

its origins to the French Revolution and beyond. Encompassed within this survey is an examination of the role of Cicero within the *Englische Aufklärung*, and within that the tradition of *autonome Moral* and Deism.⁶¹ Zieli ski identifies Ciceronian influence in the works of Herbert of Cherbury, which in turn influenced Hobbes, considering the important moral works right up to Locke. For these men the core question was the relationship between a state morality and a religious morality; Zieli ski tracks this debate by means of considering the ways in which Cicero's arguments in *De Officiis* underpinned the formulation of early modern ideas. While this work provides a vital resource, and indicates the untapped potential of the philosophy of the period for Ciceronianism, its sheer scale precludes any in depth consideration of one period, writer, or area of thought.

I will build upon the indications contained within the work of Zieli ski and Gawlick, to develop a much more thorough examination of the influence of Cicero in the period between the Glorious Revolution of 1688 and the English Enlightenment of the early eighteenth century. *Cicero Illustratus* provides the opportunity to pursue this aim. It represents a work focussed on Cicero and his cultural and intellectual influence, beyond the question of language, in the very period which has been so thoroughly neglected by scholars of the Ciceronian tradition. It embodies an unrivalled opportunity to expand our understanding of the influence of Cicero in this integral period between the two megaliths of intellectual history: the Renaissance and the Enlightenment.

⁶¹ Zieli ski (1929) pp. 232-244.

IV. Its context: *Cicero Illustratus* and the Republic of Letters

A full understanding of *Cicero Illustratus* does not rely on appreciating its author and its subject alone; the work must also be located in its cultural context. The audience Toland was writing *Cicero Illustratus* for would inevitably exert some influence over the nature of the work produced.

i. *Cicero Illustratus* and Prince Eugene of Savoy

The unambiguous purpose of *Cicero Illustratus* was to present Toland's case for the necessity of a new edition of Cicero's complete works, and the case for his own ability to execute that task, to Prince Eugene of Savoy, in the hope that financial support for the project might be forthcoming. Toland's choice of Eugene for this application was apposite, for Eugene's fame emanated not from his military prowess alone.⁶² Eugene, together with his adjutant Baron von Hohendorf, to whom *Cicero Illustratus* is directed so that he might present it to Eugene, possessed a recognised passion for literary culture.⁶³ Competently supported by Hohendorf, Eugene had collected a vast range of works, which filled the specially designed library in his Belvedere in Vienna with over fifteen thousand printed books and two hundred and thirty-seven manuscripts.⁶⁴ As the two men travelled across Europe, Hohendorf's responsibilities regularly encompassed seeking out new works or promising writers with which to expand Eugene's collection. It was in this capacity that Toland's relationship with Eugene and Hohendorf began, a meeting noted by Des Maizeaux in

⁶² For biographical accounts of Eugene of Savoy see McKay (1977); Braubach (1963-1965); Henderson (1964).

⁶³ Henderson (1964) pp. 250-265; Mulsow (1996) pp. 216-217.

⁶⁴ Collection now in the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek in Vienna.

his account of Toland's life: "while he was in Holland, he had the good fortune to get acquainted with Prince EUGENE of Savoy, who gave him several marks of his Generosity"⁶⁵ Toland's choice of Eugene as the potential patron of his edition was therefore not without merit: they had already forged a relationship, and Eugene had an existing reputation as a literary patron.

The nature of their relationship is amply apparent in *Cicero Illustratus* itself, as Toland grants space to lengthy epideictic passages at both the beginning and the conclusion of the treatise, demonstrating his awareness of the vastly superior status of his intended patron.⁶⁶ In this way, the interaction between Eugene and Toland, with Hohendorf acting as an intermediary, represents quite precisely the kind of relationship described by Anne Goldgar in her important work on the Republic of Letters.⁶⁷ In a long passage celebrating Eugene at the beginning of the work, Toland reimagines that hallowed day on which he himself met the feted general, before going on to celebrate his military prowess, employing Cicero's words of praise for Caesar and Pompey to give sufficient weight to his commendation. But it is not this aspect of Eugene's achievements that provides the focus of Toland's admiration, but rather Eugene's achievements in the literature and the arts: "sed in eum usque diem me fateor latuisse (quod exinde luculentur cognovi) non minus scilicet EUGENIUM literis esse potentem quam armis?"⁶⁸ At the close of *Cicero Illustratus* Toland

⁶⁵ Des Maizeaux (1726) p. lxv.

⁶⁶ *CI* pp. 5-9, 67-73.

⁶⁷ Goldgar (1995) pp. 30-34.

⁶⁸ *CI* p.6: "but can I acknowledge that it had certainly escaped me until that day that (which I understood after very well) Eugene was no less powerful in literature than in arms?"

pledges to preserve Eugene's achievements in a history recording the events of the War of the Spanish Succession in which Eugene's military skill had been displayed so impressively.

Also indicated in *Cicero Illustratus* is the fact that Toland's association with Eugene extends beyond a common interest in literature to encompass a shared political concern for the perpetuation of the War of the Spanish Succession. A prominent feature of Toland's depiction of Eugene in *Cicero Illustratus* is his characterisation as a champion of liberty, emanating from his efforts to prevent a French victory, a victory which would have imperilled those Protestant liberties Toland was so determined to see protected.⁶⁹ The war was fought for the liberty of Europe, and Eugene was the greatest weapon possessed in that campaign. The immediate historical context of *Cicero Illustratus* reinforces the importance of this ideological connection, for it was written in the months following an ambassadorial visit by Eugene to England, intended to persuade Harley and the Tory government to delay peace negotiations with France.⁷⁰ Toland refers to this visit in *Cicero Illustratus*, emphasising both the rapturous reception of Eugene amongst the people, and his disgust at the treatment of Eugene by Harley and the Queen, who rejected his overtures with behaviour bordering on disrespect. The composition of *Cicero Illustratus* in the aftermath of these events indicates that Toland's political affiliation with Eugene was on his mind.

⁶⁹ Champion (2003) pp. 236-238.

⁷⁰ McKay (1977) pp. 136-138; Henderson (1964) pp. 190-202.

ii. Toland and the community of the Republic of Letters

Toland's relationship with Eugene extended beyond shared political objectives and this potential alliance in the production of a new edition of Cicero. Toland had in fact been engaged in a literary correspondence with Eugene and Hohendorf since their meeting during his time on the Continent between 1707 and 1710. This correspondence was evidently so extensive that it occupied a great deal of Toland's time, or so his personal correspondence implies, when in one letter he apologised for being remiss in keeping up his communications with one associate on the basis that he had been occupied by his literary exchange with Eugene.⁷¹ This literary relationship involved the circulation of several texts. While still on the continent, Toland translated the first three of his *Letters to Serena* into French before dispersing them among the circle of Eugene and Hohendorf.⁷² Also during that period Toland collected a series of essays together for Eugene and Hohendorf, entitled *Dissertations Diverses*; this included an early draft of what would become *Nazarenus*, and the essay 'The Pillar and Cloud' which would become *Hodegus*.⁷³ Toland also used this relationship in an attempt to develop enthusiasm for a new edition of Giordano Bruno's *Spaccio*, foreshadowing his Ciceronian efforts. Finally, recent work on the heterodox essay *Traité des Trois Imposteurs* has made it increasingly clear that Toland was involved in its composition and circulation, using his literary relationship with Eugene and his circle to aid his efforts.⁷⁴ Toland had

⁷¹ *Collection* II.403-411.

⁷² Champion (2003) pp. 167-189 on these exchanges.

⁷³ A new French edition of the *Dissertations Diverses* was produced in 2005.

⁷⁴ Berti, Charles-Daubert and Popkin (1996); Champion (1990) pp. 333-356.

constructed with Eugene and Hohendorf an important means of circulating his ideas, and engaging with the broader intellectual community of Europe.

This was not the only relationship of this kind which Toland developed to aid his engagement with intellectual circles. *Cicero Illustratus* itself signifies the extent to which Toland employed the circulation of texts to forge such relationships. A letter remains amongst his personal papers which records the arrangements between himself and John Humfreys, who undertook the printing of *Cicero Illustratus*.⁷⁵ This letter details the materials which will be used for the work, indicating the care Toland hoped would be taken with its production, with fine paper for the text and a title worked in red ink. In addition, it reveals that Toland intended three hundred copies of *Cicero Illustratus* to be produced, to allow him to control its dissemination; evidently the audience Toland envisaged for his ideas on Cicero extended beyond Eugene and Hohendorf.⁷⁶ While the individuals to whom Toland planned to disseminate *Cicero Illustratus* are largely unidentifiable, an idea of the type of audience intended can be gleaned from his intellectual associations, for he had an extensive network of literary correspondents beyond Eugene with whom he was accustomed to exchange works and ideas for literary undertakings. Once more Toland's private papers are informative in this regard. Included among them is a record he made of several works on Cicero he had borrowed from such associates, in

⁷⁵ BL Add 4295 f. 24.

⁷⁶ Determining the recipients of these copies is difficult. The copy now held by the Bodleian Library, Oxford, was inscribed to John Carr by Toland, and a copy is recorded in the library of Anthony Collins according to the *Bibliotheca Collinsiana*, in Tarantino (2007), otherwise there is no record of who received copies of the work. Copies are held now at the British Library, the Bodleian, Durham University, York University, Sheffield University, Glasgow University, and Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek (Göttingen, Germany).

this case Johannes Albertus Fabricius and Gottfried Leibniz.⁷⁷ Another paper records the ‘Manuscripts of Mine Abroad’, those manuscripts belonging to Toland which he had circulated to figures including Molesworth, Castleton, Aylmer and Hugh Wrottesley.⁷⁸ Together these papers illustrate that Toland had forged literary relationships within England and on the continent, binding groups of like-minded individuals together through the circulation of texts.

These efforts locate Toland firmly in the activity of the Republic of Letters. The most recent work on this invisible community of intellectuals has examined the forms and structures which bound that community together, most notably Anne Goldgar’s *Impolite Learning*.⁷⁹ The structures of the Republic detailed in Goldgar’s work are seen in action in Toland’s interactions with intellectuals throughout Europe. The Republic Goldgar portrays was essentially a community of obligation and mutual assistance, in which credit was used and accrued through the granting of access to scholarship and ideas, and indeed the kind of personal status someone like Eugene was able to grant a controversial figure like Toland. Justin Champion has emphasised the importance of these relationships to appreciating Toland’s contribution.⁸⁰ Integral to this was the work of Robert Darnton on the circulation of texts in Enlightenment France, and Harold Love, whose research on manuscript circulation in England has demonstrated the extent to which these scribal patterns

⁷⁷ BL Add 4465 ff. 64-65.

⁷⁸ BL Add 4295 f. 43; cf. Champion (1999c) pp. 9-36.

⁷⁹ Goldgar (1995) pp. 12-53.

⁸⁰ Champion (1999c) pp. 9-36, (2006b) pp. 119-120.

influenced the formation of what Love termed “ideological communities”⁸¹ Champion has demonstrated that Toland was actively cultivating such communities with the circulation of his works.

Toland’s involvement in the Republic of Letters demonstrates a concerted effort to exploit the structures and relationships it created to permit the dissemination of ideas and texts, forging communities of those with shared ideas and concerns. *Cicero Illustratus* must be located in this context; addressed to Eugene, with whom Toland had a significant literary relationship, and printed for an author-controlled publication, allowing Toland to select its audience to an extent, it was suitably designed to continue Toland’s efforts in the Republic of Letters.

iii. Toland and the Radical Enlightenment

There was more to the Republic of Letters than the structures of sociability and exchange which made it a community.⁸² The correspondence between Eugene and Toland illustrates this, as it encompasses material which proved significant for the broader intellectual developments of the period. The works Toland circulated to Eugene were emphatically radical; the *Letters to Serena* Toland translated for Eugene and Hohendorf, for example, and their efforts to challenge the cultural dominance of the established Church.⁸³ Even more radical in their content were the *Dissertations Diverses*, in which Toland collected various works in which he argued further for religious imposture and introduced his plans for an extensive work on the

⁸¹ Love (1993) pp. 177-230; Darnton (1979).

⁸² This is the major flaw in Goldgar’s approach; cf. Grafton (2001) pp. 156-165. Goldgar denies that specific ideological goals galvanised the Republic of Letters, challenging the thesis of Jacob.

⁸³ Champion (2003) pp. 237-238; Mulsow (1996) pp. 216-217.

respublica mosaica, which would continue to make the case that Moses was a political figure. In addition, Toland used this collection of manuscripts to maintain his attack on certain Apocrypha, as begun in *Amyntor*, and the catalogue of spurious aspects of the Bible contained therein. The *Traité des Trois Imposteurs* maintained this radical exchange, advancing further the case for religious imposture by identifying the three major religions as the constructions of political figures intended to subdue the masses.⁸⁴ Amongst Toland's papers some of his correspondence with Hohendorf is preserved, in which their shared radical and heterodox interests are further confirmed, as Toland encouraged Hohendorf to discuss with his associates questions of biblical authenticity.⁸⁵

Once more, Toland's radical exchange with Eugene constitutes one among several. The path of Toland's life had brought him into contact with numerous heterodox figures on the continent, from the circles around Benjamin Furly with whom Toland had interacted while being educated in Leiden, to those figures, such as Eugene, whom Toland's diplomatic duties on the continent had allowed him to meet.⁸⁶ This group included important political figures such as Sophia, Electress of Hanover, Sophie Charlotte, Queen of Prussia, and the addressee of the *Letters to Serena*, and through them philosophical figures such as Gottfried Leibniz.⁸⁷ It was amongst this continental circle of associates that Toland particularly attempted to champion the

⁸⁴ Champion (1990) pp. 333-356.

⁸⁵ BL Add 4295 ff. 19-20.

⁸⁶ On Toland's intellectual connections with the continent see Jacob (1969) pp. 310-313.

⁸⁷ For Toland's correspondence with Leibniz see *Collection* II.388-400.

heterodox thought of Giordano Bruno, circulating his works and a copy of his life.⁸⁸ Toland's connections in England were similarly radically minded; he used the circulation of literature to solidify his associations with the radical Whigs, in particular Robert Molesworth.⁸⁹ Anthony Collins's library, a valuable resource for heterodox works, was made available to Toland for his research into such questions. The radical content of Toland's exchange was fundamental to the forging of these literary communities.

Toland's active involvement in the dissemination of radical ideas through the Republic of Letters has inevitably drawn attention to him as a significant figure in the broader intellectual developments of the period. At this point it would be worth indicating that my use of term 'radical', which I acknowledge is a disputed expression, is intended here as a concise designation for the commonwealth combination of religious and political challenges to traditional and confessional divine right accounts.⁹⁰ The importance of this period, from 1680 to 1715, for the development of a challenge to traditional beliefs and systems of power was well-established by Paul Hazard. Hazard's account laid the groundwork for a significant scholarly tradition which emphasised the radical discourse developed between the middle of the seventeenth century and the beginning of the eighteenth century for the achievements of the early and radical Enlightenment. This 'Radical Enlightenment' has been particularly associated with the work of first Margaret Jacob and now

⁸⁸ Champion (1999c) pp. 15-16; Jacob (1969) pp. 312-316.

⁸⁹ Champion (2003) p. 46, (1999c) pp. 27-28. Toland's correspondence with Molesworth is recorded in the *Collection* II.464 ff.

⁹⁰ See Pocock (1995) pp. 33-53 on the issues concerning the terminology of heterodoxy.

Jonathan Israel.⁹¹ These historians have developed a pre-narrative of the Enlightenment which traces its roots to the circulation of radical ideas prior to the 1740s, identifying this as the means by which traditional authority was first challenged. While the precise readings of this Radical Enlightenment vary, the identification of the circulation of radical ideas with the beginnings of the Enlightenment situate Toland and his works at the heart of an intellectual revolution. This was recognised by Heinemann, who claimed that Toland was prominent in what he called the second stage of the Enlightenment, in which circles of thinkers exchanged radical ideas, and it has become a staple feature of Toland studies.⁹² Toland's importance to the early Enlightenment has also been enhanced in scholarship by the increasing emphasis on the diversity of national experiences, as opposed to a single homogenous European Enlightenment experience.⁹³ The concept of an influential English Enlightenment has benefitted from this development, and with it the broader significance of a figure such as Toland. Such developments in the historiography of the Enlightenment, and the radical emphasis of Toland's engagement with the intellectual community, demand an awareness of Toland as significant figure in the Radical Enlightenment.

⁹¹ Israel (2001) and Jacob (1981); cf. Wigelsworth (2009) pp. 2-5, Champion (2003) pp. 238-239. Knights (2011) pp. 7-9 integrates the radical Enlightenment into developments in English politics.

⁹² Heinemann (1944) pp. 125-146. On Toland as an Enlightenment figure see also Israel (2001) pp. 609-614; Jacob (1981) pp. 152-154; Champion (2003) pp. 236-254; Pocock (1980) p. 91; Venturi (1971).

⁹³ Israel (2001) for example, focussed on the Netherlands. See Pocock (2004) pp. 6-9 and (1980) pp. 91-111 on the existence of an English Enlightenment, challenging Venturi (1971).

Cicero Illustratus was written in this context, as a work to be circulated within an intellectual milieu whose connections were in large part based on their shared interest in radical and heterodox ideals. It is necessary to remember this when examining *Cicero Illustratus*; it would be remiss to consider the text simply as an attempt to raise funds. Its author and its audience preclude such an assumption.

V. Investigating *Cicero Illustratus*

In view of all these factors acting upon the importance of *Cicero Illustratus*, it is even more remarkable that this work has received so little scholarly attention. In Tolandian scholarship *Cicero Illustratus* generally appears only briefly, with minimal effort made to integrate it into broader understandings of Toland's work.⁹⁴ Robert Sullivan dismisses the work as a project to occupy Toland's time during the decline of his relationship with Harley, and as further evidence of his scholarly ineptitude, citing its failure to produce financial support. *Cicero Illustratus* is identified by Robert Rees Evans as evidence of Toland's affection for Cicero, but it is not examined as a work in its own right. Justin Champion discusses *Cicero Illustratus* in a similar capacity, subsumed into a general comment concerning Toland's fondness for referring to the Roman, or as an example of Toland's exploitation of the dissemination of texts. In each case *Cicero Illustratus* remains simply an example to support another point, not as evidence in its own right for a significant feature of Toland's thought.

The sole example of a more extensive treatment of *Cicero Illustratus* appeared in the concluding chapter of Matthew Fox's *Cicero's Philosophy of History* in 2007.

⁹⁴ Sullivan (1982) p. 33; Evans (1991) pp. 153-155; Champion (2003) pp. 50, 173, 191.

For Fox the importance of *Cicero Illustratus* lies in its identification as an example of a particular method of reading and engaging with the Ciceronian text; he argues that Toland exhibits a sympathy with Ciceronian rhetoric which allowed an appreciation of Cicero increasingly diminished across the eighteenth century. In Fox's account it is not Cicero himself or his thought which is important to Toland, but the use of rhetoric to communicate ideas and to enforce influence in the public sphere. This is a perception of the significance of *Cicero Illustratus* which this thesis will challenge; neither Fox's reading of *Cicero Illustratus* nor his account of the fate of the Ciceronian tradition in the eighteenth century coheres with the evaluation of the work presented here. Fox's interpretation demonstrates further the dangers of attempting to engage with only one aspect of *Cicero Illustratus*, in this case its Ciceronian aspect. Approaching the text as a classicist, with his primary motive being the endorsement of a particular narrative of Ciceronian reception, Fox fails to appreciate fully the ramifications of its Tolandian authorship and intellectual context.

Discussions of *Cicero Illustratus* have therefore entirely relegated it to a position ancillary to the main discussion; no one has previously attempted to evaluate the importance of *Cicero Illustratus* in its own right. This thesis will rectify that omission. It will determine precisely what Toland was attempting to achieve by writing *Cicero Illustratus* so that its significance as a work can be determined. This will first of all necessitate identifying the importance of *Cicero Illustratus* to Toland himself. As shown, the subject, author, and nature of *Cicero Illustratus* all indicate a potential for it to be an important work in Toland's corpus; this thesis will determine whether it fulfils that potential. By subjecting *Cicero Illustratus* to critical

examination I will establish the purpose of the work itself, and relate that purpose to Toland's broader project so as to ascertain its function in his intellectual endeavours.⁹⁵ This will inevitably provide some new insights into the way in which the Ciceronian tradition was manifested in the early Enlightenment. The significance of *Cicero Illustratus* in the Tolandian context will further allow conclusions to be drawn concerning its importance to broader narratives of the intellectual developments of this early Enlightenment period. Toland's role as an Enlightenment figure, and his contribution to radical thought in this period, make *Cicero Illustratus* and its place in Toland's works potentially instructive concerning the contribution of classical learning in this context.

The first section of this thesis will provide a full evaluation of the work itself; in this evaluation the essential question directing my investigation will ask what the actual content of *Cicero Illustratus* reveals about what Toland intended to accomplish. This will require examining Toland's proposed approaches to the various editorial tasks. The chapters in this section will identify Toland's planned methods of presenting Cicero the man, his words, and their meaning to the reader, and examine the arguments he provided to justify his approach in each case. This will establish what Toland hoped to achieve for the Ciceronian tradition, and for himself as editor. Toland is essentially advertising himself as an editor throughout *Cicero Illustratus*, necessitating that he prove his credentials for the task. Throughout this section, the way in which Toland engages with scholarship and uses it to achieve his aims will feature prominently. This will allow some additional

⁹⁵ In this way following the advice of Ligota and Quantin (2006) pp. 11-13, who warn of the risks of classicists who fail to historicise scholarship, and historians who fail to fully evaluate and understand the scholarship.

conclusions to be drawn concerning what *Cicero Illustratus* reveals about the status and conduct of scholarship in the early Enlightenment, and the purpose such scholarship could serve.

Once Toland's purpose within *Cicero Illustratus* itself is established, in the second section of the thesis I will determine its significance to Toland's thought by seeking to establish the role of the Ciceronian tradition, as constructed in *Cicero Illustratus*, in his intellectual project. This will require an examination of how that tradition functioned in Toland's works, in order to appreciate the extent to which it constituted a notable influence. Across the two chapters in this section I will examine the primary incarnations of Cicero in Toland's works: as a source for republican ideology, and as a rational figure whose scepticism served his war on priestcraft. The relationship between Toland's invocations of and references to Cicero and the means by which Toland pursued these two fundamental aspects of his radical philosophy will be discerned. This will determine whether *Cicero Illustratus*, and the treatment of the Ciceronian tradition contained therein, was significant to the Tolandian project in general. This in turn will permit some conclusions to be made concerning the role of the classical tradition and classical scholarship in the development of radical thought in the early Enlightenment.

Cicero Illustratus has been all but ignored as a work of significance in its own right; this thesis will correct that failure. In fact, this was a work which revealed Toland actively recruiting Cicero to his radical project. Further, the identification of this as the purpose of *Cicero Illustratus* makes it a significant text for the elaboration of current narratives of intellectual history. Toland's use of classical scholarship to achieve his aims in the work, and to permit its broader purpose in his radical

philosophy, demonstrates the on-going significance of classicism to the formation of modern thought.

SECTION ONE
EDITING CICERO

INTRODUCTION TO SECTION ONE

I. The editorial project

Toland's professed intention to rehabilitate Cicero's reputation so that he might resume his position of cultural influence, particularly in the education of young men bound for careers in public service, extends beyond the rhetoric of the introductory chapters and into the scholarly discussions of the main body of the work. Toland continues to express his wish to return the "true" Cicero to prominence: "tuto nihilosecius asseverare possum, eundem hunc *Ciceronem* non paucis in ipso orbe Literario penè ignotum esse; etiamsi nullius profectò nomen, idque meritissimò, in omnium ore frequentius versetur"¹ *Cicero Illustratus* is constructed around nine articles, each in turn addressing his main editorial responsibilities, and throughout these articles, the theme of restoring the real Cicero remains at the forefront. It is therefore evident that Toland perceived scholarship as the means by which this aim would be achieved.

This is in part due to the blame he assigns to scholars, the Critics and Grammarians, for the parlous state of the Ciceronian tradition; throughout *Cicero Illustratus* disdain for the efforts of his scholarly predecessors is dominant. It was the responsibility of these men to make Cicero accessible to the reader, and they had failed: "sive quòd editores aliqui oscitantes nimis et imprudentes fuerint, sive quòd aliqui subsidiis minùs et otio gavisi sint: sive hoc denique (quod frequentius certè) ex

¹ *CI* p. 11: "nevertheless I am safely able to assert, that this same Cicero is nearly unknown to not a few in this literary world; even if no man's name, doubtless, is heard more often on the lips of all ó and that most deservedly"

plerorumque Grammatistarum ac Commentatorum ridicula affectatione, ex fastidiosâ doctrinae ostentatione, ex declamatoria rerum pusillarum amplificatione, aut ex arrogantia minimè ferendâ evenerit² Toland expands upon these accusations across the course of *Cicero Illustratus*, explaining in each article precisely how the activities of previous editors had inflicted injury on Cicero's works, rendering them inaccessible and incomprehensible to those who should be reading him.

This places the scholarly traditions of the existing editions of Cicero at the centre of the project; throughout these chapters I will establish the major themes and practices of the tradition to which Toland was responding, so that his own proposals may be evaluated against scholarly precedents.³ The history of editing Cicero has received minimal scholarly attention, in spite of the fact that it provides an insightful case study into changing editorial practices.⁴ It also reflects the shifting perceptions of the value of Cicero across the age of the early printed book, and how far that value was directed by developments in the editorial sphere. This section's treatment of the Ciceronian editorial tradition will therefore provide an important new perspective on the Ciceronian tradition from the fifteenth century to the eighteenth century.

² *CI* p. 4: 'whether because some editors have been too careless and yawned over their work, or because some have benefitted from fewer resources and less leisure: or whether, finally (as is certainly more common) this has resulted out of the ridiculous affectation of very many Grammarians and Commentators, out of the conceited display of learning, out of the rhetorical exaggeration of petty matters, or ó the least tolerable of all ó out of arrogance'

³ See the table of the editions of Cicero, pp. xxi-xxxiv, for a record of the complete editions considered in this thesis, together with the shorthand used to refer to each edition.

⁴ Hunt (1998) provides a technical account of the textual transmission of Cicero's *Academics*.

Toland also uses the articles of *Cicero Illustratus* to demonstrate how the scholarship in his own edition will improve upon the supposedly dire state of affairs in existing editions. As editor, he will be able to make the real Cicero, and the true value of his works, available to the reader, thereby initiating the rehabilitation of Cicero. The first two aspects of the editorial challenge addressed by Toland, in chapters eleven and twelve of *Cicero Illustratus*, encompass the physical form and appearance of the book. In chapter eleven, Toland describes the quality of the paper he would use, and the decorations which would adorn the edition, including various representations of Cicero on the frontispiece and within the work.⁵ In the twelfth chapter Toland turns his attention to the appearance of the text, explaining the typographical principles he intends to follow, and how he would punctuate the works.⁶ Unifying these chapters is a concern that the form of the book should reassure the reader, not discourage them, as had been the case with previous editions: *quantum solus hic defectus auctorem reddiderit difficilem, ac lectoris voluptatem minuerit, non cujusvis modo experientia, sed quotidianae pariter undequaque querimoniae, satis manifestum faciunt*⁷ Toland therefore proposes to use his editorial influence to present the text in a way which will ease the reader's engagement with the works it contains, making it more feasible for them to absorb Cicero's words.

⁵ *CI* p. 22.

⁶ *CI* pp. 23-27.

⁷ *CI* p. 23: *how much this lack alone makes an author difficult, and diminishes the enjoyment of the reader, not only anyone's experience, but their daily complaints, make clear enough*

The appearance of the edition addressed, the subsequent articles discuss how Toland intends to approach the editorial procedures concerning the content of the edition. This includes considerations of the supplementary material required by such an edition. Toland's plan for a life of Cicero to preface the works is the subject of the thirteenth and fourteenth chapters, with the aim of providing an historical account of the real Cicero paramount. Also provided to ensure the reader has all the information they need to appreciate Cicero will be certain spurious works from the tradition, discussed in chapter fifteen, and a series of indices, proposed in chapter nineteen. The text itself inevitably receives the most attention from Toland. The seventeenth chapter describes at length how he proposes to undertake the task of textual criticism, and the sixteenth and eighteenth chapters consider the paratextual material necessary to explicate the meaning of the text for the reader. The space granted to these topics conveys the importance Toland granted to establishing an accurate text for his reader, and communicating that text's meaning effectively. By engaging so thoroughly with these procedures of editing, Toland placed scholarship, and his own understanding and abilities in the field of scholarship, at the centre of *Cicero Illustratus*.

These chapters will tackle the major scholarly challenges of *Cicero Illustratus* in turn: first, the historical scholarship required to present Cicero himself to the reader; then, the methods of textual criticism selected to establish the text; lastly, the hermeneutical strategies deployed to ensure that the text could be understood. In each case, the practices of the existing tradition will be established, and the methods proposed by Toland will be evaluated.

II. Toland's scholarly challenge

This attempt to evaluate *Cicero Illustratus* and Toland's editorial efforts therein will require an understanding of the nature of the editorial project at the beginning of the eighteenth century. The most recent scholarship on book production in the early modern era has successfully shown the extent to which the need to construct authority was a formative influence on the editorial process. This has been most clearly expressed by Adrian Johns, who in turn has drawn extensively on the important work of Steven Shapin concerning the relationship between authority and trust.⁸ Shapin's account of the formation of knowledge in the history of science in the seventeenth century grants trust a vital role. In order to construct this trust knowledge had to be framed in terms which recognised the dominant cultural forces, which defined what was credible or authoritative. Johns drew upon Shapin's elevation of trust in the formation of knowledge and applied it to print culture. He argued that an editor needed to construct trust for his work if it was to be read in a way which allowed it to shape knowledge, a necessity which placed the accumulation of authority at the heart of the editorial process. Toland's proposals in *Cicero Illustratus* therefore necessitated authority if they were to be successful.

Johns further drew upon Shapin's work to emphasise the extent to which printed editions were required to reflect and respond to the cultural contexts from which they emanated if they were to produce authority and create trust.⁹ This placed Johns's approach in direct contrast to that of Elizabeth Eisenstein, who had argued that print

⁸ Johns (1998); Shapin (1994).

⁹ Johns (1998) pp.28-40; cf. Eliot and Rose (2007) pp.1-6, Walsh (2009) p. 687, Bell (2002) pp. 632-635.

was by its nature authoritative, as its form granted it the quality of fixity, which in turn created the perception of veracity and hence authority.¹⁰ Eisenstein used this understanding of print culture to argue that print's inherent authority allowed it to be a driving force in the formation of culture. Johns, arguing that this fixity was an illusion, demonstrated that those engaged in the production of books in fact had to respond to their historical and cultural context to form credit, and hence trust, for their works. The processes of editing, all of the scholarly decisions required from the editor, necessarily had to react to cultural developments if they were to be successful in the construction of authority.

It is necessary therefore to identify the particular cultural forces which were acting on Toland as editor in this period, as he strove to use scholarship to construct authority for his edition of Cicero. In England at the beginning of the eighteenth century, scholarship was a key battleground in the conflict between so-called Ancients and Moderns, in which the idealisation and glorification of the knowledge of antiquity was challenged by the achievements of modern learning.¹¹ In the *Querelle des anciens et des modernes*, primarily played out in France, the debate reflected the opposition between those who believed that the knowledge and achievements of antiquity could never be surpassed and those who argued that modern methods and knowledge had allowed men to progress beyond the accomplishments of antiquity. A conclusion of sorts was reached in the work of

¹⁰ Eisenstein (1983) pp. 3-12; cf. Eliot and Rose (2007) pp. 1-6, Iliffe (1995) p. 168, Ong (1988) pp. 117-123.

¹¹ On this intellectual conflict see Levine (1991), (1999) pp. 75-107; Grafton (2007) pp. 1-33, 189-254; Spadafora (1990) pp. 21-25; Cave (1999) p. 425; Patey (2005) pp. 32-71; Davidson (1975) p. 12; Walsh (2009) pp. 684-687; Most (2005) pp. 743-747.

Perrault and Fontenelle in France that a division between the Arts and Sciences could be instituted, granting prominence in the Arts to the Ancients, where imitation was important, and in the Sciences to the Moderns, where the accumulation of knowledge was powerful. Following these developments, the manifestation of the *Querelle* as the Battle of the Books in England shifted the emphasis to the different ways of engaging with the classical tradition. The Ancients advocated the continuing relevance of antiquity to contemporary life, and hence the authority of the classical text, while the Moderns sought to apply the tools of modern criticism to those works, a process which would inevitably undermine their authority. The focus of this Battle on the treatment of classical texts made it a prominent influence in the field of editing.

This influence could be manifested in editorial conduct in a variety of ways. The fundamental disagreement over whether engagement with classical texts should be directed towards imitation and identification or the application of scholarship and criticism permeated throughout interaction with the texts. This included how the value of the works could be decided, whether it was literary merit which determined their worth, or their ability to withstand scholarly investigation. The debate over the *Epistles of Phalaris* was directed by such concerns, as Temple and the Christ Church Wits accorded them authority on the basis of their antiquity and their literary quality, while Bentley and the Moderns felt that their obvious falsity in the face of scholarly enquiry rendered them worthless.¹² The actual procedures of editing were similarly affected by the conflict between ancient authority and modern methods. For the Ancients, modern scholarship was not only a threat, using philology and criticism to

¹² Patey (2005) pp. 48-50; Walsh (2009) pp. 684-687; Most (2005) pp. 743-747.

diminish the authority of ancient texts by exposing their weaknesses, it was also unnecessary. Ancient texts were to be read for imitation, eliminating the need for the extensive scholarship which was the standard of the Moderns. As a result, all decisions about how to present, correct and criticise the text could reflect the editor's allegiances in this scholarly debate.

These were the contextual cultural issues with which Toland was compelled to engage when determining his scholarly strategies in *Cicero Illustratus*, and how he chose to do so will form a key point of inquiry throughout this section of the thesis. Chiara Giuntini, in an essay which considers the influence of classicism on Toland's thought, provides some insight into his interaction with the Battle of the Books.¹³ Giuntini argued that Toland engaged with both sides in the Battle, endeavouring to serve his own ends, a reading of his relationship with scholarly debate which will be further elaborated here. Examining Toland's interaction with this contemporary scholarly debate not only permits an attempt to locate Toland in relation to it, and to determine how he employed it to achieve his own aims, but also will also provide an important insight into its status. As indicated, Toland was engaging with his cultural context to construct authority for his edition, so the decisions he made will reflect the respective influences of the different forces in scholarship in 1712.

III. The status of humanism

This becomes all the more significant when the place of the Battle in intellectual history is elaborated, as it forms an increasingly crucial moment in the history of Renaissance humanism. Traditional narratives of Renaissance humanism locate its

¹³ Giuntini (1999) pp. 19-35.

decline and demise to the seventeenth century, when developments in modern thought such as the new science of Bacon and the rationalism of Descartes were seen to usurp the authority of the ancients.¹⁴ This was characterised as the process by which the humanist faith in classical texts as the primary source of knowledge was replaced by the acquisition of knowledge through the application of reason and the observation of nature. The Quarrel between the Ancients and Moderns was identified as a vital moment in the transition from humanism to modern thought, as it championed the theory of progress which liberated men from the authority of the ancients.¹⁵ The implication which results from this reading is that the conflict between the Ancients and Moderns within the Battle of the Books saw humanist scholarship being entirely usurped by modern scholarship.

More recent studies have provided an alternative reading of the conflict represented by the Battle of the Books, a reading which redefines the nature of the dispute it represented. Hans Baron initiated this process by shifting the origins of the Quarrel from the seventeenth century to the Renaissance itself.¹⁶ It is Joseph Levine, however, who has significantly reoriented the terms of the debate. He too located the roots of the conflict in the Renaissance, determining its cause to be the divergence between the purposes of humanist scholarship, to recover and elevate the knowledge of the ancients, and the methods invented to achieve those purposes, most

¹⁴ Bolgar (1954) pp. 369-379; Mandrou (1979); Iliffe (1995) pp. 179-184; Douglas (1939) pp. 26-27. See Ligota and Quantin (2006) pp. 13-25 for a summary of the views which perpetuated this narrative. Hazard (1953) provides the broader context of this transition.

¹⁵ Bury (1920); Jones (1936).

¹⁶ Baron (1959) pp. 3-22; cf. Patey (2005) p. 33, Tinkler (1988) pp. 453-454.

particularly philology.¹⁷ Levine argued that the Battle of the Books, focussed in his account on historical scholarship and philology, actually represented a conflict between the claims of literature and learning, rather than humanist and modern scholarship. The fight was between those who sought to elevate classical literature, and those who sought to elevate the methods by which that literature was recovered and criticised. This reading of the Battle relates it to debates concerning humanist scholarship itself, and in particular the contributions of Anthony Grafton.¹⁸ Grafton has demonstrated that these two tendencies existed within humanism, in the fundamental conflict between one set of humanists seeking to make the ancient world live again, assuming its undimmed relevance and unproblematic accessibility; and another which seeks to put the ancient world back in its own time¹⁹

This idea that the Battle of the Books might represent the continuation of a conflict within humanism rather than a conflict between humanist scholarship and modern scholarship is important to the traditional narratives of intellectual history outlined above. It means that rather than marking the victory of modern scholarship over its humanist predecessor, it marks the on-going influence of humanist traditions in both literature and scholarship.²⁰ This locates the Battle in the debate over the fate of humanism, as evidence of the lasting authority of humanism in the early modern period. Anthony Grafton has argued extensively against the idea that the rise of the new science, Cartesian rationalism and natural philosophy marked the end of

¹⁷ Levine (1991) pp. 1-9, (1999) pp. 75, 111-116.

¹⁸ Grafton (1985) pp. 615-649, (2007) pp. 189-254.

¹⁹ Grafton (1985) p. 620.

²⁰ Tinkler (1988) p. 454.

humanism's influence.²¹ Instead, humanism continued to play an important role in early modern culture. Modern scholarship did not necessitate a break with humanist traditions, but instead showed signs of perpetuating and adapting those traditions. Grafton has shown that not only did the disciplines of humanism, most particularly in philology and history, survive well beyond its supposed demise, but also humanist interests extended into new intellectual areas. Grafton's work has attempted to show the extent to which humanism continued to exert influence in a variety of fields, from science to scholarship to moral philosophy. Toland's engagement with classical scholarship in *Cicero Illustratus* needs to be located in these conflicting narratives of the fate of humanism.

The purpose of this section of the thesis is to determine precisely what Toland was attempting to achieve when writing *Cicero Illustratus*. Toland constructed his arguments around scholarship, so in order to appreciate his aims his scholarly methods will need to be deconstructed. The process of evaluating the goal of *Cicero Illustratus* will therefore reveal its significance to the broader issues of the history of scholarship identified here. Toland's response to his scholarly context, and the scholarly strategies he selected as he strove to establish authority for his edition, will illuminate the nature of the conflict between Ancients and Moderns at this time, and the status of humanist scholarship on the cusp of the Enlightenment.

²¹ This argument is expressed in general terms in Grafton (1991a) pp. 1-22, (2001) pp. 1-15, (1996) pp. 203-223, and Grafton and Blair (1992) pp. 535-540. More specifically it is made regarding astrology in Grafton (1999), hermeneutics and law in (1997a) pp. 135-183 and (1990b), and historical scholarship in (1997b) pp. 1-33 and (2007) pp. 1-33. See also Ligota and Quantin (2006), which provides a series of essays on scholarship in the early modern period.

CHAPTER ONE

PRESENTING THE AUTHOR

The first major component of his edition Toland discussed was the prefatory life. Two chapters of *Cicero Illustratus*, together with a significant portion of its introduction, are dedicated to outlining not only the form in which he intends to represent Cicero's life, but his reasons for selecting that form, and his strategy for seeing it happen.¹ The first constituent of Toland's approach is the inclusion of an existing account of Cicero's life, published by Franciscus Fabricius in 1564.² By way of explanation for this decision, Toland offers that "ejusdem vitae rationes ab aliis pariter editas multis nominibus post se reliquit Fabricius, vir summâ diligentia, judicio, et candore praeditus"³ It may have been the most impressive of the existing lives, but that did not mean it was flawless, as Toland is keen to point out: "nec ob ea quae ipsum effugerunt tam est culpandus, quàm laudandus propter ea quae solertissimè omnium collegit"⁴ This carefully qualified compliment creates the opportunity for the second stage of Toland's strategy for the prefatory life. He plans

¹ *CI* pp. 16-20, 27-32.

² *Historia Ciceronis per consules descripta et in annos LXIV. distincta*, Coloniae, 1564; for commentary on the work see Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Latina* pp. 89-90 and Middleton, *History of the life of Cicero* p. xviii. Franz Fabricius of Düren (1527-1573) although German was extensively educated in Paris, using his classical education to make several contributions to Ciceronian scholarship; see Sandys (1908) p. 268.

³ *CI* p. 27: "Fabricius, a man endowed with the greatest attentiveness, judgement, and honesty, surpassed published accounts of the same life from others on many criteria"

⁴ *CI* p. 27: "and he is not so much to be blamed for those things which escaped his knowledge, as to be praised on account of all those which he collected with great skill"

to supplement Fabricius's *Historia* with an Historical-Critical Essay of his own composition which will rectify Fabricius's omissions.⁵ It is in Toland's discussion of exactly what he deems these omissions to be, and how he plans to correct them, that a deeper understanding of his strategy can be elucidated.

The omissions of which Fabricius stands accused are identified by Toland as questions regarding Cicero's character, a claim Toland expands upon by identifying three particular examples: the accusation of *lenitas* and *timiditas* in withdrawing into exile; of *levitas* and *inconstantia* in his political allegiances; and lastly of excessive enthusiasm in praising his own achievements. These offer an indication of the subject matter Toland has in mind when he identifies the content of his proposed essay as "disceptationes pariter eruditorum et disquisitiones, sive laudem Ciceronis sive vituperium exhibentes, in Dissertatione nostra pari fidelitate et brevitate exponentur; ut et omnia quae fortem ipsius aut timidum animum, aequitatem, doctrinam, partium studium, stilum, amores (si Diis placet) vel similia spectant"⁶ Toland reflects on those examples identified above to demonstrate how he would handle such controversial material, selecting the evidence he deemed relevant, and exhibiting the rationale he would provide in each case. This is a discussion in which Toland not only determines how he intends to tackle the challenge posed by the prefatory life, but also contributes his understanding of the appropriate content and method of such a work.

⁵ *CI* pp. 29-32.

⁶ *CI* p. 29: "equally the debates and inquiries of the learned, whether presenting praise or criticism of Cicero, are exposed in our Dissertation with the most fidelity and at the same time with the greatest brevity; together with everything which concerns his brave or fearful spirit, justice, learning, political affiliations, style, loves (forsooth) or similar things"

Toland's approach to the life which would preface the edition interacts with two key questions of scholarship. The first question concerns the function of the life in the editorial context, brought to the fore by Toland's in-depth handling of the issue. A life might be intended to play a purely informative role, supplying sufficient background and contextual material for the reader to be able to comprehend the work as a product of its own time. It also had the potential to play a notably programmatic role. The prefatory life could shape the reader's views of the author, and fix in their mind a certain image or understanding of the subject of the life, which would then influence the way the works were read and appreciated, thereby playing a fundamental role in the editor's ability to execute the edition as he wished. The form and style of the prefatory life could set the tone for the whole edition.⁷ In examining the kind of life Toland intends to preface his edition with, and the depiction of Cicero contained therein, it will become possible to discern the function Toland intended the life to have in the edition, and thus to acquire a deeper understanding of Toland's conception of the edition's greater purpose.

In addition to the discussion's potential significance in the editorial context, Toland's concern to engage with questions of methodology means that issues of historical scholarship also became relevant. The battle between the Ancient and Moderns which provided the cultural context for *Cicero Illustratus* was particularly lively in the field of historical scholarship, as traditionalists committed to the Ancient form of history were determined to see off the challenge from an

⁷ These contrasting approaches to life-writing are expanded upon by Mayer and Woolf (1995) pp. 13-16, Sharpe and Zwicker (2008) pp. 1-28, Parke (2002) pp. 2-16 and Caine (2010) pp. 1-9. Scholarship regarding the programmatic approach draws heavily upon Greenblatt (2005)'s theory of self-fashioning.

increasingly scientific Modern approach to historical scholarship. By displaying and offering a justification for his proposed methodology, and constructing it as an alternative to Fabricius' *Historia* and other existing attempts, Toland locates his treatment of the prefatory life firmly in the context of the fraught debate on historical scholarship. Why Toland should wish to engage with this debate, and what he hoped to achieve by doing so, are two of the questions which will be addressed in the following pages.

I. Engaging with the tradition

In order to understand what Toland intended to create with the prefatory life a better grasp of the nature of Fabricius' *Historia*, and the omissions of which it is accused by Toland, is required. This can be achieved by locating Fabricius' work in the tradition of writing lives of Cicero, and thereby determining the ideas it represented, and the practices it was reacting against. It is also by these means that the character of Toland's response to this tradition may be elucidated. The personal papers of Toland reveal the extent to which he deliberately sought to engage with the Ciceronian life-writing tradition, as included among them is a catalogue of works borrowed from Johannes Albertus Fabricius and Gottfried Leibniz, within which number several lives of Cicero: that of Franciscus Fabricius, together with those of Rudolphus Capellus (1683), Caspar Sagittarius (1671), Constantius Felicius (1535), and Christophorus Preyssiuss (1555).⁸ Evidently Toland had deliberately

⁸ BL Add 4465 ff. 64-65. Also listed is *Henrici Bullingeri narratio de vita Ciceronis*, Romae, 1553, edente Wolfgango Peristero Borusso [= Wolfgang von der Taube (1532-1592)]. After further investigation, with aid from Rainer Henrich, who was working on an edition of Bullinger's correspondence, it appears that what Wolfgang Peristerus actually published at that time was the translation of Plutarch's *Life* by Jacobus Angelus; no life of Cicero by Henricus Bullingerus is

endeavoured to use his contacts within the Republic of Letters to inform himself of the tradition to which he was intending to respond.

i. The ‘historic’ life

The Life Toland selected to republish in his edition, that by Franciscus Fabricius, is immediately notable for its careful organisation. Fabricius structured his account in the traditional manner of an annalist; he arranged his material according to chronological principles alone, allowing no deviation from that structural principle for discussions of character or deeper interpretation of events. The *Historia* was divided into sixty-four sections, one for each year Cicero lived, each identified according to whom held the consulship that year. In his handling of the material Fabricius also took care to elevate accuracy above any narrative concerns. Each statement, each detail of Cicero’s life, is stated simply, without judgement, and is supported by a concise record of all the relevant evidence from Cicero’s own works and from the alternative historical sources: *¶fuit autem in Cumano et Pompeiano: atque in Cumano instituit scribere de optimo statu civitatis et de optimo cive; epist. 14. lib. II et 5. lib. III ad Fratr. et epist. 13. lib. IV. ad Attø⁹* The commitment to accuracy and the pursuit of evidence demonstrated by Fabricius is more reminiscent of the philologist than the historian, carefully recording the varying sources and accounts for every episode in Cicero’s life. Fabricius’s *Historia* is life-writing in its most historical form: stripped of all interpretation and commentary, recording all the evidence with great care, so as to produce a detailed and accurate

recorded. It is further worth noting that Johannes Albertus Fabricius also mistakenly cites this work in his *Bibliotheca Latina*, perhaps exposing the shortcomings in Toland’s research.

⁹ Fabricius, *Historia* p.76.

historical account of Cicero's whole life, rather than a literary narrative. It is this almost scientific approach I seek to evoke with the denotation of the -historic life.

In deciding to include Fabricius's *Historia* in his edition, Toland was continuing a practice which was sufficiently common in the recent editing of Cicero to count as accepted. While as a stand-alone work Fabricius's *Historia* achieved success, with several reprints required in subsequent decades, it was as a prefatory life that it became dominant.¹⁰ It first appeared in this guise in 1582, preceding a collection of commentaries on Cicero produced by the Manutii family.¹¹ This example was followed in editions by Janus Gruterus in 1618, by Elzevir in 1642, by Blaeu in 1659, and by Jacobus Gronovius in 1692, and was maintained until well into the nineteenth century, when Orellius included it in his notable edition. Fabricius's *Historia* became the life of choice for editors of Cicero in the seventeenth century. The evident approval with which Fabricius's work was met was echoed by Johannes Albertus Fabricius in his *Bibliotheca Latina*, published in 1697, in which he described it as *singularis*.¹² The influence of Fabricius's *Historia* extended beyond the editorial world, inspiring others to write accounts of Cicero's life on the chronological and historical model, such as Brantius in 1612 and Chytraeus in

¹⁰ Reprinted individually in Cologne in 1570 and 1587, in Helmstedt in 1640, and in Bidingen in 1727.

¹¹ *M. T. Cicero, Manuciorum commentariis illustratus antiquaeq. lectioni restitutus*, apud Aldum, ex typographia G. Angelerii: Venetiis, 1582.

¹² Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Latina* p. 138. Johannes Albertus Fabricius (1668-1736) was a German classical scholar who contributed extensively to the collection and publication of classical materials; cf. Sandys (1908) p. 366.

1587.¹³ This element of Toland's strategy regarding the prefatory life reflects a conscious decision to continue the predominant editorial trend, and thus to appropriate the authority of that tradition.

ii. The 'Plutarchan' life

While the historic life, as represented by Fabricius's work, dominated the editorial tradition in the seventeenth century, this was not the sole option available to editors of Cicero's works. The most popular choice among editors for many years was the life of Cicero written by Plutarch, to which the historic life of Fabricius presented a marked contrast. In the *editio princeps* for the complete works, produced by Minutianus in Milan in 1498, the life chosen to accompany the works was that by Plutarch, translated into Latin by Leonardo Bruni.¹⁴ As the *editio princeps*, its use of Plutarch's *Life of Cicero* to introduce the man and his works is worthy of note, particularly as it is that life which proceeded to dominate the editorial tradition until well into the sixteenth century. It was not always the Bruni translation which was selected, however, as the translation by Achilles Bocchus featured in two separate editions produced by the house of Ascensius in 1522 and 1527, together with the Cratander edition of 1528, the Hervagius edition of 1534, the Robertus Stephanus edition of 1539, and the Carolus Stephanus edition of 1555. Plutarch's *Life of Cicero* constituted part of an established editorial tradition, emanating from the

¹³ Io. Brantius, *Elogia Ciceronis Romanorum domi militiaeque illustrium*, Antwerp., apud Hieron. Verdussen, 1612; Davidus Chytraeus, *Tabula chronologica*, Berol., 1587.

¹⁴ Referred to by his Latinised name ó Leonardus Aretinus ó by Toland, but I will refer to him here by his more popularly known name of Leonardo Bruni. Bruni's translation was titled *Plutarchi vita Ciceronis a Leonardo Aretino in Latinum conversa* in Minutianus's edition.

editio princeps for the complete works, and remaining the dominant choice in successive publications for over fifty years.

The presence of Plutarch's *Life* in the Ciceronian tradition ensured that the Plutarchan style of composition influenced how Cicero and his importance were perceived. Plutarch's *Life of Cicero* is a compelling example of his biographical method and his ability to construct a moral lesson from the life of an important historical figure; its continuing influence solidified the presence of the form of exemplary life it represented in the Ciceronian tradition. Early in his biographical project, in the preface of the *Life of Alexander*, Plutarch made explicit his belief that biography and history must be deemed to be separate genres.¹⁵ By separating biography off from historiography, Plutarch felt he had liberated it from the rules and practices which traditionally governed the historical genre. In particular, while the historian was required to include a greater mass of material to encompass the entirety of his subject, and organise it in a way suited to demonstrating the narrative of his history, the biographer was placed under no such constraints. The contrast to Fabricius and the historic approach could hardly be more marked.

In biography, Plutarch determined, the task was quite different from history, and as such allowed the author to be more selective with the available material; unlike the approach seen with Fabricius, Plutarch felt no compulsion to relate all the events in

¹⁵ Plutarch, *Life of Alexander* 1.1-3. On Plutarch's separation of the genres of history and biography and the on-going influence of that move see Gentili and Cerri (1988) pp. 61-86; Lamberton (2001) pp. 69-74; von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (1995) pp. 47-74; Parke (2002) pp. 2-7; Caine (2010) p. 8; Momigliano (1971) pp. 103-104.

his narrative, only those suitable to his purpose.¹⁶ As Plutarch's purpose was moral edification, the construction of the *Lives* was focussed almost exclusively on the portrayal of the central character so as to best display him to this end.¹⁷ Plutarch wanted his reader to observe in the *Lives* how certain characteristics and elements of a man's behaviour dictated the outcome of his life, and thus to garner from these examples lessons for the best conduct of their own lives. The lesson in the case of Cicero was negative; it was an account intended to display those character faults which would eventually lead to political failure. Cicero's most damaging faults were ambition and an overwhelming desire for glory, which too often overruled his reason.¹⁸ These faults could be found at the root of all his greatest political failures, and his eventual destruction.

The appeal of the *Lives* of Plutarch in the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries lies predominately in its emphasis on moral instruction. Through Plutarch the exemplary life was transmitted from antiquity to the Renaissance, where it found an enthusiastic reception among those seeking to instruct young men destined for public life with the example of the the great men of the past, who deemed this strategy more effective than moral philosophy for the education of the youth.¹⁹ This transmission

¹⁶ This selectivity is a prominent quality of Plutarch's *Lives*; cf. Moles (1988) pp. 9-12, Parke (2002) pp. 2-7, Kraus (2007) p. 254.

¹⁷ Plutarch's didactic approach is a key feature of his *Lives*; cf. Moles (1988) pp. 4-6, Momigliano (1971) pp. 65-100, Lamberton (2001) pp. 69-74, von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (1995) pp. 47-74, Russell (1995) pp. 75-94.

¹⁸ Plutarch, *Life of Cicero* 1.5, 6.4-5, 19.5-7, 25.1, 28.1.

¹⁹ For the importance of exemplary history in this period see Nadel (1964) pp. 296-298 and Gray (1963) pp. 497-514. For the popularity of biography to achieve this, see Sharpe and Zwicker (2008)

was made possible by a renewed enthusiasm for the classical Greek language at the beginning of the fifteenth century, during which time Plutarch's works were sought out and translated with enthusiasm.²⁰ Once Plutarch's *Lives* had been recovered, their influence on Renaissance life-writing expanded, establishing the exemplary life's importance. The prominence of Plutarch's *Life* in the editorial tradition can therefore be understood as a product of this contemporary zeal for morally instructive works.²¹

iii. The model Cicero

While the exemplary form of Plutarch's *Life* did appeal, there was a significant fault with the Plutarchan tradition which Bruni's translation in fact served to expose, and which would initiate a new aspect of Ciceronian life-writing in the sixteenth century. Plutarch's use of Cicero as a negative example was roundly rejected. In the preface to his translation, Bruni relates that as he undertook the task of translating Plutarch, he swiftly came to realise that there were major flaws with the original, emanating from Plutarch's determination to compare Cicero negatively to his parallel in the *Lives*, Demosthenes: *quippe multis pretermisissis, que ad illustrationem summi viri vel maxime pertinebant, cetera sic narrat, ut magis ad comparationem suam, in qua*

pp. 1-28; Pade (2007) I.16-17, 21, 61-87; Griffiths (1987) pp. 175-196; Burke (1998) pp. 65-78; Russell (1995) pp. 75-94.

²⁰ For a full account of the transmission and reception of Plutarch see Pade (2007), esp. I.61-87.

²¹ Plutarch's *Lives* remained prominent in early modern England, showing that Toland was engaging with a contemporary trend. They were translated into English by John Dryden, who also composed a prefatory life, and printed by Jacob Tonson in five volumes between 1683 and 1686, with further editions printed in the 1690s and into the 1700s. This was preceded by a translation by Sir Thomas Knight was printed in 1603, 1612, 1631, 1657 and 1676.

Demosthenem preferre nititur, quam ad sincerum narrandi iudicium accommodari videantur²² Bruni intended to rectify this, making modifications to Plutarch's original including the addition of a comprehensive account of Cicero's literary achievements.²³ Bruni also introduced more evidence from Cicero's own works, and material from additional sources such as Sallust's *Catiline* in order to offer a broader depiction of Cicero's life, particularly his role in the Catilinarian conspiracy.²⁴ Bruni inherits from his original a liberty in his composition which is reflected in the selectivity of his narrative and its rhetorical status, but directs these weapons more overtly towards a sympathetic portrayal of Cicero, a portrayal which celebrates him as both a politician and an intellectual model: "itaque non magis patrem patrie appellare ipsum convenit, quam parentem eloquii et litterarum nostrarum"²⁵

²² *Cicero Novus* pp. 416-418: "since he has neglected a great deal, which greatly pertained to the portrayal of this highest of men, and tells the rest so that it seems to adhere more to his comparison, in which it is clear that he prefers Demosthenes, than to the fair judgement of his narration" Bruni began work on his translation of Plutarch's *Life*, popularly called *Cicero Novus*, in 1412, while working at the papal court, and completed most of it between 1415 and 1416. Leonardus Aretinus/Leonardo Bruni (1369-1444) was papal secretary from 1405 to 1415, and chancellor of Florence from 1427 to 1444, forging his reputation for scholarship with his numerous translations of Greek texts; cf. Sandys (1908) pp. 45-47 and Griffiths (1987) pp. 3-46.

²³ Bruni, *Cicero Novus* pp. 468 ff. Hans Baron recognised only this element as a modification to the original, and considered it to be evidence of Bruni's commitment to civic humanism, as by emphasising both Cicero's literary and political achievements he was constructing him in terms resonant of the ideal civic humanist; see Baron (1967), Hankins (1995), Seigel (1966).

²⁴ Bruni, *Cicero Novus* pp. 438-444.

²⁵ Bruni, *Cicero Novus* p. 468: "and so he was not only father of his country, but father of our eloquence and literature" The sympathetic nature of this portrayal has been noted by Hankins (1995) and Ianziti (2002) pp. 805-832, who recognise the modifications Bruni made to the text as geared towards an essentially encomiastic portrayal of Cicero influenced by the civic humanism championed by Baron (1967), (1966); cf. Ianziti (1998) pp. 367-391, (1999) pp. 11-35, and (2000) pp. 39-58. Fryde (1980), however, rejects Baron's approach, identifying in the *Cicero Novus* the roots of the

Bruni's *Cicero Novus* therefore identified what in the sixteenth century would become a dominant feature of Ciceronian life-writing: Plutarch had mishandled the subject to serve his own ends, and Cicero required rehabilitation. This concern to repair Cicero's reputation is an evident motivation in many of the original lives composed in the sixteenth century, as throughout this period there is little modification to the exemplary form of life inherited from Plutarch, but numerous attempts to construct Cicero as a positive example within that tradition.²⁶ Sebastianus Corradus's *Quaestura*, first published in 1537, presents the most notable example of this process, as this account of Cicero's life was presented as a direct challenge to the hostile tradition emanating from Plutarch: "nec exceptionem, quam dicitis, in interdicto contineri: nec eum, qui de nostris hominibus scribens, tam saepe mentiatur, et Graeculos nescio quos cum summis hominibus Romanis, quasi culices cum elephantis, conferat, illis aequum debere judicari, Ciceroni certe videtur hac in parte, de qua loquimur, iniquus fuisse: quum parce laudet, et copiose vituperet, et id vituperet, quod ipsi fortasse defendemur"²⁷ Corradus's commitment to this aim

scientific history which would manifest itself more fully in Bruni's *History of the Florentine People*. See Griffiths (1987) pp. 175-196 for an account of the debate.

²⁶ For example, Constantius Felicius (1518); Hortensius Landus, *Cicero relegatus et Cicero revocatus* 1534; Christophorus Preyssiuss, *de Vita Ciceronis* 1555; Petrus Ramus (1557). For discussions of this period of life-writing see Takada (2007) pp. 247-251; Brueggemann (1795) pp. 30-32; Orellius (1836) pp. 424-477; Ernesti (1773) pp. 137-139.

²⁷ Corradus, *Quaestura* p. 142: "and he, whom you named, cannot be considered an exception: and it is not so often mentioned that he, who wrote about our men, and would pair I know not what little Greek men with the greatest Romans, like gnats with elephants, to be judged equal with them, certainly seemed to be unfair to Cicero in this manner about which we speak: since he praises sparsely, and abuses copiously, we will defend him" cf. pp. 11-13, 29-30. This work was published in Venice in 1537, under its full title *Sebastiani Corradi Egnatius, sive Quaestura, cuius praecipua capita haec sunt: M.T.Ciceronis vita undique collecta, et defensa*; it was structured as a dialogue in which the participants perform the roles of a quaestor and a treasurer, exchanging information on

results in an overtly encomiastic portrayal of Cicero, one which, as Conyers Middleton would note in 1741, acted more as an apology than as a history.²⁸ Corradus created a paradigmatic Cicero, who would provide a model for all men seeking to succeed in public office.

Corradus' determination to rehabilitate Cicero's reputation is matched in the majority of the *Lives* published in this era, though more often the attempts to elevate Cicero the man were driven by contemporary intellectual factors rather than the fixation with Plutarch which galvanised Corradus. The most significant intellectual factor was the debate concerning 'Ciceronianism'; in 1512 the papal secretary Pietro Bembo had defined the canons of literary criticism with Cicero as the sole model of imitation, a move which provoked significant controversy over the question of appropriate subjects for imitation.²⁹ In 1518 Constantius Felicius produced an account of Cicero's retreat into exile and subsequent return to Rome which constituted his contribution to this Ciceronian endeavour.³⁰ This is made explicit in the preface to the work, which reveals that he saw it as an opportunity to demonstrate his own Ciceronianism, maintaining the importance of adapting his own language to

Cicero in place of money. The meagre amount of biographical information of Corradus available identifies him as a grammarian and professor at Bologna, who died in 1556.

²⁸ Middleton, *Life of Cicero* p. xviii.

²⁹ On the Ciceronian controversy see Dellaneva (2007), Osmond and Ulery (1995) pp. 29-56, and Gray (1963).

³⁰ Its full title was *Constantii Felicii Durantini, Utriusque iuris periti, libri duo: Unus, de Exilio M. Tullij Ciceronis. Alter, De eius glorioso reditu*. First published in Rome in 1518 by Giacomo Mazzachi, alongside Constantius' version of the Catilinarian Conspiracy, and dedicated to Pope Leo X. Biographical information contained within the preface to this first edition reveals that Constantius was born in Castel Durante; he studied law in Perugia, working on his scholarship in the holidays; he was only eighteen when he completed this work.

match that of his Ciceronian evidence. To further serve his cause, the work itself presented an apologetic version of events, defending Cicero's retreat into exile, and glorifying his return. Cicero was being elevated as a man suitable for imitation. Constantius's work was employed again in the Ciceronianism debate when it was republished by Johann Cochlaus in Germany in 1535 following expansion of the debate north of the Alps and the publication of Erasmus's *Ciceronianus* in 1528. In his preface Cochlaus criticises Erasmus's omission of Constantius from his discussion of the great Ciceronians: "nemo igitur inter Ciceronianos nostrae aetatis ... fuit Ciceronis magis studiosus et amator et imitator, que iste, qui res gestas Ciceronis ipsius verbis explicare studuit"³¹ Constantius Felicius used an account of Cicero the man to launch his support for Ciceronianism. Petrus Ramus's *Ciceronianus*, an account of Cicero's life printed in 1557, also makes explicit the connection between life-writing and Ciceronian debate: Ramus argues that those who seek to imitate Cicero's language would do well to study and imitate his life as a whole, thus the biography serves to act as a frame for another contribution to the Ciceronian debate.³² This wave of apologetic accounts of Cicero's life constituted an effort to make him a worthy model, encouraged by the Ciceronian debate's emphasis on imitation.

The *Lives* in this period therefore share two important characteristics: they maintain the Plutarchan model, in the sense that they produced lives intended to be instructive, but they reoriented the life of Cicero to become a positive example rather

³¹ Constantius. *De exilio* A3: "no one among the Ciceronians of our age was a more enthusiastic admirer and imitator of Cicero than that man, who devoted himself to the exhibition of the deeds of Cicero in his own words"

³² Petrus Ramus, *Ciceronianus* was published in Paris in 1557. See Murphy (1992) pp. ix-xxiv.

than the largely negative example produced by Plutarch. Cicero was to be imitated, but first he had to be rehabilitated. These general developments in the Ciceronian tradition made themselves felt in the editorial tradition, firstly with the gradual decline of the use of Plutarch's *Life*, and secondly with the decision by Dionysius Lambinus to compose his own account of Cicero's life with which to preface his extremely influential collection of Cicero's works in 1566.³³ This life by Lambinus fulfils all the criteria of the exemplary life with Cicero as the model identified so far. In the preface Lambinus admits as much, expressing his belief that the reader can only learn useful things from the example of Cicero.³⁴ He goes on to construct his account almost as a panegyric: a narrative centred around discussion of Cicero's character, uninterrupted by reference to sources, and seemingly unaware of any weaknesses in its subject.

Fabricius's *Historia* was the most developed representative of a modification to the Ciceronian tradition, emphasising an historic approach to life-writing defined by its contrast to the exemplary life which had dominated the tradition previously.³⁵ Toland's decision to include Fabricius's work demonstrates his acceptance of the

³³ Dedicated to Charles IX of France, Lambinus entitled the work *M.T.Ciceronis Patria, Genus, Ingenium, Studia, Doctrina, Mores, Vita, Facta, Res Gestæ, Mors: omnia ferè ex ipso Cicerone à Dionysia Lambino collecta*.

³⁴ Lambinus (1566) Iij.

³⁵ A notable exception to the trends discussed here is the edition produced by Victorius between 1534 and 1537. Victorius includes what he terms *T. Livius Historiarum Libro CXX*; from the *Periochæ* we know that this book contained an account of Cicero's proscription and assassination by the triumvirs in 43 BC, seemingly confirmed by the inclusion of such a narrative by Livy in Seneca's *Suasoriae* VI.17-18, believed to be said narrative. The only other example of this account being used is in Cratander's edition in 1528, which included it alongside Plutarch's *Life* and Cornelius Nepos's account of Atticus's life.

value of the historic life, and readiness to adhere to the tradition in its current form. But, the historic life was insufficient. Toland's claim that the absence of questions of character in Fabricius's *Historia* amounted to omissions suggests a sympathy with the more liberal, character-driven approach in evidence in the exemplary tradition.

II. Evaluating Toland's *Essay*

Before such a judgement can be confirmed, an examination of exactly what Toland proposed in his *Historical-Critical Essay* is essential. For, as is evident from the tradition, while in principle the exemplary life focussed on questions of character so as to provide instruction for the reader, the life in question could still be portrayed in positive or negative terms. In *Cicero Illustratus* Toland expands on his three examples of points of controversy regarding Cicero's character: Cicero's inconsistency in political matters, his apparent cowardice, and his propensity to indulge in praise for his own achievements. In his handling of these issues lies the answer to the question of exactly what Toland is trying to achieve by addressing the so-called omissions of the historic life. For Toland had already demonstrated his belief that the men who would most benefit from a careful reading of Cicero were those set to embark on a political career, and the subject matter Toland chose here to illustrate his method all concern his political conduct. It is therefore necessary to consider Toland's efforts here with a view to the potential broader political message he intended.

i. *Levitas and inconstancia*

The charge of inconsistency, particularly in terms of his political allegiances, was one which dogged Cicero as a result of his conduct in the decade following his exile,

with an element of truth to it which Toland was ready to admit: *æum eis nimirum, a quibus antea solebat dissentire, in gratiam non semel redierat*³⁶ On his return from exile, Cicero increasingly shifted his loyalties away from the Senate, and the Senators whom he believed had betrayed him, towards Pompey, Crassus and Caesar. The controversy provoked by these shifts in Cicero's political allegiance are amply attested in his own works; Cicero was forced to respond to accusations that he was a turncoat in both speeches and letters.³⁷ Cicero famously acknowledged his own doubts about his change of allegiance in a letter to Atticus, denouncing his *De Provinciis Consularibus*, a speech advocating Caesar's wishes with respect to the provinces, as a palinode, and declaring forlornly *sed valeant recta, vera, honesta consilia*³⁸ The decisions taken in this period would haunt Cicero both in his lifetime and beyond.

The negative traditions surrounding Cicero owe a great deal of their survival to the efforts of historians in the imperial period. The initial preservation of this tradition is indebted to the work of Asinius Pollio, an historian notably hostile to Cicero, whose account was preserved by Seneca the Elder.³⁹ The greater debt for its transmission is owed, however, to two prominent forces in the anti-Ciceronian tradition: Cassius Dio

³⁶ *CI* pp. 27-28: *he had doubtless more than once returned into favour with those, with whom he was accustomed to disagree before*

³⁷ *Dom.* 4, 72; *ad QFr.* III.2.

³⁸ *Ad Att.* IV.5: *but good-bye to straightforward, honest, and high-minded policy!* (trans. Shuckburgh).

³⁹ Seneca, *Suasoriae* 6.14-15, 24-25; see also Valerius Maximus on Cicero's decision regarding Gabinius and Vatinius 4.2.4.

and the pseudo-Sallustian invective against Cicero.⁴⁰ The invective purported to be by Sallust offers the most colourful expressions of such hostile traditions: *immo vero homo levissimus, supplex inimicis, amicis contumeliosus, modo harum, modo illarum partium, fidus nemini, levissimus senator, mercennarius patronus, cuius nulla pars corporis a turpitudine vacat, lingua vana, manus rapacissimae, gula immensa, pedes fugaces: quae honeste nominari non possunt, inhonestissima*⁴¹ Cassius Dio repeated the accusation several times, although most explicitly when relating the trial of Gabinius: Pompey, he claimed, not only exerted his influence over Cicero sufficiently to prevent him from accusing his long-term enemy Gabinius, but managed to compel Cicero to speak in his favour, thereby securing for him the reputation of a *turncoat*⁴² The rediscovery and dissemination of these works in the Renaissance and beyond secured the on-going influence of this element of the anti-Ciceronian tradition.

This continuing influence is made evident by the efforts among Cicero's apologists to counter and dispel these hostile narratives. Corradus challenged the tradition with the evidence from Cicero's letters, particularly the infamous letter to Lentulus Spinther, quoting Cicero's defence of his actions with respect to the Campanian

⁴⁰ On this spurious work attributed to Sallust, and often transmitted with a reply falsely attributed to Cicero, see Novokhatko (2009) pp. 111-129.

⁴¹ Pseudo-Sallust 5: *but on the contrary this man is totally unreliable, deferential with his enemies, abusive to his friends, one moment he supports one side, at the next the other, loyal to nobody, a thoroughly undependable senator, a patron for a fee; there is no part of his body that does not cause distaste: his conceited tongue, his rapacious hands, his elephantine gullet, his scampering feet; those parts which cannot gracefully be referred to, are in his case most especially disgraceful* (trans. Novokhatko); cf. 7.

⁴² Dio, *Roman History* 39.63; see also 38.18-29, 36.44.2. See Lintott (1997) pp. 2514-2518.

Law, and determining that ‘Cicero tunc, ut ante, Rempubl. libere defendebat: sed, quum Pompeium, Caesarem, et Crassum offenderet: nec optimates, ut in epistolis ad Lentulum videre licet, gratos esse videret, sententiam mutavit’⁴³ Corradus illustrated Cicero’s disappointment in the Senators with a passage from a letter to Atticus, in which he declares that as those who have no power refuse him their affection, he will pursue the affection of those who do have power.⁴⁴ The sentiment expressed by Corradus, that Cicero looked to the Dynasts due to their greater power compared with the Senate, receives a more politic expression from Conyers Middleton in 1741. Middleton describes Cicero’s actions in this period in terms of the practicalities of political action, and his understanding that political circumstances sometimes required the ability to be flexible, and to adapt to circumstances: ‘[the Senators] considered Cicero’s management of the triumvirate as a mean submission to illegal power, which they were always opposing and irritating, though ever so unseasonably; whereas Cicero thought it time to give over fighting when the forces were so unequal, and that the more patiently they suffered the dominion of their new masters the more temperately they would use it’⁴⁵ The sense in this pro-Ciceronian tradition, as elucidated from Cicero’s letters, was that Cicero was not so much a ‘turncoat’ as forced by the ineptitude of the Senatorial body to ally himself with those whose power was more viable.

⁴³ Corradus, *Quaestura* p. 185: ‘Cicero then, as before, was defending the freedom of the Republic: but, when he was striking against Pompey, Caesar, and Crassus: and he saw that the optimates were not grateful, as it is possible to see in the letters to Lentulus, he changed his stance’ using *ad Fam.*I.9.

⁴⁴ Corradus, *Quaestura* pp. 185-186, quoting *ad Att.*IV.5.

⁴⁵ Middleton, *History of the Life of Cicero* p. 124, referring to *ad Fam.*I.9, *ad QFr.*II.8.

Toland's proposed response to this particular tradition draws on the dominant pro-Ciceronian stance, emphasising Cicero's commitment to the Republic above the personal nature of his frustration with the Senate. Toland relies for his arguments exclusively on a particular passage of the *Pro Plancio*, which forms part of Cicero's response to attacks on his *ethos* made by the prosecution concerning his political conduct.⁴⁶ Firstly, Toland reiterates Cicero's claim that it was not he who changed his mind, but rather his acquaintances, drawing on the tradition of Cicero's frustration with the Senate.⁴⁷ Toland continues with this passage from the *Pro Plancio* to construct his defence of Cicero around a principle of political theory: *stare enim omnes debemus tanquam in orbe aliquo Reipublicae; qui, quoniam versetur, eam deligere partem, ad quam nos illius utilitas salusque converterit*⁴⁸ Toland cites this as proof that Cicero's politics did in fact remain constant: he consistently made the decisions which he deemed to be of the greatest benefit to the Republic. Toland further quotes a metaphor Cicero uses in the *Pro Plancio*, in which he compares the Republic to a ship blown off course, and himself to the captain attempting to bring it to safety; here Cicero argues that it is of greater importance to bring the ship into a safe and calm harbour, rather than pursue a particular harbour just because you have safely laid anchor there before.⁴⁹ In this

⁴⁶ May (1988) pp. 116-127.

⁴⁷ *CI* p. 27, referring to *Planc.*93.

⁴⁸ *CI* pp. 28 (*Planc.*93): *stare enim omnes debemus tanquam in orbe aliquo Reipublicae; qui, quoniam versetur, eam deligere partem, ad quam nos illius utilitas salusque converterit* (trans. Watts); cf. *Rep.*II.47, *ad Att.*XXI.2 and *Pis.*9, Craig (1990) pp. 75-81. Toland uses this metaphor again when describing the period between about which he proposes to write a history, see *CI* p. 69.

⁴⁹ *CI* pp. 28-29, using *Planc.*94; cf. *ad Fam.*I.9.

way, Cicero's perceived inconstancy becomes a strength, as it permits him the flexibility necessary to always ensure that he is able to do what is best for the Republic.⁵⁰ In Toland's reading of the evidence, that is Cicero's primary concern: the integrity and safety of the Republic.

ii. *Lenitas and timiditas*

The accusations of timidity and cowardice identified by Toland were levelled against Cicero primarily on account of his decision to withdraw into exile rather than to either remain in Rome and fight against Clodius's efforts to drive him out, or to commit suicide in preference to such disgrace. Following Clodius's machinations against him, Cicero was faced with a choice between fight or flight, as Bruni succinctly puts it: "reliquum ergo erat aut in exilium ire aut ferro dimicare"⁵¹ Cicero himself offers criticisms of his actions in his letters during the period of his exile, providing his enemies with sufficient ammunition: "sed ego, quod sperem, non dispicio, cum inimici plurimum valeant, amici partim deserverint me, partim etiam prodiderint, qui in meo reditu fortasse reprehensionem sui sceleris pertimescunt"⁵² This bitterness against his former allies is only one element of Cicero's discontent. In letters to Atticus, Cicero describes at length the depth of his grief at having allowed himself to be driven from Rome, regularly querying whether withdrawal

⁵⁰ It is interesting to note that Machiavelli encouraged his prince to show flexibility in his rule, and not be constrained by the need to keep *fides*; see Machiavelli, *The Prince* XVIII.60-62 and Skinner (2002) pp. 144-147.

⁵¹ Bruni, *Cicero Novus* p. 450: "therefore it remained either to go into exile or to fight with the sword"

⁵² *Ad QFr.*I.3: "but I personally cannot see what hope there is, since my enemies have the greatest influence, while my friends have in some cases deserted, in others even betrayed me, fearing perhaps in my restoration a censure on their own treacherous conduct" (trans. Shuckburgh).

was preferable to conflict or even suicide, such is the extent of his despair during the era of his disgrace.⁵³

The speeches following his recall reveal that accusations of cowardice and weakness had already begun to emanate from his contemporaries; it was such accusations that were adapted and deployed in the anti-Ciceronian tradition.⁵⁴ This tradition owes much of its preservation to Plutarch, whose depiction of Cicero staring with longing and grief towards Rome was sufficiently convincing to reinforce his conclusion that Cicero's conduct during his exile demonstrated a weakness inappropriate to a man of his philosophical education.⁵⁵ This *topos* of Cicero's philosophical weakness was adopted and expanded by Cassius Dio. He depicted Cicero in dialogue with an otherwise unaccounted for figure named Philiscus, who at length chastises Cicero for the un-philosophical weakness he demonstrates by continuously lamenting his fate and grieving over his exile.⁵⁶ This particular tradition survived into the Renaissance, even in the works of those writers sympathetic to Cicero: Bruni reiterates Plutarch's description of Cicero's grief, and Constantius Felicius adopts it as an opportunity to praise his work's dedicatee Leo X, comparing this weakness shown by Cicero with the fortitude displayed by the Pope when he fled the uprisings in Florence to seek refuge North of the Alps.⁵⁷

⁵³ *Ad Att.* III.3, 8.2-4, 10, 12, 15.

⁵⁴ *Dom.* 95; *Vat.* 6-7; *Pis.* 18, 77-78.

⁵⁵ *Plut. Cic.* 32.1-7.

⁵⁶ Dio, *Roman History* 38.18-29; see Millar (1964) pp. 46-55 and Lintott (1997) pp. 2497-2523.

⁵⁷ Bruni, *Cicero Novus* p. 452; Constantius, *De Exilio*, in the *Praefatio*.

When seeking to challenge this *topos*, the Ciceronian apologists were forced to confront the evidence of Cicero's own letters. Indeed Corradus offers what amounts to an extremely tenuous repudiation of those letters when responding to Plutarch's account, this aspect of which he condemns as the most outright example of Plutarch's bias against Cicero.⁵⁸ Corradus claims that Cicero's expressions of grief and despair in the letters were in fact a pretence, intended to motivate his friends and allies who remained in Rome to pursue his recall with greater commitment. Other, more viable, strategies are apparent in Corradus's work. He articulates one popular approach by emphasising the illegality of the attempt by Clodius that forced Cicero into exile, using Cicero's words in *De Domo Sua* to demonstrate that his exile had no legal basis.⁵⁹ Constantius Felicius adopts a slight variation on that version, that in spite of it being within his power to do so, Cicero chose to yield so as to prevent bloodshed in the Republic: *sed armis decertare pro sua salute noluit. Quoniam et vincere, et vinci, luctuosum Reipublicae putabat*⁶⁰ The defence of Cicero could thus take two paths: that he was forced into exile by the machinations of Clodius, an approach which places the emphasis on the wrongdoing of his enemies, or that he chose to withdraw for the good of the Republic, instead emphasising the qualities of Cicero himself.⁶¹

⁵⁸ Corradus, *Quaestura* p. 165

⁵⁹ Corradus, *Quaestura* p. 154; cf. Plut. *Cic.* 30.6, *Dom.* 45, 68, 88, *Sest.* 84, 121, 145, *Pis.* 23, *Planc.* 26.

⁶⁰ Constantius, *De exilio* E3: *sed armis decertare pro sua salute noluit. Quoniam et vincere, et vinci, luctuosum Reipublicae putabat*

⁶¹ See Robinson (1994) pp. 475-480 for this summation of the differing approaches to defending Cicero's actions.

Toland adheres closely to the second of these apologetic approaches, drawing particularly upon the evidence of the *post reditum* speeches.⁶² He reiterates the level of support demonstrated for Cicero when he was under attack from Clodius; Toland describes the decision of the equestrian order to don the apparel of mourners in a show of support, and the twenty thousand youths who followed Cicero around Rome.⁶³ The purpose of this imagery was to show that sufficient support was available to Cicero should he have wished to make his case with force: *‘sustentatus in hunc modum, tantopere dilectus, venerandus omnibus, et admirationi habitus, quàm facilè obsequium detrectare, ac inimicos apertâ vi profligare posset?’*⁶⁴ In spite of all this, Cicero chose to withdraw. Toland quotes from Cicero’s *Pro Plancio* in order to provide two fundamental reasons for this. The first, that the use of force in the Republic would have subverted its laws, contrary to all that Cicero held dear. The second, that Cicero could not bear to see such bloodshed in his name tearing his beloved Republic apart. Toland quotes the concern Cicero expressed, again in the *Pro Plancio*, that *‘idem perditor Reipublicae nominarer, qui servator fuissem?’*⁶⁵ Once more the explanation for Cicero’s actions can be found in his on-going and overwhelming concern for the safety of the Republic.

⁶² In these speeches Cicero was consciously trying to reconstruct his *auctoritas* following his exile; see May (1988) pp. 89-98, Kaster (2006) pp. 1-14 and Claassen (1992) pp. 19-47.

⁶³ *CI* p. 18, referring to *Sest.* 26, 36, 128, 27 and *Post Reditum in Senatu*.

⁶⁴ *CI* p. 18: *‘supported in this way, loved so greatly, venerated by all, and held in admiration, how easily would he be able to reject the attentions of flatterers, and to conquer enemies with open force?’*

⁶⁵ *CI* pp. 18-19 (*Planc.* 89): *‘was I, who had once been the saviour of the republic, now to gain myself the name of its destroyer?’* (trans. Watts).

iii. The problem of self-praise

Of the *topoi* criticising Cicero's character, Toland acknowledges that the tradition of his arrogance and propensity to self-praise is the most prevalent, for *nullum ferè hominem aut librum consules, qui Ciceronem non nimium sanè et valde frequentem in propriis laudibus crimentur*⁶⁶ Once more the origins of this *topos* can be discerned in the criticisms directed against Cicero during his lifetime, to which he responded in his letters and speeches.⁶⁷ The most regularly cited example of this characteristic is the enthusiasm with which Cicero sought out means for celebrating his achievements during his consulship, whether that be the poetry he composed on his own behalf, or the requests he made to Luceius and Archias to that end.⁶⁸ In addition to these outright requests for recognition of his achievements, Cicero continuously peppered his speeches, both deliberative and forensic, and his philosophical works, with references to his political successes: *ita consiliis diligentiaque nostra celeriter de manibus audacissimorum civium delapsa arma ipsa ceciderunt. Quae res igitur gesta umquam in bello tanta? qui triumphus conferendus?*⁶⁹ The frequency of such claims make them a notable feature of

⁶⁶ *CI* p. 29: *you will hardly consult any person or book that does not accuse Cicero of being too enthusiastic and frequent in praise of himself*

⁶⁷ *Dom.*92-93; *Prov.*45; for Anthony's attack see *Phil.*II.20; *Off.*I.77. See Quintilian, *Institutiones* 11.1.18, 23-4 on the criticism Cicero suffered on this count.

⁶⁸ See the *Pro Archia* and *ad Fam.*v.12 for his requests to Luceius and Archias, and on the poems see *ad Att.*I.19.10, 20.6 and II.1.1-2 and *Div.*I; cf. Steel (2005) pp. 68-69.

⁶⁹ *Off.*I.77: *through my vigilance and my counsel the very arms swiftly slipped and fell from the hands of the most audacious citizens. Was any achievement of war ever so great? What military triumph can stand comparison?* (trans. Griffin and Atkins).

Cicero's rhetoric, and one which inevitably gained him a reputation for excessive enthusiasm for his own merits.⁷⁰

Plutarch's *Life of Cicero* played a vital role in the transmission of this tradition, as Plutarch's contention throughout that work was that the irrational levels of ambition and pride in Cicero were the qualities which ensured his political downfall:

71

Plutarch was not alone. Cassius Dio also identified Cicero's pride and constant celebration of the achievements of his consulship as an important element in his supposed political failure, arguing that it was this which provoked the enmity of

⁷⁰ Allen (1954) pp. 121-144.

⁷¹ Plut. *Cic.* 24.1-2: "at that time he had the greatest power in the state, but he made himself an object of envious ill-will to many, not by any wicked action, but becoming hated by many by constantly praising and glorifying himself. It was possible for neither senate nor people nor court to meet in which one did not have to hear Catiline and Lentulus being everlastingly talked about. But finally he filled even his books and writings with his eulogies and he made his oratory, which was very pleasant and had great charm, burdensome and vulgar to his hearers, this unpleasantness clinging to him like some everlasting doom" (trans. Moles); cf. 6.5.

Clodius which led to his exile.⁷² Once more the pseudo-Sallust provides the most colourful attack on Cicero for this particular weakness: ægeris, oro te, Cicero, profeceris quidlibet: satis est perpessos esse: etiamne aures nostras odio tuo onerabis, etiamne molestissimis verbis insectabere? õcedant arma togae concedat laurea linguaeö. quasi vero togatus et non armatus ea quae gloriaris confeceris, atque inter te Sullamque dictatorem praeter nomen imperii quicquam interfuerit⁷³ Cicero's works ensured that opportunities for such mockery were numerous.

Such was the power of this tradition that Ciceronian apologists were unable to deny this aspect of his character - they could only offer attempts to justify his conduct. Here Bruni sees an opportunity to correct Plutarch, as although he accepts the tradition preserved by his source, he does make an attempt to justify Cicero's conduct on account of the generosity with which Cicero offered praise to others. Bruni constructs from this argument a lesson for his contemporaries: ñnimis profecto insolentes fastidiosique sumus: virtutes ab hominibus ad unguem exigimus; eos de illis ipsis loqui non toleramus⁷⁴ Corradus looks for an explanation in Cicero's increasingly fractious relationship with the Senators, whose envy was such that he

⁷² Dio, *Roman History* 38.12.7, 37.38.2; cf. Juvenal 10.122-6 and Seneca *Brev.*5.1.

⁷³ Pseudo-Sallust 6: ñI implore you, Cicero, having acted and having achieved what you wanted: it is enough that the people have suffered. Will you burden our ears with your hatred; will you harass us with revolting words: õLet arms give way to the toga, and the military laurel-wreath to the power of speech?ö As if you were a man of the toga and not a bearer of arms when you did all that you take pride in! As if there were some other difference, apart from your official title, between you and the dictator Sulla!ö(trans. Novokhatko).

⁷⁴ Bruni, *Cicero Novus* p. 478: ñwe are too insolent and too disdainful: we demand virtues from men; but we do not tolerate them to talk about themselvesö

was forced to respond to their personal attacks in his own speeches.⁷⁵ Such discussion of his achievements was required by the antipathy of others. In addition, Corradus locates Cicero in a tradition of great men, including Themistocles and Pompey, who sought eternity for their achievements in the form of history.⁷⁶ This was not a plea for an encomium, Corradus argued, but simply an historical composition.

Toland looked to Cicero's own discussion of his motivations in speaking about his achievements, and uncovered two strategies in Cicero's speeches for justifying what could so easily be dismissed as arrogance. Firstly, Toland deployed Cicero's words from *Pro Archia* in which he claims that such great deeds by great men must by necessity be recorded for the edification of future generations: "quam multas nobis imagines ó non solum ad intuendum, verum etiam ad imitandum ó fortissimorum virorum expressas scriptores et Graeci et Latini reliquerunt?"⁷⁷ It was the nature of history in antiquity that it should record the deeds of great men so as to provide exemplars for future generations. Moreover, such recognition adhered to the understanding of *gloria* Cicero himself perpetuated, as a reward for service to the state, and hence a motivation for others to perform such service.⁷⁸ Secondly, Toland

⁷⁵ Corradus, *Quaestura* p. 242, quoting *Har.*16-17 and *Dom.*93.

⁷⁶ Corradus, *Quaestura* p. 243.

⁷⁷ *Arch.*14: "how many pictures of high endeavour the great authors of Greece and Rome have drawn for our use, and bequeathed to us, not only for our contemplation, but for our emulation!" (trans. Watts). Balsdon (1965) p. 193 argues that Cicero saw himself at the centre of historic events, citing the letter to Lentulus Spinther, *ad Fam.*1.9.

⁷⁸ *CI* p. 30, quoting *Arch.*28. For Cicero's definition of *gloria* in these terms see *Marc.*26; cf. Sullivan (1941) pp. 382-391 and Allen (1954) pp. 121-144.

uses Cicero's arguments from *De Domo Sua* to demonstrate that such comments on his own achievements were necessary responses to the attacks being made on his *auctoritas* and *dignitas* in the courts: *nam si, cum mihi furta, largitiones, libidines obiciuntur, ego respondere soleo meis consiliis, periculis, laboribus patriam esse servatam, non tam sum existimandus de gestis rebus gloriari quam de obiectis confiteri*⁷⁹ Toland sought the required justification of Cicero's actions in arguments with both an historical and rhetorical basis.

The emphasis from Toland in each of these cases was on locating and representing Cicero's own explanations for his conduct. While the alternative anti-Ciceronian and pro-Ciceronian traditions constructed their arguments from a variety of evidence, Toland consistently recreated Cicero's own arguments. In this way, he was able to maintain his case for presenting the real Cicero to the reader. The problem with this approach is the selectivity necessitated; Toland chose to locate the evidence for the real Cicero in his apologetic speeches rather than in his letters. Toland's method would therefore require extensive justification.

III. Locating Cicero's truth

Toland's willingness to display his method and discuss his approach suggests his acknowledgement of this necessity for defending his portrayal of Cicero. Evaluating his method in the context of contemporary historical scholarship will reveal how he hoped that his approach would grant authority to his depiction of Cicero the man.

⁷⁹ *Dom.*93 (*CI* p. 31). See May (1988) and Paterson (2004) pp. 79-96 for a full survey of the role of Cicero's *ethos* in his oratory.

i. A question of method

Notable from the outset is Toland's principal methodological approach: he will seek the answers to questions he is asking in Cicero's own words, and he will reproduce those words exactly, thereby allowing Cicero to speak for himself. Toland is therefore able to disassociate himself from the arguments being made on Cicero's behalf, inviting those who disagree with them to take their discontent to Cicero himself, rather than Toland: "ipsum ulterius loquentem audias, et, si potes, reprehendas"⁸⁰ Toland makes it explicit that he is acting merely as a conduit for Cicero's own defensive efforts when composing his history: "sed, ut innumeris non immerer exemplis quibus se defendere posset, immensa illa laudum cupido, sine qua nihil unquam aut bonum aut magnum susceptum, satis excusatum habet"⁸¹ Toland takes care, even in this brief survey, to display to the full that his chosen method of historical composition was one of minimal intervention.

This is not the only occasion on which Toland commits himself to an historiographical approach which emphasises the primacy of the subject's own words, as opposed to his interpretation of the material. In his *Life of Milton*, which acted as a prefatory biography to a collection of Milton's works, Toland took the opportunity to explain his approach to life-writing. Here the method expounded is essentially that made apparent in his proposed treatment of Cicero's life: he will draw on Milton's own words to allow him to speak for himself. As in the case of

⁸⁰ *CI* p. 28: "you listen to him speaking further, and, if you can, you may rebuke him"

⁸¹ *CI* p. 30: "but so as not to linger on the innumerable examples with which he could defend himself, his immense desire for praise, without which nothing either good or significant has ever been undertaken, provides him with sufficient excuse"

Cicero, Toland presents his approach in terms of the reader's ability to interact with the subject themselves, minimising his own intervention: 'in the Characters of Sects, and Parties, Books or Opinions, I shall produce his own words, as I find them in his Works; that those who approve his Reasons, may owe all the Obligation to himself, and that I may escape the blame of such as may dislike what he says'⁸² Fundamental to Toland's favoured historical method is the idea that he, as the historian, has been rendered far less important than the subject, with whom the reader is engaging directly.

ii. A question of truth

In order to understand why Toland selected this particular method to justify his portrayal of Cicero, it is necessary to judge it according to the concerns of contemporary historical scholarship. Contained within *Cicero Illustratus* are several statements by Toland on his understanding of the nature and purpose of history; such an opportunity is presented by his consideration at the end of *Cicero Illustratus* of the history of recent European events he intends to compose once his work on Cicero has sufficiently rehabilitated his Latin.⁸³ Toland articulates his sense of the function of history: 'huic enim, quicquid egerim, semper intentus sum operi, quo nomina illorum, quos ibi collando, in Honoris templo immortalitati consecrarem: quoque reliquos, patriae praesertim proditores, inustos verissimis malefactorum notis, traderem etiam hominum memoriae, hoc est, ignominiae et infamiae sempiternae'⁸⁴

⁸² Toland, *Life of Milton* p. 7.

⁸³ *CI* pp. 67-73.

⁸⁴ *CI* p. 69: 'for, whatever I have done, I have always been intent on this task, in which I would consecrate for immortality in the temple of Honour the names of those I praise there: also the

The influence of Cicero is evident, as he paraphrases Cicero's most famous adage on the purpose of history: "sed studium hocce et lux quaedam veritatis nequaquam est sufficiens, cum Historia sit pariter testis temporum et magistra vitae"⁸⁵ Here in *Cicero Illustratus* Toland is reiterating sentiments which he had expounded in earlier works: "writings of this nature should in my opinion be design'd to recommend Virtue, and to expose Vice; or to illustrate History, and to preserve the memory of extraordinary things"⁸⁶ Toland demonstrated a commitment to the didactic function of history; this further explained his reasons for criticising the purely historic life represented by Fabricius's *Historia*.

In this commitment, Toland maintained the concern of the dominant *ars historica* tradition, and indeed of the majority of historical writers of the period.⁸⁷ This majority adhered to the belief that history must offer some lesson to its readers,

remaining men, especially the traitors of the fatherland, branded with the truest marks of wrongdoing, I would hand over to the memory of men, that is, for everlasting dishonour and ill fame"

⁸⁵ *CI* p. 68: "but this good intention and, as it were, the light of truth is by no means sufficient, since History is equally a witness of the ages and teachers of life" cf. *De Orat.* II.36. Toland also quotes *Off.* I.85-87 to close *Cicero Illustratus*, claiming that the passage represents his own view of the principles of history.

⁸⁶ Toland, *Life of Milton* p. 6.

⁸⁷ The '*ars historica*' refers to a branch of historical scholarship consisting of historical manuals composed by those who undertook to define history, and to determine methods for its pursuit and composition, across the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, e.g. Bodin and Vossius. On this stage of historical scholarship see Grafton (2007); Nadel (1964) pp. 292-294; Levine (1991) pp. 268-271; Witschi-Bernz (1972) pp. 52-55; Harmsen (2000) p. 27. While the *ars historica* maintained the classical principles of history, including its largely rhetorical emphasis, inviting the accusation that it was uncritical, Grafton (2007) has shown that methods of source criticism were also developed in these works.

primarily through the transmission of wisdom and the provision of exemplars.⁸⁸ Dryden presents a summation of this principle in his *Life of Plutarch*, prefixed to his translation of Plutarch's *Lives* published in 1683: 'for Mankind being the same in all Ages, agitated by the same Passions, and mov'd to Actions by the same Interests, nothing can come to pass, but some Precedent of the like nature has already produc'd; so that having the Causes before your Eyes, we cannot easily be deceiv'd in the Effects, if we have Judgment enough but to draw the Parallel'⁸⁹ This is a theory of the purpose of history derived from the ancients, inherited by the humanists, and transmitted faithfully as far as the nineteenth century. Even as historical scholarship became a battle ground between those committed to perpetuating the Ancient principles of historiography, and those seeking to apply the scientific principles of Modern scholarship to history, the belief in the instructive function of history was maintained.

This ideal had important ramifications for the methodological principles and aims claimed by historians; for all of them, Ancients and Moderns alike, saw the pursuit

⁸⁸ Nadel (1964) offers an important survey of the development of exemplary history across this period and its fate; cf. Burrow (2007) p. 299, Pade (2007) I.16-17, Burke (1998) pp.65-78, Kewes (2005) pp. 1, 13-14. The didactic role of history in early modern England has been debated. The traditional idea of an 'historical revolution' which located the origins of modern historical method in this period was argued by Fussner (1962), Preston (1977), Momigliano (1966), Burke (1969b) and Witschi-Bernz (1972). This has been reassessed by Pocock (1985), Thomas (1983) and Woolf (1990), who argued that history continued to be used in its didactic form. For the classical roots of exemplary history see Tacitus's *Annales* III.65.

⁸⁹ Dryden, *Life* p. 33; cf. Le Clerc, *Parrhasiana* pp. 111-124. Dryden presents the first discussion of biography in English, and a useful exposition of the principles which guided Ancient historiography; see Levine (1991) pp. 271-277 and Zwicker (2008) pp. 105-126.

of truth as integral to the creation of instructive history.⁹⁰ As Dryden further proposes in his *Life of Plutarch*, 'for if the Method be confused, if the Words or Expressions of Thought are any way obscure, then the Ideas which we receive must be imperfect; and if such, we are not taught by them what to elect, or what to shun. Truth therefore is requir'd, as the Foundation of History, to inform us; Disposition and Perspicuity, as the Manner to inform us plainly; One is the Being, the other the Well-being of it'⁹¹ The sentiment here expressed, that the instructive function of history lays upon its compositors a responsibility to ensure that only the truth is transmitted, is one which is repeated in other statements on historiographical principle. In Le Clerc's *Parrhasiana*, for example, published in 1700, he states that 'nothing is so entertaining and instructive as History, when it is well written; and on the contrary, nothing more infamous and hurtful, when it is not written as it ought to be: that is to say, when it delivers Lies instead of Truth, nay even when it dissembles it'⁹² It is within this commitment to truth that the roots of the historiographical conflict between the Ancients and Moderns lies. For while truth might be a unifying aim amongst historians, the nature of that truth, and the means by which it might be achieved, were questions for debate.

iii. A question of motive

For the Ancients, this truth was to be located in those elements which had formed such a prominent part of the ancient historical tradition, namely the characters of the

⁹⁰ Nadel (1964) pp. 298-304. On the importance of truth and impartiality in ecclesiastical histories see Champion (1992) pp. 26-32.

⁹¹ Dryden, *Life* p. 34.

⁹² Le Clerc, *Parrhasiana* p. 97; cf. Levine (1991) pp. 267-290 and Nadel (1964) pp. 298-304.

men involved in those historical events under consideration. As a result, a concern with motives as a source of the truth of history was a common motif of these so-called Ancient historians. Rapin, whose work provided the most comprehensive summation of the Ancient approach to history, identified the pursuit of the motives and characteristics of his historical actors as the key task for the historian.⁹³ For history to be at its most morally instructive, the motives governing these great actions needed to be elucidated. Dryden demonstrates his adherence to this sentiment with his description of the functions of history: "that the Guesses of secret Causes, inducing to the Actions, be drawn at least from the most probable Circumstances, not perverted by the Malignity of the Author to sinister Interpretations, of which *Tacitus* is accus'd; but candidly laid down, and left to the Judgment of the Reader"⁹⁴ In this way truth becomes about the individual and his morals, thereby fulfilling the instructive function of history with a truthful and compelling display of the characteristics which made the great achievements of history possible.

The Modern school of history showed no such fascination with character and motives, particularly as a source of historical truth. This Ancient approach emanated from a selectivity permitted by the firm belief that history was a branch of literature, and as such subject matter could be dealt with accordingly.⁹⁵ The desire to ensure that history was instructive, that it provided appropriate moral examples and conduct for imitation, was the justification for emphasising those elements of history most

⁹³ Rapin, *Instructions for History*; cf. Levine (1991) pp. 268-271.

⁹⁴ Dryden, *Life* p. 35.

⁹⁵ Grafton (2007) pp. 20-33, 62-68; Gray (1963) pp. 497-514.

likely to provide such instruction. For the Moderns, however, such a selective approach to subject matter could not possibly cohere with a critical and accountable method of historical composition. An historical narrative needed to encompass all relevant information so as to be truly explanatory, not only every relevant event, but all the supplementary geographical, military and social details required for understanding. Jean Le Clerc provides an explicit account of these expectations on the part of a Modern historian in his *Parrhasiana* when explaining the breadth of knowledge an historian should be expected to have, demanding that an historian be equipped with knowledge of his subject's language, government, society and geography.⁹⁶ For the Moderns historical truth could not possibly be located only in the motives of the men involved.

Toland's proposed essay in *Cicero Illustratus* suggests an adherence to the Ancient approach; his emphasis is firmly on the question of Cicero's motivations. In every question of Cicero's character dealt with, Toland seeks the answer to the debate in Cicero's own explanation of the motivations behind his actions, and he seems to be satisfied with that as sufficient for a truthful account of events.

iv. A question of accuracy

For the Modern historian, an alternative means of pursuing historical truth was required. Jean Le Clerc, in his *Parrhasiana*, provided a useful guide to the best way for such an historian to meet with the truth in his research. Fundamental to this is

⁹⁶ Le Clerc, *Parrhasiana* pp. 98-111. Jean Le Clerc/Clericus (1657-1736) although born in Geneva lived most of his scholarly life in the Netherlands, where he contributed to biblical and classical scholarship, his biblical scholarship gaining him a reputation for radicalism; cf. Sandys (1908) pp. 441-443.

accuracy, the declaration and reporting of truth without resorting to partiality or deception.⁹⁷ Each source must be carefully judged and handled so that the historian might discern any potential for inaccuracies contained therein. In this way, Le Clerc shifts the attention away from the sources and their contents, and onto the historian himself and his ability to discern the truth, moreover his ability to employ criticism in this endeavour. The expansion of philology and classical scholarship made it easier to expose the ancient sources with criticism, as Le Clerc did so effectively to Quintus Curtius in his *Ars Critica*, revealing him to be a rhetorician more than an historian, in another example of his adherence to Modern historiographical principles.⁹⁸ Meanwhile the development of antiquarianism with its systematic approach to the evidence broadened horizons with respect to the possible evidence available.⁹⁹ The influence of the antiquarians is made evident by the increasing use of both literary and non-literary evidence in history; indeed Middleton's *Life of Cicero* was noted for being innovative in the use of documents in biography.¹⁰⁰

Toland defends his preferred method in terms reminiscent of these arguments by Jean Le Clerc.¹⁰¹ He states that the fundamental principle behind his decision to

⁹⁷ Le Clerc, *Parrhasiana* pp. 98-111, 136-165; Champion (1992) pp. 32-44 for impartial accuracy as a quality sought in critical history.

⁹⁸ Le Clerc, *Ars Critica* pp. 411-472; see Grafton (2007) pp. 1-21, 62-122, Burrow (2007) pp. 299-319.

⁹⁹ Levine (1991) pp. 282-286; Grafton (1997b) pp. 148-189.

¹⁰⁰ Trevor-Roper (2010) pp. 71-119.

¹⁰¹ Toland's relationship with Le Clerc provides an intriguing example of Toland's interaction with erudition, as he simultaneously invoked Le Clerc's name to support his own work, while seemingly challenging components of Le Clerc's scholarship. In *Hodegus*, for example, printed in *Tetradymus* (1720), Toland drew on Le Clerc's commentary on the Old Testament, while in the same work using

quote his subject at length is to ensure accuracy and avoid accusations of bias. Toland makes this claim in the introduction to his *Life of Milton*, describing the kind of historian he seeks to be in this work: "observing in this performance the Rules of a faithful Historian, being neither provok'd by Malice, nor brib'd by Favor, and as well as daring to say all that is true, as scorning to write any Falshood, I shall not conceal what may be against my Author's Honor, nor add the least word for his Reputation"¹⁰² There is a risk, Toland feels, among historians, of seeking to construct their subject into the hero they believe him to be, so "they put those words in his mouth which they might not speak themselves"¹⁰³ Toland therefore presents his method as being structured around a desire for accuracy, avoiding accusations of partiality and manipulation of the material.

This approach reflects a methodological principle notable for its contrast to the traditional commitment to rhetoric in history apparent in the *ars historica* and the historical scholarship of the Ancients.¹⁰⁴ Those scholars who located themselves in the Ancient school elevated the instructional function of history above the scholarly integrity increasingly required of historians. As a result, they maintained history as a prominently rhetorical undertaking, locating it firmly within that branch of literature. Their commitment to the didactic function of history meant that the ability of history to persuade its readers to certain actions was prized above all else, most notably

evidence from Quintus Curtius, who Le Clerc had so extensively attacked in his *Ars Critica*. See *Hodegus* pp. 12, 25.

¹⁰² Toland, *Life of Milton* p. 6.

¹⁰³ Toland, *Life of Milton* p. 7.

¹⁰⁴ On the persistence of rhetoric in history see Levine (1991) pp. 268-271; Gray (1963) pp. 497-514; Grafton (2007) pp. 1-33.

accuracy. This rhetorical emphasis was reflected in how these histories were composed, as narratives dictated by questions of clarity and style, rather than the requirements of chronology and historical events. These histories were also marked by the uncritical use of ancient sources which so provoked Le Clerc. They trusted in the superiority and authority of the ancients, and thus were willing to utilise their words more freely. This uncritical approach to history was justified by a belief in the importance of persuasion to action above accuracy. It ensured that the discrepancy between the differing approaches to historical scholarship in evidence in this period extended to methodology.

Drawing on elements from both the Ancient and the Modern schools of historiography, Toland portrays his method as governed by the desire to pursue the truth of Cicero's character and motives. He uses the rhetoric of scholarly debates concerning history to argue that the best way to locate that truth was by elevating the subject above the historian, as this would make his motives accessible, thereby ensuring accuracy. In this way Toland was able to construct scholarly authority for his claim that his prefatory life would represent the real Cicero.

IV. Manipulating Cicero's truth

The method Toland presents goes further than sanctioning his approach to locating Cicero, and thus his claim to portray the real Cicero. By implication, Toland's ability to judge Cicero and identify the truth of him is endorsed. Toland's recognition of this endorsement and the possibility it presents is demonstrated by his earlier efforts in life-writing.

i. Toland as an interpreter of the Republicans

The first occasion on which Toland exercised his preferred historical strategy occurred at the end of the seventeenth century, when he was engaged by a series of prominent Country Whig patrons to produce editions of the most important works of the English Republicans of the Civil War and post-Civil War period.¹⁰⁵ These editions necessitated much of the work under discussion in *Cicero Illustratus*, including prefatory lives. It was an entirely politically motivated editorial project, as indicated by the nature of the sponsors behind the work. In a period in which party politics were becoming increasingly fractious, the Whigs behind Toland's efforts hoped that from these prominent Republican works something of a Whig canon might be constructed.¹⁰⁶ Toland was to locate and emphasise in these works the lessons most appropriate for the Whig political philosophy.

As already noted, Toland debuted and expanded upon his historical method in his *Life of Milton*, making the case that by presenting matters in Milton's own words he was approaching the subject in the most unbiased manner possible. The Milton that Toland thereby discovers becomes not only a paragon of civic virtue, but also a committed critic of the clergy, in other words the ideal Whig.¹⁰⁷ *Areopagitica* and its critique of censorship becomes an expression of Milton's anti-tyrannical values in

¹⁰⁵ Worden (2001) pp. 86-121; Champion (2003) pp. 93-115; Daniel (1984) pp. 60-93; Sullivan (1982) pp. 12-13.

¹⁰⁶ Champion (2003) pp. 93-115; Pocock (1985) pp. 232-233.

¹⁰⁷ The *Life of Milton* demonstrates Toland's belief in the potential of the prefatory biography to manipulate the way in which the works might be read, if it is sufficiently successful in constructing from the evidence the necessary version of its subject; see von Maltzahn (1995) pp. 229-253, Lindenbaum (1997) pp. 5-22, Champion (2003) pp. 100-110, Corns (2008) pp. 75-89.

the hands of Toland, drawing on the example of the ancient societies to demonstrate the danger of such activities to liberty: "yet it is beyond contradiction, that those Nations maintain'd an excellent Government, distributing public and privat Justice, and abounding in all Knowledge and Virtue, infinitely above those who have bin ever since the most rigid Purgers, Corrupters, or Executioners of Books"¹⁰⁸ Attention is thereby distracted from Milton's anti-monarchical stance in favour of this hostility to tyrannies more suitable to Toland's purposes.

As for Milton's characterisation as a man of the utmost civic virtue, this is established post haste in the introduction to the *Life*, in which both his learning and eloquence are emphasised: "JOHN MILTON, a Man eminent at home and famous abroad for his universal Learning, Sagacity, and solid Judgment: but particularly noted as well for those excellent Volumes he wrote on the behalf of Civil, Religious, and Domestic Liberty; as for his divine and incomparable Poems, which, equalling the most beautiful Order and Expression of any antient or modern Compositions, are infinitely above them all for Sublimity and Invention"¹⁰⁹ Toland manages to make Milton not only the model of the virtuous citizen, but also shifts the emphasis of his politics away from a rejection of monarchy, instead emphasising his hatred of tyranny, thereby making Milton far more amenable to the political climate of the post-1688 years.

Meanwhile, Milton's anticlericalism becomes the defining feature of his political prose works. Returning to *Areopagitica*, the clergy are identified as a key source of the tyrannical influence of those who wish to impose censorship. In addition, the

¹⁰⁸ Toland, *Life of Milton* p. 63; cf. pp. 62-70.

¹⁰⁹ Toland, *Life of Milton* p. 6.

works of the 1640s which deal with questions of religion become dominated by an overwhelming antipathy towards the episcopacy: he continues his *Discourse of Prelatical Episcopacy*, displays the Politics of the same; which, according to him, are always opposit to Liberty: he deduces the History of it sown from its remotest Original, and shews, that in *England* particularly it is so far from being, as they commonly allege, the only Form of Church-Disciplin agreeable to Monarchy, that the mortallest Diseased Convulsions of the Government did ever procede from the Craft of the Prelats, or was occasioned by their Pride.¹¹⁰ The most controversial element of this *Life* was Toland's support for the argument that *Eikon Basilike* had been forged by the chaplain to Charles I, Gauden, thereby solidifying his, and Milton's, argument that the clergy acted as a support to tyranny.¹¹¹ This too serves to adhere Milton to the Whig cause, which was intimately tied to anticlericalism in an era which saw the Tory party aligned with the High Church Anglicans.¹¹²

¹¹⁰ Toland, *Life of Milton* p. 29; cf. pp. 30-50.

¹¹¹ Toland, *Life of Milton* pp. 73 ff; cf. Sullivan (1982) p. 11 and Champion (1999b) pp. 15-39.

¹¹² It was not only in this way that Toland manipulated the material in front of him to achieve success with his Whig project. In Ludlow's *Memoirs* the intervention was more direct, as Toland exploited the material to create a Ludlow who appears very much to be a precursor of the Country Whigs; see Worden (2001) pp. 86-121, (2002b) pp. 209-237, Daniel (1984) p. 63, Champion (1999b) p. 16. While in some cases it is smaller details modified, such as the emphasis placed by Ludlow on the Nineteen Propositions, in other cases there are fundamental changes to the nature of Ludlow, most prominently his sudden change from a Puritan to a man hostile to Puritanism, and in particular its clergy. In the case of Harrington's *Oceana* the work itself is left relatively un-assaulted, but it is surrounded in the edition by lesser known Harringtonian works which are included to shape the way in which the *Oceana* is read; see Champion (2003) pp. 105-110. Common to all these efforts is not only the political motivation behind their manipulation, but also Toland's efforts to ensure it was the author's words which provided the evidence.

Toland's depiction of Milton inevitably drew controversy: Toland was accused of exploiting his methodology to ensure his own interests were met. The extent to which he manipulated the words of Milton was particularly provocative on account of the religious and political ramifications of his reading of those words. Indeed, Toland was required to justify his method when defending his *Life of Milton* in 1699, in a work entitled *Amyntor*: "for if, like most Historians, I had in my own Words (tho' with never so much Candor) related the Actions or Sentiments of my Author, my Adversaries would presently have told the World that this was not the true MILTON, but one of my own Creation, whom I prompted to speak what I durst not own; and by whose Mouth I had publish'd all those Opinions which I would recommend to other People. Well knowing therefore the ordinary Temper and Artifices of these Men, I did partly on that Account produce his own Words to obviate their Sophistry and Calumies"¹¹³ Toland continued to argue that his method was the most accurate due to its elevation of the subject above himself, failing to acknowledge the entirely justified complaint that this, in turn, elevated his role as an interpreter of Milton. Yet Toland was able to claim authority for himself in this role, the implication being that he was capable of judging the truth in Milton's words.

ii. Toland as an interpreter of Cicero

Toland made explicit his intention to maintain the historical methods evident in the *Life of Milton* in his essay on Cicero. Would the essay require Toland to exercise his capacities as an "interpreter" to the same extent? There is sufficient evidence in *Cicero Illustratus* to suggest that Toland had ulterior motives acting upon his

¹¹³ Toland, *Amyntor* p. 5.

proposed historical-critical essay, and thus his bid for scholarly authority might have been directed towards his ability to identify a particularly pointed version of Cicero.

In the introductory chapters of *Cicero Illustratus*, which set up Toland's intentions with this edition, there are explicit statements concerning his hope that through better understanding of Cicero's texts, young men bound on a political career may learn to conduct themselves more appropriately.¹¹⁴ Toland does not hold back when explaining why he deemed Cicero to be such an important political exemplar: he attained the title of *pater patriae* by winning the gratitude of both pre-eminent persons in the Republic and the people as a whole, as was demonstrated by the votes of a free Republic.¹¹⁵ Further, as Toland shows by emphasising the events leading up to Cicero's exile, his virtue was such that the people freely gave their support to him. Evidently of importance to Toland here was that Cicero was able to succeed politically purely through the virtue of his conduct, and without resorting to force. Also evident, Toland deemed Cicero to be an important political exemplar, from whom contemporary men ought to be seeking instruction.

The concern with Cicero's status as a model for political conduct in the introductory chapters of *Cicero Illustratus* is echoed in Toland's summary of his proposed essay. Every criticism of Cicero's character Toland identified was repudiated with an argument which suggested that Cicero was motivated above all else by his commitment to the Republic: he fled into exile to protect the Republic from bloodshed, he adapted himself to political circumstances so as to be as effective as possible when serving the Republic, even his desire for a permanent record of his

¹¹⁴ *CI* pp. 16-17.

¹¹⁵ *CI* pp. 17-18.

own achievements was intended to offer instruction for the future champions of the Republic. Toland was constructing Cicero to be the ultimate example of civic virtue in a Republic. While any attempt to relate this to specific contemporary circumstances must by necessity be speculative, given the nature of the portrait of Cicero that Toland was proposing, the spectre of Robert Harley, and the possibility that Toland intended his portrayal of Cicero to act as some sort of rebuke for Harley, must be considered.

As indicated in the Introduction to this thesis, Toland had a long and often difficult association with Robert Harley. Toland's work as a propagandist on Harley's behalf had gone unrewarded, and by 1710 Toland and Harley increasingly found themselves on separate sides of the political divide.¹¹⁶ The shift in Harley's alliances set he and Toland at odds over an issue of the utmost importance to Toland: the power of the High Church.¹¹⁷ It was under the governance of Harley that the High Church element was able to introduce several reforms intended to weaken toleration, including legislation against occasional conformity in 1711, and the Schism Act in 1714. In a letter dated February 9th 1710-11, Toland took the opportunity to express his fears to his correspondent: "a violent suspicion is strongly rooted in the minds of many, and indirectly affecting all, as if I know not what long-winded measures were concerted in favour of the Pretender's more easy access to the British Empire; and consequently against the rightful and lawful claim of the House of Hanover"¹¹⁸ In

¹¹⁶ Downie (1979) p. 2; Sullivan (1982) pp. 12, 26-27; McInnes (1970) pp. 77-83; Speck (2004); Holmes (1967); Evans (1991) pp. 128-130.

¹¹⁷ Hill (2002) p. 62; Kenyon (1977) pp. 128-145; Hoppit (2000) pp. 231-236; Holmes (1967) p. 113.

¹¹⁸ *Collection* II.404-405; the correspondent's name has been obscured by the editor of the letters, Pierre Des Maizeaux.

1712, the year in which *Cicero Illustratus* was published, Toland's faith in Harley had been all but eradicated by Harley's enthusiasm for peace negotiations with the French, with a view to ending the War of the Spanish Succession.¹¹⁹ Toland's two key public commitments were sorely undermined by these negotiations: the defence of Protestant liberties, and the Hanoverian Succession. Toland's official break with Harley came in 1713, following the signing of the Treaty of Utrecht, and was expressed in 1714 in Toland's *The Art of Restoring*.

At the heart of the attacks made by Toland against Harley was his claim that Harley lacked commitment to the Commonwealth. *The Art of Restoring* set up a direct comparison between Harley and another betrayer of the Republic, General Monk. By supporting peace negotiations with the French Harley was undermining the Hanoverian Succession, and thereby putting the Commonwealth in the gravest jeopardy, in Toland's view: *for I know him so intimately, that cou'd he once get into Play (a Thing in that capricious State far from impossible) then all Europe must be made a propitiatory Sacrifice to the French King, whose Power and Gold he adores*¹²⁰ The War of the Spanish Succession was vital to halting the spread of Catholic hegemony in Europe, and England's abandonment of her allies would vastly weaken their position and expose the Protestant powers in Europe, such as Hanover, to grave danger. Toland had Harley's potential betrayal of both himself and the Commonwealth at the forefront of his mind when writing *Cicero Illustratus* in 1712, lending greater significance to his determination to portray Cicero as an

¹¹⁹ Downie (1979) p. 168; Champion (2003) pp. 134-135; Evans (1991) pp. 122-123.

¹²⁰ Toland, *The Art of Restoring* p. iv, part of an extended attack pp.iii-viii. See Evans (1991) pp. 121-155, Holmes (1967), Kenyon (1977) pp. 146-169 on the Succession crisis. See Kearney (1997) p. 209 on Toland's commitment to the Hanoverian Succession.

ideal exemplar for politicians on account of his consistent commitment to the Republic above all other considerations.

Toland's preoccupation with Harley when composing *Cicero Illustratus* can be confirmed with evidence from elsewhere in the work. The work is addressed to Prince Eugene of Savoy, a man who had led many allied attacks on France during the War of the Spanish Succession, and who had recently travelled to England in a desperate bid to convince Queen Anne and Harley of the need to continue the War. The choice of Eugene becomes therefore significant, as do Toland's jibes at those who made Eugene's visit to England unsuccessful – namely Harley. In addition, when describing the historical project for which the edition of Cicero is preparation, Toland expresses his intention to celebrate not only Eugene's achievements, but also those of Marlborough, who had been a sworn enemy of Harley since Harley used his influence on the Queen to manoeuvre Marlborough out of office. Toland's disappointment in Harley was evidently at the forefront of his mind when composing *Cicero Illustratus*, and it need not take too much to believe that the discussion of appropriate political conduct proposed in Toland's essay on Cicero's life might be directed at a man Toland was convinced was betraying the Commonwealth.

There is sufficient evidence in *Cicero Illustratus* to suggest that Toland was laying the groundwork for a constructing a version of Cicero suitable to his own purposes. As demonstrated by the precedent he set with his work on the Republicans, he was prepared to use the method he presented as a shield of scholarly authority with which he may obscure his manipulation of the material available and present it as the truth. Toland was fully aware that the historical method he advocated granted him this opportunity.

V. Conclusion

Toland structured his discussion of the prefatory life around the principle that the most popular account of Cicero's life, that of Fabricius, was acceptable, but was marked by a series of omissions which required correction. Examining these claims in the context of the existing Ciceronian life-writing tradition identified the omissions as tantamount to the difference between the two forms of life which dominated that tradition: the historic life, represented by Fabricius, and the exemplary life. Toland's description of the essay with which he proposed to supplement Fabricius's work recognised the value of the tradition of the exemplary life, as it provided Toland with the opportunity to discuss Cicero's character and rehabilitate the real Cicero following the damage done by hostile traditions, and even by the Ciceronian apologists. But, in order to justify his claim to be able to present the real Cicero, Toland needed to seek scholarly authority by expounding the method by which he would locate his Cicero.

This method yielded two important results for Toland. First, it granted him this sought-after scholarly authority by adhering to both Ancient and Modern ideas of historical truth. It achieved this by emphasising that his own interference would be minimalist, that he would use only the subject's words to present their views. The explicit aim of his method, therefore, was the elevation of the subject above the historian, in order to ensure accuracy and the presentation of the truth. This had a secondary result, as the elevation of the subject by implication promoted the historian's knowledge and judgement of that subject. Toland championed a method which not only claimed to locate the truth, but which also assumed the historian's

ability to recognise that truth. Toland's awareness of this, and willingness to exploit it, is made evident in both the Ciceronian and the Republican evidence.

CHAPTER TWO

ESTABLISHING THE TEXT

The question of the prefatory life dealt with, Toland was able to turn his attention to the heart of the editorial project: the construction of the text. In the seventeenth chapter of *Cicero Illustratus*, Toland dwells at length on this most important editorial function, offering an in-depth consideration of the nature of the challenge that confronted him, and his strategies for overcoming that challenge.

In a chapter with a clear polemical emphasis, Toland structures his contemplation of the problem almost exclusively as a series of criticisms aimed at both the state of the text and the efforts of his predecessors to rehabilitate it. This is the means by which Toland seeks to locate his editorial identity, by relating his own methods to those of his predecessors and rivals. The texts themselves had suffered immeasurably across generations of abuse, as *antiqui scriptores fuerint ab indoctis librariis miserum in modum lacinati, et, in illâ saeculorum barbarie, non omnes duntaxat faedè lacerati, sed plerique etiam ad interitum perducti*¹ This apparently dire state of affairs had then been worsened by the editors who had been entrusted with the task of healing that text, who instead caused further damage in their perpetual pursuit of glory for themselves. Their concern to demonstrate their own learning and see themselves established as

¹ *CI* p. 40: *antiqui scriptores fuerint ab indoctis librariis miserum in modum lacinati, et, in illâ saeculorum barbarie, non omnes duntaxat faedè lacerati, sed plerique etiam ad interitum perducti*¹ This apparently dire state of affairs had then been worsened by the editors who had been entrusted with the task of healing that text, who instead caused further damage in their perpetual pursuit of glory for themselves. Their concern to demonstrate their own learning and see themselves established as

Kings of the Republic of Letters drove them to pull apart the texts in their quest for mistakes which could then, with great display, be corrected.² Toland portrays them as conducting a war in pursuit of this renown, indifferent to the devastation wrought: *si claritati autem, quam imaginantur, et celebritati suae vel minimum detractum iri olfaciunt, tunc contra hostium famam (bene quòd non contra vitam et fortunas possint) quibusvis arreptis armis immaniter grassantur; non justum enim est ampliùs bellum, sed furor, laniena, caedes, incendia, vastationes*³ This portrayal of a text laid waste as a result of critics conducting their battle on its pages made a convincing case for the necessity of Toland's proposed edition.

While the chapter is largely negative in its attitude, the positive elements of Toland's approach to the challenges posed by the text do make themselves known. Features of his method are apparent in both generalised statements, and his critique of others' efforts regarding particular examples of variants in the text.⁴ He offers his view on which variants can be deemed necessary, and how to approach those that meet this qualification, with the promise that *quascunque...comperero, quae linguae Latinae,*

² *CI* p. 50.

³ *CI* p. 51: *but if they sniff the smallest detraction from their celebrity and renown, which they imagine to be true, then they advance monstrously against the reputation of the enemy (it's a good thing they can't advance against their life and fortunes) taking up any weapons they can; for it is no longer a just war, but rage, butchery, fire, devastation* cf. pp. 40, 43, 48.

⁴ The logic behind his choice of examples is unclear, as they do not represent particularly significant variants in the text, being instead rather trivial examples. When discussing his choice of passages to examine for flaws in their punctuation in chapter XII (pp. 23-27), Toland suggests that he chose the passages at random to indicate how wide-spread the problems were; perhaps he adopted a similar method for these variants.

quave sententiarum respectu, variantes alicujus momenti lectiones, sedulus eas (uti dixeram) adnotabo⁵ In the evidence provided by his attack on editorial practice, and his presentation of his proposed methods, broad principles can be discerned, and foremost among these is his concern for clarity, both within the text and within the presentation of the variants. A pledge of clarity is supplemented with a promise of accuracy: *universis itaque (ut recolligam) lapsibus et hallucinationibus librariorum praetermissis, frivolis et temerariis rejectis conjecturis, muliebribus convitiis et pedaneis vitilitigationibus evitatis, ac codicibus manu exaratis (unde varias hauserim lectiones) sine ullis annectis commentatiunculis indicatis; facillimè inferas, angustius istam partem in nostra editione spatium occupaturam, etsi multò majorem forsan quàm in ulla alia variarum verarumque lectionum copiam producturi simus*⁶ Commenting on a series of examples drawn from the efforts of others, Toland not only has to prove the merit of his claims for clarity and accuracy, but also has to demonstrate that he has the scholarly prowess necessary for such work.

The issue of textual criticism was one of significance to the entire editorial project. It became a vital weapon in the efforts by editors to construct authority for their work, as it

⁵ *CI* p. 49: *whatever variant readings of some importance I shall discover, whether with regard to the Latin language, or to the content, I will attentively note them down (as I have said)* cf. pp. 40, 41, 45, 47.

⁶ *CI* p. 50: *and so (to gather the matter together) when the collective errors and hallucinations of copyists are left behind, when the trifling and heedless conjectures are rejected, and when the feminine scoldings and petty wrangles are shunned, and when the manuscripts (from where I have derived variant readings) have been indicated without any comments added; you would most easily infer that this element is going to occupy a narrower space in our edition, although we are about to bring forward perhaps a much greater store of variant and true readings than in any other* cf. p. 47.

was the means by which their text became respected, and their own capacities as editors were established.⁷ Most often, textual integrity was drawn from the method by which that text was formed: whether by deploying an array of evidence so as to produce the most comprehensive text, or by using the innate genius of the editor himself, able to create the most attractive text.⁸ There were also those editors who claimed authority on account of what they were attempting to achieve with the text. One such strategy was to restore the text as far as possible to its original form, a popular approach in the earliest days of the printed text, and favoured in particular by the Aldine press.⁹ The authority of the edition was thus inextricably linked to the process of textual criticism. Toland's attacks on his editorial predecessors, and the claims he makes for his own text, need to be evaluated in terms of how he is trying to achieve authority for his proposed text. The discussion in *Cicero Illustratus* therefore presents a useful reflection of the continuing interplay of textual authority and editorial conduct.

It was not only in relation to editorial authority that textual criticism acquired great significance, but in its own right as a heavily discussed aspect of scholarship.¹⁰ The

⁷ Feld (1978) p. 84.

⁸ Feld (1978) p. 86; Tanselle (1983) pp. 45-49 on the question of scholarly involvement in the text.

⁹ McLaverty (1984) pp. 121-122 advocates this approach in modern textual criticism. See Lowry (1979) pp. 217-256 on the Aldine editions. See Kelemen (2009) pp. 73-80 on how different types of edition require different approaches to textual criticism.

¹⁰ Modern debate on textual criticism continues at a pace, with Tanselle (1989) pp. 11-38, (1983) pp. 21-68, West (1973) and Willis (1972) making key contributions. For the history of textual criticism the best surveys are Metzger (2005) on the text of the New Testament, and Kenney (1974), Timpanaro (2005), Feld (1978) and Reynolds and Wilson (1991) on textual criticism in general.

debate focussed on the most appropriate methods of textual criticism, and on the purposes to which those methods should be directed. Scholars argued whether texts should be treated as historical artefacts, and thus reconstructed as closely as possible to their original, or should texts be valued as continually relevant, and thus reconstructed to serve contemporary functions.¹¹ Closely tied to this question was that of whether textual criticism should be used to create the most accurate text, or the most attractive, readable text. These questions of purpose closely dictated the stances taken on the best methods of textual criticism. Toland's discussion had to engage with questions of appropriate textual criticism in and of itself, if his stance on the question of editorial authority was to be viable. This makes *Cicero Illustratus* a useful contribution to ideas concerning textual criticism at the beginning of the eighteenth century. It is necessary therefore to examine whether Toland's treatment of the question of textual criticism reveals a genuine desire to modify the methods which were predominant at that time, or merely a haphazard attempt to discredit his rivals and establish a facade of editorial authority for himself.

I. Textual criticism in the Ciceronian tradition

Toland's discussion of the Ciceronian text reveals, or appears to reveal, a full familiarity and engagement with the history of that text, as he draws examples of emendations from prominent sixteenth and seventeenth century editors of Cicero such as Gruterus, Gronovius and Lambinus. As he also focusses a great deal of his polemic on the state of

¹¹ Grafton (1991a) pp. 23-46.

the text, and the conduct of his predecessors, an examination of the tradition to which he is responding will illuminate his approach.

i. The *editiones principes*

The advent of the printing revolution established the circumstances which would dictate the state of the text for generations. Enthusiasm for the printed text drove publishers to see classical works produced in print with all possible haste, the result being that the copy chosen as the basis for a print edition was often the most readily available rather than the best available.¹² This granted a permanence to versions of the work which might be, and often were, faulty and inferior. It was not only a question of permanence, but of authority. As the printed text could be disseminated rapidly, and offered a widely accessible standard edition, it would become the version to which all scholars would refer. It was by this process that the flawed authority of the *editio princeps* was created.

This is clearly demonstrated by the editorial tradition of Cicero. The *editio princeps* for the complete works of Cicero was produced by Alexander Minutianus in Milan in 1498.¹³ Minutianus's sole concern was to collect the works of Cicero together, and as such he demonstrated a minimal interest in the quality of the works used. The texts chosen were largely drawn from the *editiones principes* of individual works, which had been produced by Sweynheym and Pannartz, De Pensis and Bivilaqua in the previous

¹² On the age of the *editiones principes* see Kenney (1974) pp. 3-20; Reynolds (1983) p. xliii; Reynolds and Wilson (1991) p. 208; Timpanaro (2005) p. 45; Feld (1978) pp. 87-97.

¹³ Alexander Minutianus (1450-1522); there is little biographical information about this man.

decades.¹⁴ These texts were not approached critically, nor was any effort made to correct them by collation with the manuscript evidence.¹⁵ In spite of this, the texts as they appeared in this edition were viewed as sufficiently authoritative to provide the base texts for several subsequent editions, in particular those produced by the house of Ascensius in Paris.¹⁶ The Ascensiana in turn formed the base text for the important edition produced by Petrus Victorius between 1534 and 1537. In addition to the Ascensiana, the Minutianus text of the rhetorical works was used by Cratander for his 1528 edition, collated with the individual *editiones principes* in a misguided attempt to improve the text. The continuing, and usually unmerited, authority of the *editio princeps* is well attested in the Ciceronian tradition.

ii. The dominance of the *textus receptus*

The authority of the *editio princeps* influenced the tradition beyond the diffusion of a faulty text. As demonstrated by the transmission of Minutianus's text, the printed text dominated the tradition to such an extent that it would be transmitted in a unilinear fashion, with editors focussing their efforts on correcting the text already in circulation. There would occasionally appear an edition which made so many changes to the existing text that it would usurp it in status, and the cycle of transmission would begin

¹⁴ Ebert (1837) p. 320; Orellius (1836) p. 197; Dunlop (1827) pp. 55-56; Kenney (1974) p. 11; Hunt (1998) pp. 226-230.

¹⁵ Hunt (1998) pp. 232-234 does claim that one manuscript was introduced by Minutianus.

¹⁶ The Minutianus edition provided the base text for Ascensius (1511), and subsequent efforts in 1527 and 1531. In establishing the transmission of these texts I have used, besides the editions themselves, Hunt (1998) pp. 232-234, Ernesti (1773) pp. 216-217, and Orellius (1836) pp. 197-215.

again. This is evident in the process of transmission undergone by the Ciceronian text in the first centuries of printing.

The Minutianus text and its offspring were rivalled by the texts published by the house of Aldus Manutius between 1502 and 1523, which in turn provided the base text, or at least elements of a base text, for one Ascensius edition produced in 1522, for parts of the Victorius recension in 1534 and for Paulus Manutius in 1540. Victorius' recension, based on the Aldine text and Ascensiana, offered a new authoritative text; it provided a base text for Camerarius in 1540, for Robertus Stephanus' 1538 edition, and most importantly for Janus Gruterus' notable 1618 edition. In parallel to this was the alternative text produced by Paulus Manutius in 1540, which served as the base text for Robertus Stephanus' 1543 edition, which in turn transmitted Manutius' text to Carolus Stephanus in 1555, to the Gryphii editions, and to Colinaeus in 1543. It was also the text which was used by Lambinus for his influential 1566 edition, which corrected the text so extensively as to initiate a new cycle, chosen as the base text for editions by Gothofredus in 1596, Brutus in 1570, and several other smaller editions.¹⁷ Gruterus, meanwhile, who had used the text of Victorius, produced the text which would be favoured by the vast majority of editors in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.¹⁸ It is a process marked by the dominance of a single text, the *textus receptus*, around which other editors would have to base their efforts.

¹⁷ Lambinus' text was reproduced several times with revisions by others, but still printed under his name. For example, the edition produced in London in 1585 made many changes to Lambinus' text, relegating his emendations to the notes, but still published it as Lambinus' text.

¹⁸ Elzevir (1642); Blaeu (1658); Schrevelius (1661); Graevius (1684); Gronovius (1692).

The sentiments of editors of the period demonstrate not only an awareness of the problematic state of the text in circulation, but a perception of their role as editor almost entirely in terms of that text. Editors spoke of themselves as ‘purifiers’ or ‘correctors’ of the text, their whole task focussed around the improvement of the text in front of them. This language was used by Petrus Victorius to describe his task when undertaking his edition of Cicero: ‘*anta cupiditate exarsi clarissimum hunc scriptorem foedissimis maculis inquinatum purgandi*’¹⁹ Indeed it is a perception evident throughout the editorial developments of the Ciceronian tradition, as contrasting with the minimalism of the earlier Aldine and Minutianus editions editors became increasingly vocal about exactly how they could improve upon the text currently in circulation.²⁰ The dominance of the *textus receptus* ensured that textual criticism in this period developed as a process of correction, rather than the collation more familiar from the nineteenth century onwards.²¹ There were two fundamental resources available for this correction of the text: the manuscripts and textual evidence, and the editor’s own *ingenium*, as manifested in conjectural emendation.²² While one form of emendation

¹⁹ Victorius (1534) volume I, *Petri Victorii explicationes suarum in Ciceronem castigationum*: ‘I caught fire with so much passion to purify this most famous writer soiled by most foul blemishes’

²⁰ Dyck (2002) pp. 319-329; Feld (1978) pp. 84-85.

²¹ Kenney (1974) pp. 3-20, 25-26; Bloch (1965) pp. 119-120; Most (2005) p. 747. This can also be said of the transmission of the New Testament, and the lack of enthusiasm with which an entirely new text was pursued, see Tanselle (1983) p. 49, Timpanaro (2005) pp. 58-74; Kelemen (2009) pp. 83-95, Most (2005) pp. 748-749.

²² Timpanaro (2005) p. 45; Greetham (1992) p. 352; Reynolds and Wilson (1991) p. 209; Tanselle (1983) pp. 23-45.

was never used to the exclusion of the other, the extent to which each was emphasised and the claims made for each approach became a defining feature of textual criticism in the pre-Lachmann era.

iii. *Emendatio ingenii ope*

The approach of conjectural emendation required two levels of particular knowledge or skill from the editor. First, in his decision to introduce a conjectural emendation, he needed to exercise his judgement that the available variants transmitted in the manuscripts were simply not worthy of or characteristic of the author.²³ It was a decision driven less by a concern for accuracy, than a perception of the how the text should appear or read. This decision made, the editor would then have to draw on all his knowledge and taste in order to propose a correction which improved on the manuscript evidence. This knowledge, or the claims to it, could vary from an innate skill, to a supreme familiarity with the author, the language, or the genre, or, increasingly in the seventeenth century, to the editor's reason.

There was a strong tradition of conjectural emendation in Ciceronian editing, with certain editors acquiring particular reputations for their conjectures. Paulus Manutius was one such editor, as in his 1540 edition of Cicero's works he supplemented the evidence from the *Codices Italici* with numerous conjectures of his own. Of all the editions of Cicero produced prior to Toland, however, it was Lambinus who achieved the greatest notoriety as a conjecturer, although this was not an entirely justified

²³ Willis (1972) pp. 8-12; Tanselle (1983) pp. 23-45; Reynolds and Wilson (1991) p. 209; Kenney (1974) pp. 25-26.

reputation.²⁴ Lambinus took the trouble to collate manuscripts in Italian libraries for his edition, and placed great emphasis on these efforts in the preface to the work, with an account of the sources of his manuscript evidence, and a pledge to use them fully. Lambinus pre-empted the accusation that he took liberties with the text when making his emendations, determining three possible complaints against his approach, the second of which being *eorum, qui quererentur, et nimis multa, et nimis audaciter a me esse immutata*²⁵ He goes on to answer this predicted criticism by describing his method as a compromise between conjecture and the manuscripts. In spite of these efforts, his reputation as a bold conjecturer was sealed, to the extent that his emendations were removed from the text to the critical notes in subsequent imprints. Gruterus contributed his own attack on Lambinus to maintain this characterisation, with the scathing dismissal that *Lambiniana sane nimium sibi indulserat*²⁶ The risk with conjectural emendation, as demonstrated by the reaction to Lambinus's efforts, was that it could easily be perceived as too bold an imposition on the text.

²⁴ Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Latina* p. 143; Ernesti (1773) p. 219; Orellius (1836) pp. 203-204; Ebert (1837) p. 322; Dunlop (1827) p. 56. Hunt (1998) pp. 243-248 goes so far as to suggest that Lambinus would falsely attribute conjectures to manuscript sources. Dionysius Lambinus/Denys Lambin (1520-1572) was a French classical scholar who worked in the service of Cardinal de Tournon and as professor of Latin in the College de France in Paris; cf. Sandys (1908) pp. 188-191, Reynolds and Wilson (1991) p. 157, Pfeiffer (1976) p. 112.

²⁵ Lambinus (1566) *Idem erudito, et humanitate polito lectori*: *eorum, qui quererentur, et nimis multa, et nimis audaciter a me esse immutata*

²⁶ Gruterus (1618) *Praefatio*: *Lambiniana sane nimium sibi indulserat* Dissent over whether Lambinus deserved this reputation continued well into the twentieth century; see Grafton (1983) pp. 80-82, Sandys (1908) pp. 188-191, and Reynolds and Wilson (1991) p. 157.

The success of an edition in which conjectural emendation featured considerably depended to a great extent on the claims made by the editor for his *ingenium*. This elevation of the editor encouraged a new kind of authority for a text, the authority created by the quality of its editor. This is again evident in the Ciceronian tradition, particularly in the increasing prominence of the editor himself on the title page and within the prefatory material. In the first half of the sixteenth century the emphasis in the title, if there was any, was on the works contained therein. Increasingly the editor's name would feature on the title page, but it was accompanied with minimal fanfare. Following Lambinus's edition, in which his name, method and views were given great prominence, the qualities of the editor or the men whose work was featured in the edition came to be accompanied with accolades such as *doctissimorum hominum* or *accuratissimum*.²⁷ In the seventeenth century, praise for the editor could be augmented in the prefatory material with epigrams and eulogies dedicated to his skills.²⁸ This emphasis on the editor and his *ingenium* was characteristic of a form of edition which drew its textual authority from that editor. It was also symptomatic of the state of affairs described by Toland, in which scholars had constructed for themselves a Republic in which they might be lauded as Kings.

iv. *Emendatio codicum*

In contrast to the concerns provoked by conjectural criticism, emendations drawn from the manuscript evidence acquired the designation *conservative criticism* on the basis

²⁷ Brutus (1570); Scot (1588); Gruterus (1618); Gronovius (1692).

²⁸ Gruterus (1618); Gronovius (1692).

that it was a less dramatic form of emendation. This could prove an erroneous assumption. The evidence of the manuscripts was granted primacy, a primacy founded on the hypothesis that the readings located in the codices must constitute the most accurate available variants.²⁹ In the more extreme manifestation of this approach, the fluidity and beauty of the text was sacrificed to the accuracy that was associated with the readings found in the manuscripts.

One of the earliest complete editions of Cicero noted for its emphasis on the manuscript evidence employed in the formation of the text was that produced by Petrus Victorius between 1534 and 1537.³⁰ Victorius made numerous changes to a base text formed from a combination of Minutianusø and Aldusø text, drawing these corrections from the Medici library to which he had been granted access. Victoriusø approach was notable for its conservatism, as he sought to use readings attested by the manuscript evidence as far as possible: *quare multis priscis exemplaribus comparatis id opus, magnum sane et arduum, adgressus sum, et quam accuratissime potui absolvi atque ad exitum perduxia*³¹ Victoriusø commitment to the manuscript evidence was total, with

²⁹ Willis (1972) pp. 8-12; Kenney (1974) pp. 25-26.

³⁰ Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Latina* p. 142; Ebert (1837) p. 321; Sandys (1908) p. 135; Orellius (1836) p. 199; Ernesti (1773) p. 218. Petrus Victorius/Piero Vettori (1499-1585) was a Florentine whose changing relationship with the Medicis first drove him from Florence, and then permitted his return under the rule of Cosimo as a professor of Greek and Latin; cf. Sandys (1908) p. 135 and Pfeiffer (1976) pp. 135-136.

³¹ Victorius (1534) *Petrus Victorius Bartholomaeo Caualcanti suo. sal.* (Aij-Aiij): *quare* whereby I undertook this work, having collated many ancient examples, clearly a great and arduous task, and I have finished it as accurately as I couldø

his concern to report that evidence almost overriding his other editorial concerns.³² In spite of this conservatism, or because of it, Victorius's recension was extremely well received.

This is particularly true of Gruterus, who used Victorius's recension as his base text in his 1618 edition of Cicero's works, an edition which placed great importance on its textual evidence.³³ In the preface Gruterus describes his extensive use of *æditio Petri Victorii, omnium profecto ante hanc nostram et castissima et castigatissima*³⁴ The appeal of Victorius's contribution lies in Gruterus's own concern to produce a text formed as far as possible from the manuscripts. This edition used the emendations which had been made by Janus Gulielmus, who had died before he could publish his work. Gulielmus had collated manuscripts from across Europe, proposing to produce a text corrected entirely with manuscript evidence.³⁵ Gruterus took these corrections and supplemented them with his own, drawn from the manuscripts of the Palatine library in Heidelberg, which was at that time under his authority. Gruterus was convinced of the

³² Grafton (1975) pp. 162-168 and (1983) pp. 52-63 identifies Victorius's commitment to the manuscripts as inspired by Politian, and an inspiration for Scaliger; cf. Grafton (1991a) p. 28. Victorius's efforts are praised by Timpanaro (2005) pp. 45-57 and Hunt (1998) pp. 239-241.

³³ Janus Gruterus/Jan Gruter (1560-1627) was born in the Netherlands, and forced to flee to England on account of his Protestant faith, which further saw him move through several positions in Europe before becoming librarian of the Palatine Library in Heidelberg; cf. Sandys (1908) pp. 358-362 and Pfeiffer (1976) pp. 138-139.

³⁴ Gruterus (1618) *Praefatio*: *æthe edition of Petrus Victorius, clearly the most unpolluted and most correct of any edition before ours*

³⁵ Gruterus (1618) *Praefatio*; Hunt (1998) p. 248. As will be seen in later examples, Gulielmus suggested sufficient bold ó and inaccurate ó conjectures which undermine this claim.

accuracy of his evidence, and thus was able to make great claims for the recension he had created: *optimum Romanae linguae auctorem mille amplius locis illustravi, correxi, auxi*³⁶ These two editions offer a sense of the extent to which manuscript evidence, and the accuracy it was believed to bring to the text, was elevated in the editorial tradition.

This tradition which so concerned Toland, on account of the continuing imperfections of the text, was structured around the difference in emphasis rival editors placed on their ability to reconstruct the text. These attempts at reconstruction were based around the two major resources at editors' disposal in this period: conjectural emendation, and the testimony of the manuscripts.

II. Toland and conjectural emendation

In order to make a convincing case against the dominant transmission of the text, and those responsible for that transmission, Toland needed to challenge those methods by which the text was supposed to be improved. Beginning with his portrayal of conjectural emendation, it is necessary to evaluate how he attempts to suggest that it had proved insufficient.

i. Toland and needless conjectures

Toland makes no attempt to censor his condemnation of certain conjectural emenders on account of the chaos they have wrought in the texts: *nunc etiam temporis extitit insulsa*

³⁶ Gruterus (1618) *Praefatio*: *illustrated, corrected, healed the best author of the Roman language in more than a thousand places*

illa Divinatorum natio, quorum plerique, ut nunc, illotis manibus ad haec sacra accedebant, ac omnia ideo deturparunt, profanarunt, corruperunt³⁷ Following a critique of one such attempt to emend the text by another editor, Toland pledges that tales itaque miserrimas conjecturas, et syllabarum captationes, in totum ex nostra editione eliminabimus³⁸ Within this statement lies some hint of the reasoning behind Toland's antipathy to this particular approach, in the suggestion that the motives behind such conjectures could not be justified. Toland describes the occasions on which conjecture might be necessary, and such occasions are extremely limited: quando ergo varia aliqua lectio eundem exprimet sensum, et puram etiam ab utraque parte latinitatem, tunc vocem eam aut phrasin textui inseram quae ipsi auctori consuetior, vel fide manuscriptorum firmatior³⁹ For Toland, there were few occasions on which conjecture was required, particularly not when the evidence from the manuscripts was sufficient.

³⁷ *CI* p. 49: then also this absurd nation of Conjectural emenders existed at that time, most of whom, as now, approached these sacred objects with unwashed hands, and for that reason they have disfigured, desecrated, corrupted everything

³⁸ *CI* p. 42: and so we will banish such most wretched conjectures, and the pursuit of syllables, from our edition throughout

³⁹ *CI* p. 41: therefore when a variant reading expresses the same sense, and also expresses the Latin style undefiled on either side, on such an occasion I would insert into the text that word or phrase which is more usual for the author himself, or more strongly confirmed by the testimony of the manuscripts. The debate about which variants may be considered necessary continues within textual criticism today, see Tanselle (1983) pp. 23-45, West (1973) pp. 47-59. Willis (1972) pp. 36-42, when discussing what is appropriate to include in the *apparatus criticus*, rejects the inclusion of variants which are purely orthographical, and readings found only in single manuscripts.

Toland provides several examples of times when conjectures introduced by editors could not be justified. The following passage from the third book of *De Natura Deorum* is one such example: "vide, quaeso, si omnis motus, omniaque quae certis temporibus ordinem suum conservant, divina ducimus, ne tertianas quidem febres et quartanas divinas esse dicendum sit"⁴⁰ In 1566 Lambinus had emended this passage, conjecturing that *quoque* should replace *quidem*, adopting a suggestion originally made by Muretus, on the basis that "quidem, Ciceronis sensus non assecutus"⁴¹ In making this emendation Lambinus not only rejected the text transmitted through all prior editions, but also the evidence available in the manuscripts. It is the decision to conjecture against the manuscripts for which he is most culpable in Toland's view: "scire velim, quare Lambinus adverbium *quoque*, ex sua conjecturâ, adverbio *quidem*, manuscriptorum auctoritate firmato, praeposuerit in hoc loco?"⁴² In this he is maintaining the stance of that champion of the manuscripts, Gruterus, who determined that the presence of *quidem* in all of his Palatine manuscripts negated any need for emendation.⁴³ In this case, Toland's preference for the manuscript evidence was ill-founded, as *quoque* was able to improve the sense of the Latin; *quidem*, meanwhile, can

⁴⁰ *DND*.III.24 (*CI* p. 42). In these quotes, the Latin reads as in *Cicero Illustratus*.

⁴¹ Lambinus (1566) IV.63-64: "quidem, does not follow the sense of Cicero's; this is one of those emendations made by Lambinus in 1566, but relegated to the notes in subsequent editions.

⁴² *CI* p. 42: "I want to know, why in this passage Lambinus preferred the adverb *quoque*, in accordance with his own inference, to the adverb *quidem*, when *quidem* was supported by the authority of the manuscripts?"

⁴³ Gruterus (1618) IV.170, where Gruterus also accused Lambinus of only introducing the emendation to please Muretus.

be rejected as the handiwork of a careless scribe.⁴⁴ Here the manuscripts showed their limitations, and conjectural emendations their benefits.

Toland also rejects two conjectural emendations made to a passage in the first book of *De Legibus* by Gulielmus, as recorded by Gruterus. The first in the following sentence: *nam qui se ipse norit, primum aliquid se habere sentiet divinum ingeniumque in se suum simulacrum aliquod dictatum*⁴⁵ Gulielmus introduced *genius* here, in place of *ingenium*, in spite of the manuscripts favouring *ingenium*, and *quasi ingenium illic non magis esset appositum*⁴⁶ In his preference for *ingenium* Toland is supported by the practice of his predecessors, as Lambinus, Victorius and Gruterus all maintained that reading, with Gruterus accusing Gulielmus of merely seeking to destroy syllables. In this conjecture Gulielmus was alone. The second emendation proposed by Gulielmus to this passage came in this statement: *intelleget quem ad modum a natura subornatus in vitam venerit* Toland described the proposed emendation as follows: *paucis interjectis versibus, nullâ necessitate nec manuscriptorum fide compulsus, a natura subornatus excudendum voluit natura sua ornatus; quod deformare potiùs quàm emendare est*⁴⁷ Toland is not alone in this attitude. Gruterus, who published the

⁴⁴ Pease (1955-1958) p. 1015 shows that *quidem* inappropriately modifies *tertianas*, thus preferring the reading of *quoque*; cf. Mayor (1885) pp. 83-84.

⁴⁵ *Leg.I.59 (CI pp. 42-43)*.

⁴⁶ *CI p. 42*: *as if ingenium were not more suitable there*

⁴⁷ *CI pp. 42-43*: *after a few lines, compelled neither by any necessity nor by the authority of the manuscripts, he wanted to print a natura subornatus as natura sua ornatus; which is to deform more than to correct*

conjectures of Gulielmus in the notes of his own edition, rejected Gulielmus's suggestion on account of both the view expressed elsewhere by Adrianus Turnebus and the lack of variation in previous books; indeed, neither Lambinus nor Victorius saw any need to comment on the text at this point, maintaining *a natura subornatus*. This reiterates Toland's conviction that such conjectural emendations to the text were too often unnecessary, particularly so when there was sufficient manuscript evidence of an appropriate reading. There were few occasions on which Toland would accept the necessity of a conjectural emendation to the text.

ii. The case for conjecture

Although Toland evidently had doubts regarding the value of conjectural criticism, there were those contemporary to him in English classical scholarship who were willing to champion this approach to textual problems, and foremost among them was Richard Bentley.⁴⁸ In the years just preceding Toland's *Cicero Illustratus* Bentley published, in stages, an edition of Horace's works.⁴⁹ It was in this edition that Bentley made his famous statement of his principles for emending: *nobis et ratio et res ipsa centum codicibus potiores sunt*⁵⁰ In the preface, and in the emendations and the notes

⁴⁸ Richard Bentley (1662-1742) was an eminent English classical scholar and theologian, strongly connected with Cambridge University; cf. Haugen (2011), Brink (1986) pp. 21-83, Sandys (1908) pp. 401-410.

⁴⁹ The text of this edition was produced in 1706, but was republished in 1711, the year before *Cicero Illustratus*, with the critical notes and some further corrections to the text.

⁵⁰ Bentley, *Horace* in the *Notae* p. 147, *ad Carm.* III.27.15: *for me reason and the matter itself are better than a hundred manuscripts*

accompanying the text, Bentley explicitly advocated the importance of conjectural emendations, cementing his association with the practice.⁵¹ He states his proposed method clearly: *plura igitur in Horationis his curis ex conjectura exhibemus, quam ex Codicum subsidio; et, nisi me omnia fallunt, plerumque certiora*⁵² He warns against the excessive reliance of some editors on the evidence of the manuscripts, arguing that such a conservative approach to textual criticism could in fact be more dangerous and damaging to the text than conjecture. Bentley's argument for conjectural criticism is focussed on the qualities possessed by the editor which make it worthwhile. In particular, Bentley emphasises the innate genius and reason of the effective editor: *est et peracri insuper iudicio opus; est sagacitate et ; est, ut de Aristarcho olim praedicabant, divinandi quadam peritia et : quae nulla laborandi pertinacia vitaeve longinquitate acquiri possunt, sed naturae solius munere nascendique felicitate contingunt*⁵³ It becomes evidence of an editor's powers of reasoning, that he is able to engage with the text to the extent that he can produce useful conjectural emendations.

Bentley's arguments for conjectural emendation can therefore be understood as

⁵¹ Haugen (2011) pp. 130-149; Timpanaro (2005) pp. 45-57; Brink (1986) pp. 61-83; Sandys (1908) p. 406. In spite of the emphasis of both Bentley and others on his use of conjecture, out of nearly seven hundred emendations, only two hundred are conjectural, the rest using manuscript evidence; cf. Konstan and Muecke (1992-1993) pp. 179-180, von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1982) p. 81.

⁵² Bentley, *Horace* p. viii: *therefore in these Horatian notes I will produce more emendations from conjecture than from the help of the Manuscripts, and, unless I am totally wrong, the greater part of them more certain*(trans. Haugen, 2011 p. 134).

⁵³ Bentley, *Horace* p. viii: *but you also need an incredibly keen judgment; you need sagacity and shrewdness; you need what the ancients ascribed to Aristarchus, a certain faculty of divination and prophecy. These can be acquired by no quantity of labour or length of life, but they come purely as the gift of nature and by happiness of birth*(trans. Haugen, 2011 pp. 133-134).

arguments for his own authority and skill, or *ingenium*, and thus for the text that he is able to produce.

The case Bentley made for conjectural criticism as expressed in the preface to his Horace formed an important constituent of his scholarly project, and as such it was a prominent feature of a fraught scholarly debate. Bentley's stance had been developed in his works throughout the 1690s. The *Epistola ad Joannem Millium*, which appeared in 1691, saw Bentley using his learning and *ratio* to discern the spurious elements of the text from the genuine.⁵⁴ Two of Bentley's critical principles, fundamental to his adherence to conjectural criticism, were deployed in this particular work: his refusal to accept the written word at face value, and his belief in the power of reason to elucidate the confusions of the text. This work was followed by Bentley's *Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris*, in which he approached the problem of the authenticity of these letters with those tools of criticism which had been apparent in his treatment of Joannes Malalas.⁵⁵ Bentley once again employed a combination of historical reasoning and trust in his own reason and judgement to produce strong critical arguments that proved the inauthentic status of the letters. By emphasising the potential for reconstruction of the text based on reason before the historical evidence, Bentley made himself a prominent figure in the history of English classical scholarship.⁵⁶ Although his efforts were

⁵⁴ Brink (1986) pp. 41-60; Grafton (1991a) pp. 14-17.

⁵⁵ Levine (1991) pp. 47-84; Brink (1986) pp. 49-60.

⁵⁶ Timpanaro (2005) pp. 45-57; Brink (1986) pp. 84-98.

influential, guiding the development of scholarship in Cambridge and inspiring a generation of English conjectural critics, they were also controversial.⁵⁷

Bentley was responding to an entrenched and powerful anti-conjectural stance. There was a significant tradition of conservative criticism in England, according to which conjectural criticism, in spite of its humanist tradition, had never seemed defensible.⁵⁸ Such interventions by the editor, no matter what claims he was able to make for his *ingenium*, were simply unacceptable. The question became one of reason versus the authority of the tradition of the text. It is reflected in Le Clerc's *Ars Critica* where, concerned by the influence being established for conjectural criticism not only by Bentley, but by a group of conjectural critics in the Dutch tradition, he used his work to warn against the potential dangers of conjectural emendation.⁵⁹ The second volume of Le Clerc's exposition on the appropriate methods of criticism outlined his *leges emendandi*. Le Clerc's seventh, and last, law warned against conjectural emendations, explaining that *nulla de re graviore leguntur querelae, quam de audacia Criticorum, qui conjecturas suas, pro Veterum Scriptorum verbis, contra fidem Codicum MSS.*

⁵⁷ See Haugen (2011) pp. 149-154 on reactions to Bentley's *Horace*, and Timpanaro (2005) pp. 45-57 on Bentley's influence on Musgrave, Porson, Dobree, and Elmsley.

⁵⁸ Haugen (2011) pp. 130-149. See Levine (1991) pp. 247-248 on Alexander Pope's particular antipathy to Bentley's claims. Hearne also criticised Bentley's method of improving manuscripts *ex ingenio*, see Harmsen (2000) pp. 27-28 and Douglas (1939) p. 233.

⁵⁹ Bentley (1978) p. 31; Kenney (1974) pp. 40-44; Keene (2004) pp. 215-223; Sandys (1908) pp. 441-443.

Lectoribus incautis obtrudunt⁶⁰ He went on to attack the example set by Sigismund Gelenius and Joseph Scaliger, and to suggest that the actions of such critics caused serious wounds in the works of the ancients, due to the undisciplined way in which they pursued their emendations.

iii. Toland and the editor's *ingenium*

Hence when Toland expressed doubts about the justifications for conjectural criticism, he faced one particular argument being made in its favour: the *ingenium* of the editor achieved what purely working with the evidence could not. Toland's discontent with this argument pervades his discussion of textual criticism.

Toland's main concern with this argument is best expressed in his criticism of Gronovius's treatment of the following passage in *Rhetorica ad Herennium*: *contentio est oratio acris et ad confirmandum et ad confutandum*⁶¹ The question under consideration regarding this particular passage is whether the preposition *ad* should be repeated or not. In Toland's view such minutiae of the text should not be the subject of variants, suggesting that *enim dicere satius fuisset, utrumque scribendi modum esse probum et aequaliter usurpatum; quod de in, et ab, et e, ac aliis perinde praepositionibus, intellegi debet*⁶² Toland is less concerned here with techniques of textual criticism,

⁶⁰ Le Clerc, *Ars Critica* II.365: *no more serious quarrels are read about the matter, than about the boldness of the Critics, who recklessly force in their conjectures, in place of the words of the ancient writers, against the faith of the manuscripts* cf. Timpanaro (2005) pp. 58-74.

⁶¹ *Rhet.Her.III.23 (CI p. 41).*

⁶² *CI p. 41: it would have been better to say, that each way of writing is good and commonly used; which ought to be understood concerning in, and ab, and e, and similarly with all other prepositions*

rather he is seeking to use Gronovius's handling of the variant to raise an issue of great concern to him: the vanity of the editor. When Gronovius addressed this textual question in his *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, he deemed it apposite to justify his own choice with a note of considerable length, at thirty lines and in the smallest print. While there is some discussion to be had regarding the repetition of *ad* in the majority of codices, whereas Lambinus omitted one *ad*, thirty lines of comment was judged by Toland unnecessary. As far as Toland was concerned, there is only one possible explanation for Gronovius's editorial decision: *ne similia nudè unquam proponuntur, sed criticis (si Diis placet) observationibus semper ad ostentationem comitata*⁶³ Toland's account of this variant in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* thus becomes a parable on the dangers of editors primarily concerned with ostentation and their own erudition.

This accusation recurs throughout Toland's discussion: any particular skill editors may have brought to the recension of the text has been undermined by their innate vanity and resultant wish to display their own learning, whatever the cost to the text. Toland offers a passionate condemnation of the lengths to which editors might go to seek or create errors in the text which would permit them the opportunity for flaunting their erudition: *quàm multos locos sanos satis et castigatos sic jugularunt maleferiati Critici? ut ingenii sui acumen, et ne nihil ex se afferre aut effecisse videantur, ostendant. Quantum, per Deum immortalem! tineis, blattis, et cariei debent nonnulli? qui voculis appendendis, et dimetiendis literulis, non levem gloriam aucupantur; ac ea propter antiquos legunt*

⁶³ *CI* p. 41: *ne similia nudè unquam proponuntur, sed criticis (si Diis placet) observationibus semper ad ostentationem comitata*

auctores, ut mendas offendant aut faciant, non ut qualemcunque illinc utilitatem vel sibi vel aliis proferant⁶⁴ In this sentiment Toland would later be echoed by Housman: -most men are rather stupid, and most of those who are not stupid are, consequently, rather vain; and it is hardly possible to step aside from the pursuit of truth without falling a victim either to your stupidity or your vanity⁶⁵ It was for such flaws in their approach that Toland largely rejected the attempts to draw authority from the *ratio* or *ingenium* of the editor. The elevation of that authority would permit them too much freedom, and the weakness of their characters and their desire for fame was such that they would exploit it, causing significant damage to the text in the process.

Toland's primary complaint against conjectural emendation was the liberties it justified; it allowed unjustified and inappropriate changes to the text, on the basis of something as unreliable as an editor's *ingenium*. It permitted far too much freedom and control to men with whom it could not be trusted, whose interests were self-motivated, and therefore not compatible with the power conjectural criticism handed to them over the text.

⁶⁴ *CI* p. 43: -How many rational and perfectly correct passages did the Critics with too much time on their hands butcher in this way? In order to show off the sharpness of their intellect, and so that they do not seem to produce or accomplish nothing of their own. How much (by the immortal God!) do several owe a debt to book worms, and cockroaches, and rot? Who by weighing particles, and measuring single letters, strive for no insignificant renown; and they read the ancient authors just for this reason, to expose or create errors, and not to bring out anything useful from them either for themselves or for others

⁶⁵ Housman (2009) p. 126; cf. West (1973) pp.7-12.

III. The manuscript evidence

As Toland judged conjectural criticism to be flawed, and necessary only in the rarest circumstances, his assessment of emendations based on manuscript evidence is all the more important.

i. Toland and the manuscripts

Toland's criticisms of conjectural emendations made by his predecessors demonstrate his belief that conjectures should not be made which contradict reliable manuscript evidence. In addition, Toland's critique of a variant in the second book of *De Natura Deorum* suggests an acceptance of the fact that manuscript evidence can correct a clearly corrupt reading in the *textus receptus*, and indeed should be sought out for that purpose. The passage Toland selects to demonstrate this point is as follows: "qui autem omnia quae ad cultum Deorum pertinerent, diligenter retractarent et tanquam relegerent, sunt dicti religiosi e religendo, ut elegantes ex eligendo"⁶⁶ Toland complains that editions too often include the variant *pertractarent* in place of *retractarent*. *Pertractarent* was the reading which appeared in the *editio princeps* of Minutianus, and was the common reading for many years; it was reintroduced to the text of the Lambinus edition after he corrected it in 1566, and selected by Paulus Manutius for his recension. *Retractarent*, however, had a stronger presence in the manuscripts, as was found by Victorious and Gruterus when forming their collations. In addition, *retractarent* fits the structure of the sentence better, contributing to the pairing and repetition of words

⁶⁶ *DND.II.72 (CI p. 46)*.

prefixed by *re-*.⁶⁷ Toland therefore recognised the valuable resource provided by the manuscript evidence, particularly in the face of the corrupt tradition emanating from the *editio princeps*, and the continuing authority of that tradition.

Toland's respect for the evidence of the manuscripts is further apparent when in an earlier chapter of *Cicero Illustratus* he evaluates the spurious works of Cicero, while deciding which to include in his edition.⁶⁸ Toland justifies his intention to include certain dubious works due to their respectable record in the manuscripts: *quum in manuscriptis enim codicibus locum invenerint, cur idem in impressis privilegium non obtineant, haud perspicio*⁶⁹ This is the argument he makes for *Orationem ad Populum et Equites*, also known as *Pridie quam in exilium iret*, a speech supposedly delivered the day before Cicero withdrew into exile, but dismissed on both historical and stylistic grounds.⁷⁰ Its continued presence in editions is largely due to its transmission in the ninth century manuscript Paris lat.7794 (P) in which all of the *post reditum* speeches, delivered between 57 and 56 BC, were transmitted. Similarly, the *Epistola ad Octavium* maintained its place in editions of Cicero as it had been transmitted not only with the

⁶⁷ See Mayor (1885) II.184 on the use of tenses in this passage.

⁶⁸ Grafton (1990a) on the relationship between forgeries and developments in scholarship.

⁶⁹ *CI* p. 33: *quum in manuscriptis enim codicibus locum invenerint, cur idem in impressis privilegium non obtineant, haud perspicio* Bagnani (1960) p. 233 describes the exploitation of manuscripts to support forgeries in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

⁷⁰ See Clift (1945) pp. 91-92 and Gudeman (1894) p. 147 on the *Oratio*, and Reynolds (1983) pp. 57-61 on its manuscript transmission.

Commentariolum Petitionis, but within the family of Italian manuscripts important to the transmission of Cicero's letters.⁷¹

While Toland exhibits appreciation for the manuscript evidence, he is also careful to express his awareness of its innate flaws. A significant portion of his discussion in chapter seventeen is dedicated to an involved description of the travails undergone by manuscripts during their transmission, and hence the parlous state of this evidence.⁷² Toland's account relates that those manuscripts which managed somehow to survive the period of what he terms *Gothica barbaries* were subsequently subjected to the imperfect care of monks, whose ignorance was as damaging to the welfare of these texts as the preceding generation.⁷³ Toland finds particularly reprehensible their tendency to replace Greek text with the words *Graecum est, non legitur*. He further offers a relatively comprehensive summation of the various ways in which manuscripts can be corrupted during the process of transcription, including the unintentional mistakes that occur through failure to recognise words or letters, or through omission or repetition. It is such errors in transmission that give rise to the kind of irrelevant or unimportant variant rejected by Toland, and, in his view, exploited by later editors: *an artis ergo tam*

⁷¹ Clift (1945) pp. 115-116; Gudeman (1894) p. 148.

⁷² On these problems of transmission see West (1973) pp. 12-29; Reynolds (1983) pp. xiii-xliiii; Willis (1972) pp. 47-50.

⁷³ *CI* p. 46.

eximiae est, codices Manuscriptos evolvere, edacem pulverem excutere, maculas a vetustate vel librariis inustas tollere, et variantes inter se conferre lectiones?⁷⁴

Toland is ready with examples to illustrate both the errors that arise in the manuscripts following these problems of transmission, and the unnecessary exploitation of such errors by editors. One such example is found in the work of Gruterus on *De Divinatione*, and his comment on the following passage from the second book: *quomodo autem mentientem, quem vocant, dissolvas? Aut quemadmodum soriti resistas?*⁷⁵ Gruterus selects the reading *aut mentientem* on the basis that it appears in the Pithoean manuscript and the second Palatine, and was the reading selected by Victorius. While Toland agrees with Gruterus's reading, he criticises Gruterus's decision to include in the accompanying note the information that the first Palatine read *aut ementientem*, the third *autem non mentientem* and the fourth Palatine *aut non mentientem*. Toland rejects these details as fundamentally unnecessary to the reader's comprehension and appreciation of the text: *quasi publico magni interesset scire, descriptors olim fuisse non minùs imperitos, quàm sunt hodie plerique Typographi, qui subjecti operis ne verbum saepe intelligunt?*⁷⁶ In fact, both Toland and Gruterus are incorrect, as the preferred reading is *autem mentientem*, as appeared not

⁷⁴ *CI* p. 48: *or* therefore is it such an extraordinary skill to unroll the manuscript books, to shake off the devouring dust, to remove the marks branded on them by the ages or the scribes, and to gather variant readings together?

⁷⁵ *Div.II.11 (CI* p. 45).

⁷⁶ *CI* p. 45: *as* if it made much difference for the public to know, that transcribers were once no less ignorant than most Typographers are today, who often do not understand a word of the work in front of them?

only in the vulgate, but as was selected by Lambinus, and, as Gruterus acknowledged, had been evident in the third Palatine. The logic of the text demands *autem mentientem*; also, allowing the text to read *aut...aut...* would change the meaning of the text significantly. Here Toland and his approach are particularly culpable, as although Gruterus selected the wrong reading, he at least recorded the alternatives and their provenance, whereas Toland proposed to omit such important information.

Toland's justification for this omission relates to his attitude to the manuscript evidence. While he evidently judged it to be useful and valuable when used appropriately, he was aware of the flaws resulting from the historical processes it had undergone, and thus felt that it could be exploited by over-zealous, self-motivated editors.

ii. The problem of the manuscripts

Paramount among Toland's concerns is the uncritical attitude of so many editors to the manuscript evidence. Cocmannus is selected for particular criticism on this count for the way in which he uses the manuscripts in his 1706 edition of *De Oratore*. Similar to the reproach made against Gruterus's notes to *De Divinatione* above, Toland disparages Cocmannus's apparent trust in the available manuscript evidence regardless of its quality. He selects as an example this passage from the first book of *De Oratore*: *nam me haec tua platanus admonuit, quae non minus ad opacandum hunc locum patulis est diffusa ramis, quàm illa cujus umbram secutus est Socrates*⁷⁷ Cocmannus annotated the text

⁷⁷ *De Orat.*I.28 (*CI* p. 47).

with the different readings evident across the manuscript tradition: the Joanneus codex had *ad pacandum*, the Pithoean and Memmian had *placandum*, another Palatine had *occupandum*, and another had *oppacandum*. In spite of all these variants, the reading selected by Toland of *ad opacandum* had a long tradition from the vulgate, was chosen by Victorius and Lambinus for their editions, and was confirmed by another Palatine in Gruterus' edition. Toland also identifies for criticism another variant discussed by Cocmannus in a passage shortly after that above: *æloquentia, rempublicam dissipaverunt*⁷⁸ In this, Toland rejects Cocmannus' attempt to replace *dissipaverunt* with *disparuerunt* on the basis of its presence in the Pithoean manuscript, preferring instead the reading selected by Gruterus from the ninth Palatine, and also used by Victorius and Lambinus.⁷⁹

Encapsulated in these grievances is Toland's frustration with the faith with which such manuscripts were treated, a faith which could too easily be exploited. Cocmannus is attacked for allowing his commitment to the manuscripts to lead him to include variants that evidently emanate from the faults of transmission already delineated.⁸⁰ In his concern over the authority of the manuscripts, Toland was reflecting a debate at the heart of textual scholarship in that period, in particular in the field of biblical criticism. The rival views held of the value of the manuscript evidence for the Scriptures shaped the debate on the Bible in the late seventeenth century. Among the Protestants devotion

⁷⁸ *De Orat.*I.38 (*CI* p. 47).

⁷⁹ A conjecture by Gulielmus of *disperaverunt* is rejected by all.

⁸⁰ *CI* p. 47.

to the Bible was a key tenet of their ideas, encapsulated in the refrain *sola scriptura*; it was the means by which they might be liberated from the theological tyranny of the Roman Church, and permitted to engage with their faith directly.⁸¹ The idea that the manuscripts could provide evidence with which to challenge points of doctrinal importance in the Bible was marked in the work of Desiderius Erasmus, whose challenge to the Johannine comma greatly undermined the doctrine of the Trinity; he discovered that no extant manuscripts contained 1 John 5:7, and thus ejected it from his first edition, although it was restored to subsequent editions.⁸² This initiated a long tradition of using the manuscripts to challenge elements of the Bible important to doctrine, from the Gospel of Matthew to the Book of Revelation.⁸³ Baruch Spinoza's work was of central importance to these efforts, as it was his contention that the Scripture should be treated like any other text, and subjected to criticism in the same way.⁸⁴ This commitment to criticism of the Scripture elevated the evidence of the manuscripts, which provided the resources with which to challenge the traditions instituted by the Church.

⁸¹ Champion (2006a) p. 228; Israel (2001) pp. 447-456.

⁸² Iliffe (2006) pp. 141-142; Levine (1997) pp. 573-596; Bloch (1965) pp. 114-118; Hamilton (1996) pp. 109-111.

⁸³ Keene (2006) pp. 94-115. See also Snobelen (2006) pp. 116-132 on the Trinity, Timpanaro (2005) pp. 58-74 on the Freethinkers' use of variants to challenge the Gospel, and Champion (1999a) pp. 77-96 on Newton's efforts to expose the corruptions to the Scripture.

⁸⁴ Hazard (1953) pp. 213-231; Preus (2001) pp. ix-xiii; Israel (2001) pp. 447-456.

In his own contributions to biblical scholarship Toland can be identified with this tradition.⁸⁵ His insinuation in the course of his *Life of Milton* that not all of the Scripture could be considered genuine provoked a deeply hostile response from more traditional corners.⁸⁶ Ofspring Blackall was one such man roused to anger by Toland's comments; in 1699 he responded to Toland's *Milton* with a lengthy sermon in which he denounced the work as an outrageous attack on religion.⁸⁷ Toland in turn responded to his critics, and in particular Blackall, with a treatise entitled *Amyntor*. Rather than display any remorse for his previous suggestions, Toland presented a full catalogue of those elements of the scripture that he deemed spurious, and an accompanying explanation of his conclusions. Inevitably there was further outcry, and the work was condemned by the Lower House of the Convocation; the most notable feature of Toland's account is his refusal to accept the authority of Church tradition. An updated, scribal version of this catalogue actually forms part of Toland and Eugene's literary exchange: Toland sent Eugene *Amyntor Canonicus* from Leiden in August 1710. Toland's willingness to employ the manuscript evidence as a challenge to the Church is best demonstrated in his later work *Nazarenus*; this text expounds his belief that he had found a Christian text from the early Church which had been lost, in the form of a manuscript of the *Gospel of Barnabas*, which had been included in the *Gelasian Decree* in the sixth century.⁸⁸ If

⁸⁵ Champion (2003) pp. 190-212.

⁸⁶ Keene (2006) pp. 94-115.

⁸⁷ Carabelli (1975) pp. 62-63.

⁸⁸ Champion (1999b) pp. 1-8.

this claim were indeed proved to be true, it would require a completely new view of the Scriptures and the question of the authority of the Bible.

In the face of such challenges to the authority of the Scripture, Catholics and those committed to the doctrines of the Church worked to undermine the foundation of these challenges, namely the manuscript evidence. Traditionalists claimed authenticity for the existing form of the Bible on the basis of the authority of the tradition of the Church; the Church had determined long ago which texts were Scripture, and thus they would remain. The authority of the vulgate of the Bible, the version being challenged by biblical critics, was of vital importance to numerous doctrines of the Church, and as such needed to be defended against such incursions. This authority was sufficiently important as to be reinforced by the Council of Trent, held between 1545 and 1563, where it was determined that the Scripture should never be interpreted in a way that conflicted with the authority of tradition, ensuring that there was no attempt to modify the text of the Bible fully until the beginning of the eighteenth century.⁸⁹

At the heart of efforts to challenge the biblical critics was the work of Richard Simon.⁹⁰ In his *Critical History of the Old Testament*, published in French in 1678, Simon argued that given the lack of evidence for the original formation of the Bible, there was no choice left to scholars but to accept the authority of the tradition of the

⁸⁹ Reynolds and Wilson (1991) p. 148.

⁹⁰ Richard Simon (1638-1712) was a French Oratorian and biblical critic; cf. Hazard (1953) pp. 213-231 and Israel (2001) pp. 447-456.

Church.⁹¹ He rejected the view of the opposition, voiced most distinctly by Spinoza and his followers, that the additions and alterations made obvious by the manuscript tradition inhibited the authority of the Scripture; Simon argued that rather the only factor which could influence its authority was the quality of the author of those alterations, not the fact of the alterations themselves. The reliance shown by some Protestants on the text, most notably the Socinians, was ill-founded in Simon's view, as the transmission of the manuscripts had rendered them so flawed that referral to tradition in order to clarify them was simply necessary.⁹² This summation of the situation was reflected in his interaction with the problem of the Johannine comma, which he acknowledged was missing from the manuscript tradition following his own research on the matter, but he maintained this need not demand its expulsion. As the manuscripts were not a viable resource, Simon argued that the tradition of the Church was the best authority for the true Scripture, the only way to interpret the text.⁹³ Doubts regarding the assumption that manuscripts could provide the most accurate evidence therefore formed a key component of debates in broader textual scholarship, legitimising Toland's concerns.

In addition to general questions in scholarship about the assumed authority of the manuscript evidence, there was also the notable problem of how access to the manuscripts shaped their use, and the tendency of editors to judge manuscripts

⁹¹ Simon, *Critical History* pp. 17-28; cf. Iliffe (2006) pp. 141-142.

⁹² Simon, *Critical History*, Pref.b. John Daillé used this argument to discredit the texts of the Fathers in his *Treatise*, printed in 1675. It is also a concern which features in Thomas James's handling of the manuscripts in his *Treatise*, printed in 1612.

⁹³ Simon, *Critical History*, Pref; cf. Hazard (1953) pp. 213-231 and Keene (2004) pp. 207-213.

according to their availability rather than their quality. In his critique of comments made by Cocmannus and particularly Gruterus, the weight given to the manuscripts they happened to have access to features heavily. Cocmannus used the text of Gronovius as the base text for his edition, introducing variants according to the evidence of the six manuscripts he was able to consult, four from libraries in Oxford, two the gifts of friends; accessibility to the manuscripts determined their inclusion, rather than value.⁹⁴ Gruterus is a conspicuous example of this approach. His career as a scholar, heavily influenced by the ramifications of his Protestant faith, finally brought him to the University of Heidelberg, where he acquired control of the Palatine Library.⁹⁵ The importance and authority Gruterus granted to the Palatine manuscripts was immense, and he allowed them to dominate his reading of the Ciceronian text. The particular merit he claims for the Palatine manuscripts is at the heart of the authority of his text: *animusque addent, ut paullo post super Tullio plures adhuc consulam MSS. Palatinos, quos habemus ultra ducentos*⁹⁶ The claim Gruterus was making for his edition amounted to accuracy on the basis of unrivalled access to a manuscript collection of the utmost authority; however, this judgement by Gruterus was based on little more than his ready access to this particular collection of manuscripts.

⁹⁴ Cocmannus, *De Oratore, Lectoris*. See Goldgar (1995) pp. 12-53 on how such exchanges shaped the Republic of Letters.

⁹⁵ Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Latina* p. 144; Bayle, *Dictionary* pp. 1489-1493; Orellius (1836) p. 207; Sandys (1908) pp. 358-362; Pfeiffer (1976) pp. 138-139.

⁹⁶ Gruterus (1618) *Praefatio*: *and they encourage me in the near future to consult still more Palatine manuscripts on Tully, of which we have more than two hundred*

This was an age of manuscript collectors, whose efforts to accumulate as many manuscripts as possible ensured that the number of manuscripts increased, but not necessarily their quality.⁹⁷ Men such as Pithou and the Medici formed collections of manuscripts; editors would then attempt to claim authority for their recension of the text on the basis of their access to such a collection.⁹⁸ The challenge of acquiring such access was a continuous battle for scholars, requiring a network of contacts and friends, or at least a position which required a great deal of travel. Gruterus's *Praefatio* relates how Gulielmus travelled through Germany, France and Belgium collating manuscripts. Nicholas Heinsius, whose work contributed a great deal to scholarship on manuscripts, was able to collate numerous manuscripts on his continuous travels around Europe as a diplomat.⁹⁹ One of the greater mysteries of *Cicero Illustratus* is how Toland intended to gather the necessary manuscript evidence to achieve his aims; he regularly travelled in Europe, and his own papers suggest sufficient friendship with Johannes Albertus Fabricius to permit an exchange of information. I suspect that part of the appeal of Eugene of Savoy as a potential patron was the immense library he himself had gathered,

⁹⁷ Timpanaro (2005) pp. 45-57.

⁹⁸ Reynolds and Wilson (1991) pp. 157-158; Kenney (1974) pp. 75-84.

⁹⁹ Nicholas Heinsius (1620-1681) was not a professional scholar; he was employed primarily in diplomatic and public functions, producing his scholarly work in the leisure time available to him; Heinsius's diplomatic roles, such as acting as an envoy for Queen Christina to Italy in 1651, allowed him to travel extensively; it was on these travels that Heinsius conducted research into extensive collections of manuscript evidence across Europe. See Sandys (1908) pp. 323-326, Kenney (1974) pp. 57-62.

to which he might have permitted Toland access.¹⁰⁰ Editors in this period were notably constrained by questions of access; Toland would have needed to forge the necessary relationships with figures in the Republic of Letters to enable admittance to the collections.

Toland urged caution in the use of manuscripts, not because the evidence was entirely unworthy, but because he believed that in the enthusiasm for the elevation of manuscript authority the application of critical thought had been diminished. As a result, editors such as Gruterus and Cocmannus had been able to advance their own authority based on misuse of the manuscripts.

iii. The call for critical practices

The solution to this dilemma was not to reject the manuscript evidence entirely, but to introduce critical thinking into their use. Toland recognised the need to apply some level of judgment to the quality of the manuscripts, rather than merely the number of manuscripts. Discussing an array of potential variants presented by Gruterus in one example, Toland declared it necessary to differentiate between the evidence of *boni* and *mendosi codices*, and to grant greater importance to the former. Toland provides no explicit explanation of what constitutes a ‘good’ manuscript; a sense of what he intends the differentiation to mean must be elucidated from his discussions of the variants. The passage under discussion is drawn from the first book of *De Divinatione*: ‘nec abducar

¹⁰⁰ Other collections Toland probably had access to include the library of Anthony Collins, which included numerous printed editions of Cicero’s works (see *Bibliotheca Collinsiana*), the Bodleian, and libraries in Leiden and Vienna.

ut rear, aut in extis totam Etruriam delirare, aut eandem gentem in fulguribus errare¹⁰¹

Gruterus was doubtful that *ut rear* should be present at all in this sentence: *⁊vix potui refrænare manum, quin ejicerem illus, ut rear, quod nullo apice compareret in pal. pr. aut sec.*¹⁰² In Toland^øs view such a note is irrelevant, as while *ut rear* may have been absent from these two manuscripts, it was present in a number of *boni* manuscripts, thus elevating the relevance of the quality of the manuscript. Indeed, Victori^{us} and Paulus Manutius kept the *ut rear* in place, following the evidence of their manuscripts. None of these editors, even Gruterus who sought to expel *ut rear*, suggested replacing *abduc^{ar}* with *adduc^{ar}*, which would not only allow *ut rear* to be omitted, but is more Ciceronian. Only Lambinus suggested *adduc^{ar}* in place of *abduc^{ar}*, but he still kept *ut rear* in the text in spite of this. Toland might have claimed a concern for the quality of manuscripts, but was not necessarily successful when exercising that concern.

In the Renaissance period, such attempts to approach the manuscript evidence in a scientific manner had been initiated by Politian and then Joseph Scaliger. Politian had established that older manuscripts were preferable to the humanist copies they spawned, and hence attempted to employ the oldest manuscripts available; this amounted to the principle of *eliminatio codicum descriptorum*.¹⁰³ Scaliger built on Politian^øs

¹⁰¹ *Div.I.35 (CI p. 44).*

¹⁰² Gruterus (1618) IV.412: *⁊I was scarcely able to restrain my hand, so that I did not expel this ut rear, because it was in no way visible on the first or second Palatine*

¹⁰³ Kenney (1974) pp. 6-10; Reeve (1996) pp. 29-30; Reynolds and Wilson (1991) pp. 143-145, 210; Greetham (1992) pp. 308-309; Bentley (1978) p. 310; Timpanaro (2005) pp. 46-57; Grafton (1991a) pp. 6-12, 47-75, (1983) pp. 9-44.

achievements, recognising in his work on Catullus a stemmatic relationship among his manuscripts, and the possibility of an archetype.¹⁰⁴ Efforts were renewed in the seventeenth century to develop a critical approach to manuscript use. Nicholas Heinsius, following his travels across Europe to gather evidence from manuscripts, argued for a new standard of manuscript collation.¹⁰⁵ Le Clerc continued contributing to matters of scholarship by demanding in his fourth law for emending *ne ulla emendatio a lectione veterum codicum nimium receditur*, exhibiting a preference for older manuscripts.¹⁰⁶ Most importantly, the seventeenth century saw the gradual development of the fields of palaeography and diplomatic, particularly in Jean Mabillon's *De re Diplomatica*, published in 1681.¹⁰⁷ Increasing concern with the correct use of the manuscripts was dominating the scholarly landscape, and with the appearance of palaeography the tools were beginning to be available to determine what that correct use might be.

While Toland favoured manuscript evidence over conjecture, he was all too aware of its shortcomings. His concern over these shortcomings was primarily driven by the

¹⁰⁴ Grafton (1975) pp. 151-181, (1983) pp. 161-179; Kenney (1974) pp. 54-56; Reynolds and Wilson (1991) p. 210; Greetham (1992) p. 313; Timpanaro (2005) pp. 45-57.

¹⁰⁵ Kenney (1974) pp. 57-62; Greetham (1992) pp. 317-318; Sandys (1908) pp. 323-326; Timpanaro (2005) pp. 45-57.

¹⁰⁶ *Ars Critica* II.356: *ne do not let any emendation depart too much from the reading of the ancient codices*. Le Clerc also used the *Ars Critica* to make a case for the principle of *difficilior lectio potior* when working with manuscripts; cf. Bentley (1978).

¹⁰⁷ Reynolds and Wilson (1991) p. 171. Most (2005) pp. 743-745 describes how eighteenth century scholarship was marked by the development of such organisational disciplines.

opportunity they presented for further exploitation by editors, who used the authority of the manuscripts, together with the issues of access, to further facilitate their intrusion into the text.

IV. The restoration of the author

Toland's treatment of the available means of undertaking textual criticism reveals a deep discontent with the way in which editorial authority was forged through exploitation of those resources. Whether by emphasising the native genius required to produce successful conjectures, or allowing their own interests to influence their use of the manuscript evidence, editors had made themselves indispensable to the formation of the text. Toland's account is an extensive exposé of the degree to which the role of the editor himself had evolved to acquire unjustifiable authority over the text.

i. The attack on the philologists

In his concern over editorial exploitation of textual criticism Toland was not alone, but in fact reflected a prominent anxiety within contemporary scholarship. One of the key points of principle which provoked conflict within classical scholarship at the beginning of the eighteenth century concerned the value of philology, and the extent to which it should be allowed to intrude upon the text.¹⁰⁸ William Wotton had provoked the Ancients by claiming philology as one of the fields in which the Moderns could claim superiority in his essay *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning*, published in

¹⁰⁸ Most (2005) p. 742 on the hostility to scholarly pedantry among literary critics.

1694.¹⁰⁹ Wotton, and those who concurred with his stance, most notably Richard Bentley, argued that the critical standards required by philology allowed scholars to eradicate the flaws of the classical texts. Bentley's editorial approach has demonstrated the effects of this philosophy: the *textus receptus* was not to be recreated, and emended where necessary, as was the traditional approach, but rather overthrown, so that the philologist might use his erudition and his reason to construct the text anew.¹¹⁰

The implication that philology empowered modern scholars to use their learning and their reason to strip ancient texts of their authority by exposing their errors inevitably infuriated those scholars for whom the superiority of the classical texts was sacrosanct. Temple, the exponent of the first great wave of the Ancients's view of scholarship in England, acknowledged in his *Essay on Ancient and Modern Learning*, written in 1690, that philology had made an invaluable contribution to the restoration of the texts.¹¹¹ The project of restoration largely complete, however, he rejected philology's intervention into the minutiae of the text, an intervention which only served to undermine the integrity of those texts. He states that "since they have turned their Vein, to debase the Credit and Value of the Ancients, and raise their own above those, to whom they owe all the little they know; and instead of true Wit, Sense, or Genius, to display their own proper Colours of Pride, Envy, or Detraction, in what they write: To trouble themselves and the World with vain Niceties and captious Cavils, about Words and Syllables, and in

¹⁰⁹ Wotton, *Reflections* p. 353. See Patey (2005) pp. 48-50; Levine (1991) pp. 43-46, 49-53.

¹¹⁰ Walsh (2009) pp. 684-687; Iliffe (1995) pp. 179-184; Most (2005) pp. 747-749.

¹¹¹ Temple, *Miscellanea* III.298-299; cf. Levine (1991) pp. 43-46.

the Judgment of Stile...There is, I think, no Sort of Talent so despicable, as that of such common Criticks¹¹² Such treatment of the texts, as mere historical documents to be weighed and judged and corrected, neglected the authority merited by their long history, and by the assumption of ancient superiority so important to the Ancients.

This fundamental disagreement over the value and purpose of intervention in the text was manifested in one of the defining literary tropes of the Battle of the Books: the attack on the philologist as a pedant, who sought only to identify mistakes so as to show off his own learning. The image was made particularly famous by Jonathan Swift in his satires contributing to the scholarly debate.¹¹³ In *A Tale of a Tub* in 1704, Swift included *A Digression concerning Criticks*, in which he mocks the pride with which they pursue their work. In discussing what it means to be a critic, Swift parodies the seriousness with which critics^ø took themselves and the pursuit of errors in the classical texts: now, from this Heavenly Descent of *Criticism*, and the close Analogy it bears to *Heroick Virtue*, it is easy to assign the proper Employment of a *True Ancient Genuine Critick*; which is, to travel through this vast World of Writings; to pursue and hunt those monstrous Faults bred within them; to drag out the lurking Errors like *Cacus* from his Den; to multiply them like *Hydra's* Heads; and rake them together like *Augea's* Dung; or else drive away a Sort of *dangerous Fowl*, who have a perverse Inclination to plunder the best Branches of the *Tree of Knowledge*, like those *Stymphalian* Birds that eat up the

¹¹² Temple, *Miscellanea* III.299.

¹¹³ Levine (1991) pp. 110-115; Starkman (1950) p. 94; Griffin (2010) pp. 32-33.

Fruit¹¹⁴ Swift's satire articulates the hostility provoked by the philologists' assumption of superiority over the ancient texts, and by the seemingly single-minded way in which they pursued their critical aims to the potential cost of the texts themselves.

Le Clerc also expressed concern over the conduct of critics, demonstrating how widespread this issue was within the Republic of Letters. In his *Parrhasiana*, Le Clerc included a section on philology, in which he laid at least some of the blame for the diminishing status of classical texts at the door of philologists. He argued that their conduct, that their pedantry and petty quarrels, hardly acted as a testimony to the improving qualities of the classics: "they bite every Body, quarrel with one another for Trifles, and give one another the foulest Language; in a word, instead of that charming Politeness, which, they say, is only to be found in the ancient Writers, we see nothing in them but a *Pedantry*, which can be endured nowhere but amongst Scholars"¹¹⁵ Indeed Le Clerc was so concerned by the conduct of the critics that he directed the *leges emendandi* presented in his *Ars Critica* towards controlling scholarly interference in the text. The first two of his laws sought to make explicit the occasions on which interference in the text was justified, so as to limit the occasions on which philologists could intrude their petty quarrels and need for glory into that text. The first law stated "si quid mutetur, mutationem res ipsa, orationisve series, stylusve scriptoris postulato" while the second expanded upon this to demand "omnis emendatio linguae ingenio, aut

¹¹⁴ Swift, *A Tale of a Tub* p. 32.

¹¹⁵ Le Clerc, *Parrhasiana* p. 182.

scriptoris stylo consentanea esto¹¹⁶ Of the many problems within scholarship Le Clerc sought to ease with his *Ars Critica*, that of the critics was a prominent one.

Evidently Toland concurred with this prevailing concern regarding the conduct of the critics, which he sought to expose in *Cicero Illustratus*; in fact, within the polemical emphasis of his discussion, Toland's proposed strategy for handling this threat can be discerned. Fundamental to this strategy was the effort to diminish the claims to authority which dominated his discussion, together with his efforts, similar to those of Le Clerc, to eradicate supposedly unnecessary variants, those variants he felt were introduced solely as a means of displaying the intellectual prowess of the editor. Once editorial authority had been challenged, something was required to replace it, and Toland had a very clear view of what that might be, indicated by the following criticism of a particular conjecture: *res, ut mea fert sententia, prorsus intoleranda est, conjectores hosce quid Auctorem scripsisse vel decuit vel oportuit, sibi definiendum arrogare; praesertim cum alicujus tantum mendosi codicis omissione suffulti sint*¹¹⁷ Toland felt that by their actions critics were attempting to advance their own interests to the cost of the author. In a bid to correct this gradual accumulation of authority by the editor, Toland focussed his strategy on the reallocation of that authority to the author. He advocated a practice whereby the language and thought of the author should be the

¹¹⁶ Le Clerc, *Ars Critica* p. 344: *if anything is changed, the matter at hand, the order of the speech, or the style of the writer should demand that change* p.350: *the emendation of everything must be consistent with the character of the language, or the style of the writer*

¹¹⁷ *CI* pp. 43-44: *this matter, as I think, is absolutely not to be suffered, that these conjecturers claim for themselves the right to define what the author either should have written or must have written; especially when they have been supported only by the omission of some faulty codex*

editor's foremost guide for emending the text, thereby locating authority in the author's practice not the editor's taste.

ii. Toland and Cicero's language

Toland prided himself on his familiarity with Cicero's language. In the fifteenth chapter of *Cicero Illustratus* Toland had identified those spurious works of Cicero which he proposed to include in his edition, an exercise in which his knowledge of Ciceronian Latin was made instrumental.¹¹⁸ On the question of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* for example, Toland acknowledges that the Latin dated from the same period of Cicero, but rebukes the foolishness of those who believed that it could have been written by him. Those scholars who imagined that the *Oratio Graeca de pace* could possibly be genuine, particularly Charles Merovillius, are forcefully berated for believing that such Latin could be Ciceronian, as 'Latina illa...pudendis ubique scatet Gallicismis, neque probioris est monetae, quàm Petronii Fragmenta Nodotiana'¹¹⁹ Toland had therefore already demonstrated the extent to which he allowed his knowledge of Cicero's language to guide his interaction with the texts.

The role he intends to grant to this knowledge in handling the true text can be illustrated with his criticism of Gruterus's comments on the following passage from *Pro Rabirio Perduellionis*: 'quantum intervallum tandem inter te atque illum interiectum

¹¹⁸ *CI* pp. 32-35.

¹¹⁹ *CI* p. 34: 'this Latin...bristles with scandalous Gallicisms, and is not of more honest coin, than the *Petronii Fragmenta Nodotiana*'. Although originally in Greek in Dio's *Roman History* book 44, the speech was translated into Latin in the early modern editions.

putas?¹²⁰ Gruterus uses the notes to explain his belief that *intervallum* and *interiectum* were surplus to the requirements of the sentence, and thus could be omitted: *tollass intervallum, tollas interiectum, nihil discesserit de auctoris sententia*¹²¹ Toland condemns Gruterus' comment as an assumption regarding Cicero's style, suggesting that he preferred a sparse and concise method of composition, and such surplus additions to the text were primarily intended to fill out the prose rhythm. Confounded by Gruterus' assertion, Toland responds that *copiosa profecto apud Ciceronem omnia, sed nihil supervacuum; quo vero copiosior, eo melior*¹²² Toland's frustration with Gruterus' comment reflects both his conclusion that editors were increasingly prepared to allow their own tastes to intrude on the texts, and his proposal that to correct this tendency awareness of the author's own style and language should be restored to primacy.

This strategy, to argue for a reading of the text based primarily on Cicero's own style, features often in the discussion of textual criticism in *Cicero Illustratus*. Unfortunately, Toland's case is several times undermined by his own failure to fully appreciate Cicero's language and style.

In the variant drawn from the third book of *De Natura Deorum*, as discussed above, Toland seeks an explanation for his preference not only from the manuscript evidence,

¹²⁰ *Rab. Perd.* 15.

¹²¹ Gruterus (1618) II.547: *you may throw out intervallum, you may throw out interiectum, without changing the meaning of the author*

¹²² *CI* p. 43: *everything is undoubtedly copious in the works of Cicero, but nothing is unnecessary; in fact the more abundant, the better for him*

but from the stylistic arguments.¹²³ Toland argues that while *quidem* did not have precisely the same meaning as *quoque*, it served more elegantly there, suggesting a more fitting reading on account of its linguistic significance.¹²⁴ The case Toland makes for *quidem* on the basis that it more stylistically appropriate, however, is flawed. For *quidem* to be the correct reading, it would have to function with *ne*; Cicero very rarely, indeed if ever, used the construction *ne...quidem* in the positive sense of ‘indeed’ which the text would require here. While he often used *ne...quidem* to mean ‘not even’ that would confuse the sense of this sentence.¹²⁵ Unfortunately for Toland, his knowledge of Ciceronian usage is undermined here.

Gruterus once more becomes the target of Toland’s ire when discussing his handling of the variant in the first book of *De Divinatione* identified above.¹²⁶ As discussed, Gruterus proposed the expulsion of *ut rear* from this passage, primarily on the basis of the manuscript evidence, but also because he deemed it inconsistent with the usual standard of Cicero’s Latin, declaring ‘et certe Latine loquetur Tullius, quamvis resecetur’¹²⁷ This provokes Toland, who rejects the suggestion that the presence of *ut rear* somehow impeded Cicero’s Latin: ‘sed non minus Latine loquetur si permaneat; nam ex earum phrasium numero est, quae tam adesse quam abesse, sermonis filo non

¹²³ *DND*.III.24.

¹²⁴ *CI* p. 42.

¹²⁵ Mayor (1885) pp. 83-84. On Cicero’s use of *quidem* in general see Solodow (1978) pp. 30-53.

¹²⁶ *Div*.I.35.

¹²⁷ Gruterus (1618) IV.412: ‘certainly Tully spoke in Latin, although it was pruned’

interrupto, possunt¹²⁸ Once more, Toland's knowledge is exposed. The reading in the passage preferred by modern editors, that of *utar igitur nec adducar*, is not only equivalent to *adducar ut rear*, but is found several other times in that sense in Cicero's works, whereas *ut rear* appears nowhere else.¹²⁹

As a final example, when making his case that variants based on differences in spelling which in no way alter the word's meaning Toland declares that *inscientia* verò et *inscitia* ita promiscuè utitur Orator, ut solus periodi numerus utramlibet praeponderare faciat¹³⁰ Toland's argument that Ciceronian usage justified the omission of comments on this variant once more proves somewhat faulty. The only Latin author who does seem to use *inscientia* and *inscitia* interchangeably is Tacitus, as they do have slightly different emphases in their meaning. *Inscientia* tends to denote a more philosophical ignorance, and it is in this sense that Cicero employs it, particularly in the context of Academic Scepticism.¹³¹ In contrast, Cicero tends to use *inscitia* in a way appropriate to its meaning of general ignorance.¹³²

¹²⁸ *CI* p. 44: ðbut he speaks no less in Latin if it were to stay there; for it is one of those phrases, which can be as well present as absent, without interruption to the thread of the conversationð

¹²⁹ Pease (1963); usage found in *Fin.*I.14, IV.55, *Leg.*II.6, *ad Att.*XI.2, *Clu.*104.

¹³⁰ *CI* p. 42: ðin fact the Orator used *inscientia* and *inscitia* with so little distinction that the rhythm of the sentence alone determined which of the two he would incline towardsð

¹³¹ *Phil.*II.81; *Inv.*I.41, II.5; *Ac.*I.16, II.74; *Div.*I.118; *Fin.*I.46; *DND.*I.17.

¹³² *Prov.* 11; *Brut.*67; *De Orat.*I.99; *Part.*42; *Leg.*I.31; *DND.*I.85; *Off.*I.122, I.144, III.72; *Parad.*II.20; *ad Fam.*IX.1. See Pease (1955-58) I.115.

Toland was not successful in his attempts to correct variants according to Ciceronian usage, betraying his own shortcomings as both a Latinist and a Ciceronian.¹³³ Nevertheless, each of the examples were intended to make the case for judging both the necessity of a variant, and if necessary determining the appropriate reading, primarily on the basis of the author's style and usage, rather than the judgment of the editor on the basis of his *ingenium*, the manuscripts in front of him, or his own personal taste.

iii. Toland and Cicero's thought

As with Cicero's language, when discussing the spurious works he intended to include in his edition, Toland introduced his knowledge of Cicero's thought as a means of discerning the genuine from the false. This is demonstrated by his discussion of *De Memoria Artificiali Libellus*, which he judges to be a work exploiting the suggestion of such an endeavour in *Rhetorica ad Herennium*.¹³⁴ For Toland, however, such a work is extremely unlikely to have been written by Cicero, as Cicero dealt with the question of *memoria* in the second book of *De Oratore*, and any additional discussion of the subject was unwarranted.¹³⁵ *Rhetorica ad Herennium* is identified as spurious on similar grounds. In addition to its linguistic and historic improbability, the rhetorical theory it expounds differs from that of Cicero in notable ways: *sed quando earundem cum eo rerum et nominum definitiones tradit (quod persaepe sit) disparitas adeo palpabilis sese*

¹³³ Toland's skill as a Latinist had already had doubt cast upon it by Huet, whose review of Toland's *Origines Judiciae* amounted to a catalogue of errors, with the unforgiving conclusion that *ce sentiment ne peut venir que d'un homme tout à fait novice dans les belles Lettres* Huet, *Lettre* p. 1591.

¹³⁴ *CI* pp. 33-34, referring to *Rhet. Her.* III.28.

¹³⁵ *De Orat.* II.350-360.

prodit, ut de contrariis etiam sententiis nihil dicam, quòd mirer medius fidius Sanctum Hieronymum olim et Priscianum, vel nuperiùs Marinellum et Kirchmaierum, libros hos Ciceroni attribuisse¹³⁶ Once more, this is knowledge which Toland applies to his understanding of the text itself.

Returning to the conjectural emendations Gulielmius proposed to *De Legibus* I.59, Toland supplemented his arguments against the suggested emendations with this statement on Cicero's practice: "quamvis enim idem plerumque significant, cùm *Genius* tamen pro spiritu ab humana mente distincto saepe accipiatur, non dubito quin Cicero, ubi de hominis sui ipsius et facultatum naturalium cognitione tractat (quod ibi facit) *ingenium* consultò scripserit¹³⁷ On this occasion, Toland's knowledge of Cicero actually proves correct, as *genius* does not appear in his works, whereas *ingenium* does so regularly, and in the sense granted to it by Toland.¹³⁸ He recognised that when philosophising Cicero took great care with the nuances of the words employed.

Toland's comments on the treatment of the following passage taken from *De Inventione* demonstrate further his frustration with the failure of editors to factor

¹³⁶ *CI* pp. 32-33: "but when he relates the definitions of the same things and names as he does (which is very often) the difference betrays itself so palpably, to say nothing of the contrary opinions, that I would wonder that once Saint Jerome and Priscian, or later Marinellus and Kirchmaier, attributed these books to Cicero"

¹³⁷ *CI* p. 42: "for although they express much the same thing usually, since *Genius* is often understood as the soul distinct from the human mind, I do not doubt that Cicero, when he handled an inquiry concerning man's knowledge of himself and of his innate capabilities (which he does there) wrote *ingenium* deliberately"

¹³⁸ A search on the LLT-A database found no examples of Cicero using *genius*.

Cicero's thought into their handling of the text: "at enim qui Patriâ potestate, hoc est Privatâ quâdam, Tribunitiam potestatem, hoc est Populi potestatem, infirmat, minuit is majestatem"¹³⁹ Toland reports that Gronovius commented that no-one could possibly believe that this had been written by Cicero, apparently on the basis that being familiar with the functions of these two aspects of the constitution, Cicero would have no need to further define them in this manner. Toland dismisses this assertion as reflecting a fundamental misunderstanding of Cicero's rhetorical technique, and his handling of the subject of *inventio*. For in Toland's view, by defining his subject here Cicero is offering an example of the status theory central to the process of *inventio*, and the need to focus some cases around issues of definition, and construct one's case from that point.¹⁴⁰ Toland goes on to demonstrate the rhetorical impact of this practice with comparison to the oratorical endeavours present in the Church, as priests used the practise of defining the terms *blasphemia* and *perduellio* to more convincingly make their cases. In his treatment of this possible variant, two principles deemed important by Toland can be elucidated: the editor should not attempt to presuppose the thoughts of the author, and he should always approach the text with a full appreciation of that author's theory and method.

Toland as editor will therefore subjugate his own taste and his intentions for the text to the style and language of the author, together with the thought and theoretical practices

¹³⁹ *Inv.II.52 (CI p. 44).*

¹⁴⁰ May and Wisse (2001) pp. 32-34; cf. *Inv.I.10, De Orat.II.114-177.*

of that author. A good editor must yield entirely to these priorities, diminishing his own role notably.

V. Conclusion

When Toland made his case in *Cicero Illustratus* that the text of Cicero's works was in a deplorable state, and that the editors whose responsibility it had been to rehabilitate it were in fact in large part responsible for its continuing limitations, he was compelled to address the entire editorial tradition. This he did, drawing examples of what he judged to be mishandled variants from the most significant editions of Cicero's works to illustrate his argument. He used these examples to expose the methods employed by editors to improve the text as flawed; as a result, the editors' claims for authority, often based on these methods of textual criticism, were undermined. In order to make his case more convincing, Toland drew on the arguments dominating scholarship in this period, concerning the value of conjectural criticism, appropriate critical use of the manuscripts, and, most importantly, the hostility being engendered by the work of the critics. Fundamental to Toland's argument was the concern, evident across scholarship, at the extent to which the editor was imposing himself, and his own taste, on the text, to the point that the editor became key to the level of authority possessed by a text.

Toland's aim in this discussion was to expose this problem, and to provide some guidance for remedying it. He sought not only to strip the respected editors of their means to accruing authority by challenging conjectural and conservative criticism, but also to construct the needs of the author as a guiding principle in textual criticism. For Toland, the source of textual authority should be its adherence to the language and

thought of its author above all else, particularly when attempting to make the real Cicero accessible through his works. In this way, the excesses of conjectural and conservative criticism might be controlled, and the editor's power subjugated. It is the unspoken implications of this aim that must once more be acknowledged, as while appearing to make a case for limiting the editor's power over the text, Toland is in turn elevating his own position as a judge of Cicero, in this case as a judge of what Cicero would say. His actual inadequacies in this capacity are amply apparent, but that is less significant than the fact that he was evidently constructing this role for himself with the aid of all the scholarly arguments and erudition at his disposal.

CHAPTER THREE

UNDERSTANDING THE TEXT

Toland's approach to establishing the text itself determined, the focus shifts in the eighteenth chapter of *Cicero Illustratus* to his intentions with respect to the notes which will accompany that text. The fact that he intends to include notes commenting on the text is swiftly acknowledged; it is the principles guiding the composition of those notes, together with their form and their content, that are the true subject of the discussion. In one succinct statement Toland expresses how he will approach this challenge: "omnibus enim locis hiulcis, difficilibus, ambiguis, vel merito controversis, breves quidem sed locupletes adjungam Annotationes"¹ These ambiguities that Toland feels are a plague on the Ciceronian text are revealed in the course of the chapter as emanating from two distinct problems: that of the Ciceronian text itself, and that of the contributions made by the Critics.

The Ciceronian text generates difficulties in the first place due to the details, references, and content which require supplementary materials for their elucidation, and in the second place due to the elusiveness of the authorial voice, which presented opportunities for the misinterpretation of the author's intention. The Critics, meanwhile, had managed either by their over-zealous efforts to display their erudition, or by the interference of their own interests in the emphasis of the notes, only to exacerbate the obscurity of the text. Toland makes clear during this discussion what he understands the purpose of the commentary to be: it exists to

¹ *CI* p. 52: "for indeed I will add brief but rich Annotations to all corrupt, difficult, ambiguous passages, or passages provoking just disputes"

focus on eliminating these obscurities, so as to ensure the clarity of the text for the reader. This reader, it is worth recalling, is not intended to be the scholarly man, but the civil man, planning to pursue a career in the public sphere.

In addition to identifying the problems impeding understanding of the text, and hence necessitating explication, Toland uses several chapters in *Cicero Illustratus* to explain precisely how he plans to achieve his aim of clarity. Toland states some of these plans in clear terms. In the sixteenth chapter, for example, he reveals that each of the rhetorical works, the speeches, and in some cases the philosophical works, will be prefaced with a brief synopsis to summarise its contents for the reader and explain its ideas.² In the eighteenth chapter, Toland announces his plan to include not only his own notes, but also the commentaries by Asconius Pedianus and the Anonymous Scholiast.³ These had been published as part of complete editions of Cicero for the first time in the late seventeenth century efforts by Graevius and Gronovius, an innovation Toland evidently felt worth maintaining. Linguistic aids were to be included, such as Latin translations of the Greek words and sentences which appear, so as to aid the reader's comprehension of those works of Cicero, in particular the *Letters*, in which Greek quotes and references were used with regularity. In the nineteenth chapter, Toland proposes an *Index rerum et verborum* to complete a comprehensive set of interpretative tools for the reader.⁴ There are also less direct

² *CI* pp. 35-40.

³ *CI* p. 52. For Asconius Pedianus see Mayer (2010); Marshall (1985); Squires (1990). The Anonymous Scholiast presumably refers to the scholia included by Gronovius which subsequently acquired the name *Scholia Gronoviana*, which is in the Teubner 1907 edition of *Scholia in Ciceronis Orationes Bobiensia*.

⁴ *CI* pp. 58-61.

statements of intent within Toland's discussion of the commentary. As was the case in his handling of textual criticism, a large part of his treatment consists of critiques of the efforts of his predecessors. In order to understand the ideas guiding Toland's own approach, it is necessary to evaluate the criticisms he applies to the endeavours of others. By examining these elements of Toland's discussion, it will become possible to comprehend precisely what Toland intended the purpose of his commentary to be, both for himself and for his reader.

The commentary was by no means insignificant to the editorial project, making the clarification of Toland's intentions important. An editor could make a variety of decisions regarding the form and content of the notes accompanying their text, and each decision had ramifications. This is demonstrated by the sheer flexibility of the commentary form and the range of options available to the editor, from the full learned commentary to explanatory notes directed to only one element of the text to the absence of any notes at all. The audience was one determining influence on these decisions. It was these notes which dictated how the reader understood the text; they were also the means by which an editor was able to construct the text's meaning for that reader in a way which adhered to his own values and purposes.⁵ In addition to influencing how the reader engaged with the work, decisions made regarding the commentary had ramifications for the editor himself. There was debate about the level of editorial intrusion into the text which could be thought acceptable; some editors sought authority for their texts on account of their purity, whereas others wanted to claim authority on account of some particular insight they

⁵ Jeanneret (1999) p. 36; Pooley (2006) p. 68; Kraus (2002) pp. 1-27.

themselves might bring to the text.⁶ Such decisions were connected to the process by which the editor attempted to construct authority for his edition. It is in Toland's description of his plans for the commentary that it becomes possible to clarify the means by which he was attempting to use the explanatory notes to facilitate the trust of the reader, and hence the influence of his edition.

Behind these editorial decisions were the developments in scholarship, particularly in the field of hermeneutics, which granted meaning to the different forms of commentary.⁷ Theories abounded for how a text should be read, each dictated by the value placed on ancient texts for the modern reader. For some the value of a work was to be located in the text itself, and all extraneous material was simply that, surplus to requirements. The scholar needed to provide the material to explain and justify the construction of the text, but no more. Those commentaries which did provide paratextual material, such as historical explanation, literary parallels, source material, paraphrases and digressions, approached the value of the text for the reader from two different directions.⁸ There were those who located the value of the text in its historical meaning, in what it revealed about the context in which it was written. In these cases the notes focussed on providing the historical details required to place a text in its context. There were, on the other hand, those who saw the value of the

⁶ Feld (1978) pp. 81-111.

⁷ Patey (2005) pp. 50-51; Scodel (1999) pp. 543-544; Levine (1991) p. 46; Walsh (2009) p. 687.

⁸ Jeanneret (1999) p. 36 defines these approaches as allegorical and philological; Grafton (1985) pp. 615-49 identifies them as historical/scientific and classical/pedagogical; Patey (2005) pp. 50-51 identifies them as scientific and humanistic. Gray (1963) pp. 497-514 shows that these approaches might be united by rhetoric. See also Céard (2012) pp. 3-23 on the typology of commentaries during the Renaissance. I will be using the terminology of 'philological' and 'pedagogical' as these terms most aptly suit the commentaries I will be dealing with here.

texts in their ability to offer instruction and guidance to the modern reader, or insight into the modern world, and thus advocated a different approach to reading, one more concerned with the relevance of the text to the reader. For these scholars, explanation of the significance of the work was the primary aim of the commentary, and hence that commentary was filled with moral, philosophical or scientific exegesis. These two approaches did not exist in vacuums, acting entirely independently of one another, but they did influence where the emphasis of a commentary might lie. It was these debates within scholarship which formed a background to the decisions being made in the editorial sphere, as the content and emphasis of commentaries came to signify differing scholarly stances and allegiances.

I. Commentary in the Ciceronian tradition

The diverse possible approaches to commenting on the text are amply reflected in the tradition of commenting on Cicero. Toland used the spectrum provided by the tradition in a bid to identify the character of his own proposed commentary: *ætametsi integras unius, aut plurium editorum, Notas explicatorias non mihi in consiliis sit subtexere; ad Graevii scilicet institutum, qui fuit recentiorum Criticorum facile praestantissimus: textus nihilominus non adeo nudus et incomitatus prodibit, ac in Victorii, Gruteri, et Gronovii editionibus*⁹ An examination of this tradition will clarify what Toland hoped to indicate regarding his plans with this statement.

⁹ *CI* pp. 51-52: *ætalthough it is not in my plans to append the complete Explanatory Notes of one or more editors; I mean of course following the custom of Graevius, who was easily the most splendid of more recent Critics: nevertheless the text will not appear so bare and unaccompanied, as in the editions of Victorius, Gruterus, and Gronovius. Toland's engagement with the tradition of Ciceronian commentaries is further evidenced by references to the commentaries he consulted*

i. The unadorned text

In the earliest examples of complete editions of Cicero's works, the editors did not deem it necessary to fill the margins of their pages with notes, nor add extra weight to the edition by appending voluminous comments on the changes made to the text. The absence of such paratextual material was an expression of a fashion for producing the printed text in a manner which echoed its original form.¹⁰ In these earliest days of printing, an authoritative text was often judged to be the one which resembled most closely if not the manuscripts, then the form in which the texts were imagined to have been originally produced. The imposition of notes and commentary would have corrupted the purity of that text. The printing house of Aldus Manutius was a particular champion of this form of printing.¹¹ The Aldine editions, including the editions of all of Cicero's works produced between 1502 and 1523, are particularly sparse, with textual notes and commentary omitted. The production of a pristine text was the priority in these editions, rather than explanation of either the text or its meaning.

While the Aldine editions demonstrated the clearest commitment to this principle, the house of Aldus Manutius was not alone in the Ciceronian tradition in its desire to present an unadorned, uninterrupted text. Indeed, until the middle of the sixteenth century this fashion dominated editorial endeavours. Minutianus's *editio princeps*,

amongst his personal papers (BL Add 4465 ff. 64-65), including that of Fulvius Ursinus produced in 1581, together with other less well known commentaries on Cicero's works.

¹⁰ Feld (1978) p. 86 designates this approach 'primal'

¹¹ Feld (1978) pp. 93-94; Bolgar (1954) p. 375; Lowry (1979) pp. 217 ff. For comment on the Aldine editions of Cicero's works see Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Latina* p. 142; Ernesti (1773) p. 217; Orellius (1836) p. 240; Dunlop (1827) p. 56.

published in 1498, left the text bare, although he did include in his edition the fourth century commentary by Marius Fabius Victorinus on Cicero's rhetorical works.¹² While this commentary was an extensive consideration of the rhetorical works, with single lines of text isolated and explicated with paragraphs of commentary, its quiet attachment at the end of the edition suggests a greater wish to record another prominent work, rather than to compromise the otherwise uninterrupted text. In a similar vein is Cratander's 1528 edition; at the beginning of this edition, separate from the text itself, Cratander included brief selections from an array of his scholarly predecessors, including Aulus Gellius, Politian, Marcus Antonius Sabellicus, Filippo Beroaldo, Pietro Crinito, Desiderius Erasmus, Guillaume Budé, and Konrad Peutinger. Minutianus and Cratander chose to include some comment of eminent pedigree, but both refrained from introducing their own notes, and from allowing such commentary to impinge on the text. Meanwhile, the edition produced by Hervagius in 1534 followed more closely in Aldine footsteps by producing an entirely pristine text, as did Gryphius some years later in his series of editions produced between 1546 and 1548.

Toland implicitly rejected an approach to editing which omitted any interpretative guidance by expressing no compunction about adorning his text with notes. His edition would respond to the developments which followed this initial phase of editing, developments which saw the introduction and swift expansion of the explanatory note in the Ciceronian edition.

¹² *Victorini Commentarius in Rhetorica Ciceronis*, on which see Copeland (2011) pp. 241-243, Mack (2011) p. 18 and Halm (1964) pp. 155-156. Cox and Ward (2011) have demonstrated that the prominence of rhetoric in the medieval school tradition would make a commentary such as this almost an expectation in 1498.

ii. Commenting on the text

As the sixteenth century progressed, the complete editions of Cicero's works began to be equipped with increasingly extensive notes and commentary. This is a process which began with the Juntine edition produced by Petrus Victorius between 1534 and 1537, whose notes also represent a demonstration of one of the forms of commentary which dominated the tradition, a form which I shall here refer to as the textual commentary. While the text itself remained unadorned, Victorius composed and appended his own *Explicationes* to the edition.¹³ These explanations focussed entirely on the reconstruction of the text, offering justifications, linguistic illustrations, and literary parallels, all directed towards the validation of the changes Victorius made to the received text. It is Victorius's contention that if the text were fully explicated in this way, that text could then be employed more usefully:

—Sed cum postea animadverterem multa esse loca maxime in epistolis, quae nisi aperirentur, obscura futura essent, cum aut historia illarum rerum à multis ignoratur, aut versus reconditi aliquorum poetarum citantur, non nulla etiam parum certa, et in variis libris variè scripta, quaedam suspecta, alia autem prorsus mendosa quae omnino oporteret indicare, necesse esse duxi quasdam adnotationes conficere, quae obscura illustrarent, incerta et suspecta

¹³ Victorius published these *Explicationes* independently subsequently; they were also reproduced by Robertus Stephanus in his 1538 edition of Cicero's works, and included in the 1540 edition by Brutus.

ostenderent, depravata et manca, ne quempiam nulla utilitate
exerceant, denotent¹⁴

Victorius's purpose is to make Cicero's works comprehensible to the reader, and his method of doing so is to explicate the text as fully as possible. The focus of the notes contained within such a textual commentary was directed towards the establishment of the most accurate text; this was the service these editors sought to offer their readers, the provision of the best text with which to work and engage.¹⁵ This was a commentary provided so that the reader might understand the text itself.

This form of commentary, as developed by Victorius, became prominent in the Ciceronian tradition. Lambinus perfected it in his 1566 edition of Cicero's works, where he confined his notes to the end of each volume of his edition, and those notes set to work expounding Cicero's Latin, and its literary qualities, so as to establish that text fully.¹⁶ Lambinus's notes drew on an array of evidence directed towards the justification of his emendations, particularly the conjectures: he sought parallels in Cicero's other works in order to determine usage, he expanded on common Ciceronian practice, what historical detail he introduced was intended to offer support for a particular variant. As was the case with his recension of the text,

¹⁴ Victorius (1534) *Explicationes*: -but when afterwards I noticed that there were many passages especially in the letters, which unless they were explained, would be obscure, since either the history of the matter was unknown by many or the little-known verses of some poets were cited, some things also far from certain, and written differently in various books, some things suspect which it was right to expose by all possible means, so that I thought it was necessary to compose certain notes, which illustrate the obscure passages, reveal the uncertain and suspect, and show the corrupt and lacunose, lest they trouble anyone to no purpose

¹⁵ Dyck (2002) pp. 319-329; Mayer (2010); Kraus (2002) p. 2.

¹⁶ Kenney (1974) pp. 63-67; Mayer (2010).

Lambinus' notes proved influential, and were reprinted in several subsequent editions.¹⁷ Another eminent scholar, Fulvius Ursinus, maintained this approach to commenting on the text in the notes he produced for Cicero's works in 1581.¹⁸ His notes too addressed various emendations and difficulties in the text, and used literary parallels, the Latin language, and familiarity with Ciceronian usage to explain why the text should read the way it did.

This form of commentary was also popular in the seventeenth century editions of Cicero's works. In 1618 Gruterus adopted the same presentation of the commentary used by his predecessors, allowing the text to remain uninterrupted, and confining his commentary to the end of each volume of his edition. This commentary is even more exclusively textual than that of Victorius. Gruterus too selects only the textual variants to comment on, and in those comments the emphasis is almost entirely on the manuscript evidence and editorial history which led him to decide on that particular variant. He expresses such a purpose for his notes in his preface: *saepius tamen memini mutationis eorundem in Notulis meis: quid ni enim sic vocem, ubi omnia fere signantur punctis; ita quidem ut vix umquam correctionis nostrae*

¹⁷ Of the complete editions recorded pp. xxi-xxxiv, Ursinus (1584); Scot (1588); Graevius (1684); Verburgius (1724). Among other editions: *M. Tullii Ciceronis opera. Cum annotationibus Dionysii Lambini, viri doctiss. singulis tomis distinctis*. Venetiis, ex Bibliotheca Aldina 1569-1570; *M. Tullii Ciceronis opera omnia, quae exstant. Editio ad Manutianam et Brutinam conformata. Cum Annotationibus et castigationibus, quae ex variis doctorum virorum scriptis selectae, suis quaeque Tomis adiectae sunt*. Francofurti, apud heredes Wechel 1590; *M. Tullii Ciceronis opera omnia cum notis D. Lambini et D. Gothofredi*. Coloniae Allobrogum 1616.

¹⁸ Fulvio Orsini/Fulvius Ursinus (1529-1600) was a prominent antiquarian in Rome, who served for a long time as librarian to Farnese cardinals, providing him with the opportunity to examine manuscripts; cf. Sandys (1908) pp. 153-154 and von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (1982) p. 30. As was the case with Victorius, these notes were produced independently, and it was in their independent form that Toland saw them.

reddatur ratio?¹⁹ Such details are on occasion supplemented with consideration of the appropriateness of the Latin, but only in so far as it relates to the accuracy of the text. As was the case with Lambinus, the on-going importance of Gruterus's recension was reflected in the adoption of his notes by several successors.²⁰ Gronovius, at the other end of the seventeenth century in 1692, integrated Gruterus's notes into his commentary, while adopting them as a model for his own notes. Gronovius's main modification was to allow his notes to feature on the same page as the text, at the bottom of the page.

Toland described the editions of Victorius, Gronovius and Gruterus as unadorned, as lacking entirely in the kind of notes he himself intended to supply. This implies a dismissal by Toland of a form of commentary which focussed on the explication and justification of the text itself, with little or no concern for the meaning or significance of that text, and which had dominated the Ciceronian tradition for almost two hundred years.

iii. Commenting on the text's meaning

While the textual commentary may have dominated, there were plentiful examples of an alternative form of commentary, one which I shall designate as the explanatory commentary for these purposes. This was a form of commentary in which it was not the variants or the textual issues which drew the attention of the commentator, but

¹⁹ Gruterus (1618) *Praefatio*: "however more often I am mindful of the mutation of these same editions in my little notes: for why should I not call it thus, when almost everything is marked with points; so that an account of our corrections should hardly ever be yielded?"

²⁰ Elzevir (1642); Blaeu (1658); Schrevelius (1661).

the historical, literary, and cultural details of the text.²¹ Such commentaries supplied the reader with the necessary detail to appreciate historical and literary references and contextual details, to understand stylistic and rhetorical flourishes, to perceive parallels in the text's content to other works, to elucidate the sources of any given passage. Some went beyond these tools of explanation to provide paraphrases of the arguments for the reader, and to produce digressions on questions of moral or philosophical importance. This was a form of commentary concerned less with the text itself, and more with the meaning of that text, and with providing the reader with the means to appreciate that meaning.

There are several examples of such commentaries among the editions of Cicero's works produced in the sixteenth century. The most notable is that of Paulus Manutius in 1540, which set the standard for this style of commentary in the tradition.²² Indeed, at the end of the seventeenth century Jean Le Clerc, in his *Parrhasiana*, expressed his wish that the notes of Manutius might still act as a model for critics: "the Notes of *Paulus Manucius* upon *Cicero's* Epistles, which are such as I would have, cost him much more Pains than the Critical Notes of many others, though never so much esteemed."²³ Manutius's commentary proved immensely popular, and was reproduced by other editors of Cicero several times.²⁴ Manutius selected for

²¹ Dyck (2002) pp. 319-329; Reeve (1996) p. 31.

²² Paulus Manutius/Paolo Manuzio (1512-1574) was the youngest son of Aldus Manutius, and took over his Venetian press; cf. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (1982) p. 29 and Sandys (1908) pp. 100-101.

²³ Le Clerc, *Parrhasiana* p. 169

²⁴ Sturmio, *Epistola* 1540; Hieron. Ferrarii *ad Paulum Manutium emendationes in Philippicas Ciceronis* 1542; Stephanus (1543); Boulietius (1562); Ursinus (1584); Graevius (1684).

comment those elements of the text which might be difficult for the reader: points of law in the speeches, explanation of specific customs, references, or technical terms, and in order to clarify them for the reader, he drew on historical evidence, works of Cicero, and the relevant sources. In this way he established the appropriate parameters for explanatory notes as adopted by other editors of Cicero who sought to provide similar interpretative tools for the reader. Such an editor was Joachim Camerarius, who also published an edition of Cicero's works in 1540, and whose notes went even further than Manutius in their effort to explicate every potentially oblique detail in the text.²⁵ From the prefatory material and continuing throughout the notes Camerarius dedicated himself to the full exposition of the text, an attention to detail driven by his commitment to providing editions suitable for education.²⁶ This is most clearly demonstrated by the attention he grants to elucidating the particular rhetorical practices employed by Cicero.

Manutius and Camerarius included notable innovations in their editions of Cicero, being the first to adorn some of his works with synopses, or brief prefatory summaries, for the benefit of the reader. Paulus Manutius used these synopses to preface, for example, the speeches. He introduced the occasion of the work, the case in question, the key characters, and summarised the gist of Cicero's argument, so that the reader had all the necessary background information to engage with the case. Again, Camerarius's efforts exceeded even those of Manutius, producing synopses for the speeches often three times the length of those of his contemporary. Camerarius's

²⁵ Joachim Camerarius of Bamberg (1500-1574) was a prominent German scholar in the sixteenth century, responsible for numerous editions of Latin and Greek works; cf. Pfeiffer (1976) p. 139, Sandys (1908) pp. 266-267.

²⁶ von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (1982) pp. 44-45; Freedman (1986) pp. 230-231.

synopses also provided background details for the work, but supplemented this with a more extended account of the content of the work itself, in addition to passing judgement on the rhetorical skill displayed therein, and any other features meriting comment. The influence of this style of commentary, as best represented by Manutius and Camerarius, was felt throughout the Ciceronian tradition, not only through the publication of individual Ciceronian works with such annotation, but through the reprinting of the Manutian scholia and notes of Camerarius, and the adoption of their techniques.²⁷

Another form of commentary was developed towards the end of the seventeenth century which encompassed both the textual and explanatory commentaries discussed above: the *variorum* edition. Such were the editions produced by Graevius between 1684 and 1699, those which Toland placed at the opposite end of the interpretative spectrum from Victorius, Gruterus and Gronovius.²⁸ These editions included numerous different commentaries, so as to provide the fullest possible exposition of the text. Graevius's edition of the speeches, for example, prefaced each speech with the synopses of both Manutius and Camerarius, before placing the notes of Graevius, Hottomannus, Lambinus, Ursinus, Gruterus and more underneath the text, and appending the scholia of Manutius in full (see figure 1). In his *Parrhasiana* Le Clerc dwelt upon such editions, declaring that although in their

²⁷ The Manutiana scholia were reprinted in Stephanus (1543); Colinaeus (1543); Gryphius (1546); Boulietius (1562); Wechel (1590); Graevius (1684); Verburgius (1724). Camerarius's notes were reproduced in Boulietius (1562); Graevius (1684); Verburgius (1724).

²⁸ Johann Georg Graevius/Guava (1632-1703) was a prominent German classical scholar and antiquarian; cf. Sandys (1908) pp. 327-328, Pfeiffer (1976) pp. 152, 162, von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (1982) pp. 73-74.

ARGUMENTVM P. MANVTII.

Comitiis consularibus, quae consul Cicero habuit, D. Iunius Silanus, & L. Licinius Murena consules designati sunt. Post comitia Murenam de ambitu competitor ejus accusavit clari nominis jurisconsultus Ser. Sulpicius cum tribus subscriptoribus, M. Catone, probitate sensuque erga rempublicam insigni viro, Cn. Postumio, Ser. Sulpicio adolescente. Defendit eum Cicero, defensum jam a Q. Hortensio, & M. Crasso. Iucunda in primis oratio est. nam & jurisconsulti propter Sulpicium exagitantur: & Stoica disciplina, cui deditus erat Cato, facete lepideque deluditur: adeo ut Cato, dignam consule gravitatem ei detrahens, dixerit id, quod in Plutarcho legimus: Dii boni, quam ridiculum consulem habemus.



Vae deprecatus sum a diis immortalibus, iudices, more institutoque majorum, illo die, quo auspicato comitiis centuriatis L. Murenam consulem renunciavi: ut ea res mihi magistratuique meo, populo plebique Romanae, bene atque

Quae deprecatus sum a diis] Exordia orationis hujus vel duo sunt, vel unius partes duae, vel post exordium excursio. Nihil enim vel perparum interest. Prior igitur pars habet ipsius causae & defensionis commendationem, secunda patrocinii. Non enim solum in hoc elaborandum fuit, ut a causa iudices non essent alieni, sed etiamne qua invidia defensoris nocere posset reo. Sed de utraque parte nunc deinceps aliquid dicamus. Prioris ergo capita sunt *Religio & pietatis officium*, quae implicantur inter se: quod etiam Demosthenes facere solere cernitur, ut capita permisceat atque contexat. Ordinetur autem ampliter & splendide, ut dicentis personae dignitati atque auctoritati conveniebat. In primis enim cum omnibus in orationis partibus tum maxime in principiis decore servendum, cum vix alia res ita so-

leat avertere animos atque iudicia hominum, quam si id quod deceat negligatur. De quo, i. e. *ἡ δὲ τὴν ἀποτροπὴν*, ut Graeci appellant, Rhetores diligentissime praecipere, & Cicero in oratore copiose & magnifice notat his verbis: *Est autem quid deceat oratori videndum, non in sententiis solum, sed etiam in verbis. Non enim omnis honos, non omnis auctoritas, non omnis aetas; nec vero locus aut tempus aut auditor omnis eodem aut verborum genere tractandus est, aut sententiarum. Semperque in omni parte orationis, ut vita, quid deceat est considerandum, quod & in re de qua agitur positum est & in personis, & eorum qui dicunt, & eorum qui audiunt.* Haec Cicero. Atque est hic locus perdifficilis & late patet, & sine prudentia singulari explicari non potest. Itaque & a Philosophis diligenter & copiose in officiis tractatur. Est autem in hoc initio

Figure 1. Graevius (1688)

earliest form they were often heavily flawed on account of the ineptitude of their editors, they had proved useful, particularly for students of the classics: "the Publick has been better pleased with them, and all those, who Love Humane Learning, have been extremely glad to have a compleat Collection out of all the best Criticks, to consult it when there is an occasion for it"²⁹ Such an approach had the potential for provoking discontent, however, as the sheer weight of material could be judged overwhelming.

When locating himself within the tradition of Ciceronian commentary writing Toland distances himself from that aspect of the tradition here denoted the textual commentary; the single-minded focus on the accurate construction of the text displayed in these commentaries does not fulfil the requirements of the reader, as Toland understands them. Toland's description of the aims of his proposed commentary identifies his efforts with the explanatory commentary, which sought to elucidate not only the text, but the text's meaning. Within this commentary tradition, however, different approaches and emphases abounded, reflecting an array of ideological and scholarly agendas. A detailed examination of Toland's discussion in *Cicero Illustratus* will clarify exactly what he understood the meaning of the text to be, and how he planned to make it accessible to his reader.

II. The 'philological' approach to the text

In keeping with his usual method of elaborating on his intentions, Toland frames his propositions around critiques of his predecessors' efforts. The first form of explanatory commentary addressed by Toland which shall be considered here is that

²⁹ Le Clerc, *Parrhasiana* p. 170.

which focuses on the explanation of specific details of the text to place it in its context; I shall here denote this form of commentary as ‘philological’

i. Explaining the text

Within the eighteenth chapter of *Cicero Illustratus* Toland selects for criticism, among others, notes composed by François Hotman on the *Pro Lege Manilia*, and by John Davies on the *Tusculan Disputations*. These are two commentators united in their comprehensive efforts to provide the reader of Cicero’s texts with the means of understanding every detail and reference contained therein. Hotman’s attention to detail is indicative of his association with the jurists, who applied their commitment to a scientific approach throughout their literary work.³⁰ The nature of Davies’s approach to commenting on the text is hinted at by his strong association with Richard Bentley, who in fact contributed some comments and emendations to this edition of the *Tusculan Disputations*.³¹ Davies, like Bentley, directed his efforts towards supplying all the historical and literary details necessary to explicate those passages inaccessible to the modern reader, aiming to clarify their meaning beyond any doubt. Toland selects for criticism two examples of these efforts to provide the detail to explain the text.

³⁰ François Hotman (1524-1590), while most famous as a jurist and the author of the political tract *Francogallia*, did engage in some classical scholarship including studies of Roman law, and these commentaries on Cicero’s speeches; cf. Sandys (1908) p. 193. It is interesting to note that in 1711 Toland’s close friend Robert Molesworth had produced a translation of Hotman’s *Francogallia*, citing it as important text for the case of liberty.

³¹ John Davies (1679-1732) was a prominent scholar at Queen’s College, Cambridge, whose reputation was primarily forged with a series of commentaries on Cicero’s philosophical works; cf. Sandys (1908) p. 412, von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1982) p. 81, Cooper (2004).

First, Toland addresses an annotation made by Hotman to the *Pro Lege Manilia*, concerning Cicero's comparison of Mithridates' flight from Pontus to that made by Medea from the same place.³² Hotman provides the reader not only with a brief summation of who Medea was, but quotes the lines of poetry describing her escape from Cicero's *De Natura Deorum* III.67, and provides a reference to the account of the same event in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.³³ Toland is dismissive of these efforts by Hotman to detail the story of Medea for his reader: "an opus erat Hottomannum, ut plures non addam, Medeae nomine in Oratione *pro lege Manilia* prolato, veneficae illius historiam ex Ovidio fusius recitare? aut cui bono fabulas et fictiones Poeticas in tali opere pueriliter inserere, nisi parùm cognita sit historiola aliqua, aut sit allusio forsàn non satis clara?"³⁴ Such extensive detail is judged unnecessary by Toland. Indeed, Hotman's commentary is notable for its detail, as each paragraph of Ciceronian text is followed by often more than two pages of notes from Hotman. It serves as an excellent example, then, of an approach to commentary writing which sought to identify and explain any and every detail in the text which might not be immediately accessible to the modern reader (see figure 2).

³² Hotman, *Orationes* p. 404 on *Man.22*.

³³ The origin of the lines Cicero quotes in *De Natura Deorum* is unclear, although possibly from the *Medea* of Accius.

³⁴ *CI* pp. 55-56: "or was it necessary for Hottomannus, so that I do not add more, highlighting the name of Medea in the speech *Pro Lege Manilia*, to recite the story of this sorceress from Ovid at greater length? Or to insert childishly in such a work Poetic stories and tales, unless it is some small history barely known, or perhaps it is not a clear enough allusion?"

M. Tullii Ciceronis pro P. Quintio ORATIO I.



VAE RES in ciuitate diu plurimum possunt, ex contra nos. ambæ faciunt in hoc tempore, summa gratia, & eloquentia. quarum alteram C. Aquili vereor, alteram metuo. eloquentia Q. Hortensii ne me dicendo impediatur, non nihil commoueor. gratia Sex. Neuii ne P. Quintio noceat, id verò non mediocriter pertimesco. neque hoc tantopere querendum videretur, hæc summa in illis esse, si in nobis essent saltem mediocria. verum ita se res habet, ut ego, qui neque vsu satis, & ingenio parum possum, cum patrono disertissimo comparer. P. Quintius, cui tenues opes, nullæ facultates, exiguæ amicorum copiarum sunt, cum aduersario gratiosissimo contendat. Illud quoque nobis accedit incommodum, quod M. Iunius, qui hæc causam Aquili aliquoties apud te egit, homo & in aliis causis exercitatus, & in hac multum & sæpe versatus, hoc tempore abest, noua legatione impeditus: & ad me ventum est, qui ut summa haberem cætera, temporis quidem certe vix satis habui, ut rem tantam, tot controuersis implicatam, possem cognoscere. ita, quod mihi consuevit in cæteris causis esse adiumento, id quod in hac causa deficit. Nam quo minus ingenio possum, subsidio mihi diligentiam comparauit. quæ quanta sit, nisi tempus & spatium datum sit, intelligi non potest.

F. HOTOMANI COMMENTARIUM.

In ciuitate. In hac ciuitate. ut infra, pagina 24. Aut C. Aquilius vir iuratus hoc ius in ciuitate constituit. Et pag. 35, Si est homini honesto locus in ciuitate inuio Neuii.

Summa gratia et eloquentia. Gratia, copia est plurimorum amicorum, ut scribit Aconius: & intelligitur ex his verbis quæ proximè insequuntur: P. Quintius, cui exiguæ amicorum copiarum sunt, cum aduersario gratiosissimo contendat. Plurimum autem in ciuitate gratia poterat. primum in iudiciis: etenim moris erat in iudiciis tum priuatis, tum publicis, amicos omnes aduocare, quorum auctoritate moueri iudices posse putabantur. iique, ut scribit Aconius, Aduocati dicebantur, qui scilicet præsentiam suam amico commodabatur. Orator enim, Patronus dicebatur. Patronus autem, instituto Romuli, qui ex Patrum numero plebi, quos ei commodum esset, deligendi potestatem fecit, qui ipsius causas suscipere. ex quo illi quidem Patroni, hi verò Clientes, ut alibi docuimus, dicebantur. Eò igitur & Prætores, & Consules, & omnes denique, quicunque poterant, tum magistratus, tum alii ciuitatis principes aduocabantur: in quibus potentia quidem dicebatur: quum in eo cui aduocati aderat, Gratiæ verbum potius vsurparetur. In hanc sententiã ipse in Oratione pro Cæcina, Denique, inquit, nimia ista quæ dominatur in ciuitate potestatis, in hoc solo genere quiescit. Has copias amicorum, qui aduocari ad iudicium solebant, AEschines in Oratione contra Ctesiphontem τῆς ἀποκαθάρσεως ἕνεκα ἐπιμαρτυρίας nomine significat: quibus verbis modò quod Manu, modò quod Acie instructa Latini appellat, Græci declarant. Τὸ μὲν ἀποκαθάρσει ἐστὶν, ὡς ἀδελφῶν, καὶ τὸ ἐπιμαρτυρίας, ὡς ἀδελφῶν. Copias enim aduocatorum ostendit Demosthenis & Ctesiphontis: quas inuidiose Manu, atque acie instructa, quasi ad vim faciendam comparatas appellat. Poterat præterea Gratia plurimum in honorum petitionibus, poterat in Senatu, qua de re mentio fit in Miloniana quæ dicit Munatiu Plancu suam potestatem inuidiose criminari, ac dicere, Senatū nō quod sentiret, sed quod Tullius vellet, decernere. Denique omnibus in Reip. partibus amicorum copiarum plurimū (ut ipse dicit) poterant. De eloquentia verò, quid attinet dicere: quum in liberis ciuitatibus dominam & reginam eam rerum omnium fuisse cõstet: ut ipse docet initio libri de Oratore 1.

Quarum alteram. ἡ ἑτέρα, præter consuetudinem loquendi: ut ad Eloquentiam referatur. Alteram C. Aquili. Hic est, puto, C. Aquilius Gallus, auditor Q. Mutii Pont. Max. ut scribit Põponius in capite de origine iuris, Seruii Sulpitii in iure præceptor, ut Cicero tradit in Bruto: clarus iuris ciuilibus scientia, à quo de dolo malo formula prolata est, quam Cicero euerriculum malitiarum omnium appellat, in libro de Nat. Deorum 1 1 1, & de Offic. 1 1 1. quem ipse idem & in Topicis & eodem libro de Offic. suum collegam appellat, opinor, quod Præturam vnã cum ipso gesserit: quum Tullio quidem de pecuniis repetundis, Aquilio verò ambitus quaestio obuenerit: ut in Cluentiana significat, & alibi exponemus.

Ne me dicendo impediatur. Ne per multis in rebus timore prolabar, ut ipse inquit pag. 27. & hac vercudia qua quidẽ, auctore Fabio, nihil est ad conciliandū grauius, beneuolentiã sibi iudicis adiungit.

a. i.

Figure 2. Hotman, *Orationes*

Toland also identifies for criticism an annotation made by John Davies to Cicero's *Tusculan Disputations*.³⁵ Davies recorded the difficulties in that passage with respect to the origins of the philosopher Pherecydes, whose origin in Syros had been doubted and debated. He rejected the claim by Eustathius that Pherecydes emanated from Babylonia, and that of Augustine and John Tzetzes that he was an Assyrian.³⁶ He commented that Syrus was incorrect in the vulgate, but that it had been acknowledged as Pherecydes's birthplace by Diogenes Laertius, Clement, Porphyry, Suidas and more. This note provokes Toland's ire, as he felt that he had settled the question of Pherecydes's origins, and this problem in the *Tusculan Disputations*, in the second of his *Letters to Serena*.³⁷ Toland is scathing of Davies's claims for his achievement here: "quasi id non fecissent, quos aliàs nominabo, orbi literatorum universo notissimi Critici"³⁸ Toland again identifies for criticism a note which he judged to be unnecessary for ensuring the clarity of the text.

The examples Toland has identified here for comment represent instances of a particular form of commentary: the philological, or scientific, commentary.³⁹ Fundamentally, the philological commentary was explanatory rather than interpretative. This explanatory function is indicated by the type of comment involved; it would provide innumerable details so that the reader fully understood

³⁵ *Tusc.*I.38 (*CI* p. 55).

³⁶ Davies, *Tusculan Disputations* p. 33.

³⁷ Toland, *Letters to Serena* p. 28.

³⁸ *CI* p. 55: "as if the most famous Critics from the whole world of literature had not done this, whom I will name at another time"

³⁹ On the philological commentary see Grafton (1985) pp. 618-627, (1991a) pp. 49; Jeanneret (1999) p. 36; Mayer (2010).

what the text was intending to communicate. This included not only historical details, but literary features explained as characteristic of the Latin language at that time. In addition sources and parallels for the text were identified in order to demonstrate the extent to which it represented a common feature of the ancient world. In this way the philological commentary sought to make accessible to the reader the literal sense of the text; this was the immediate and first level of meaning the words conveyed, as the author intended. The philological commentary provided the tools to make that meaning clear; it was therefore characterised by its extensive detail, directed towards explaining the text's immediate meaning for the reader.

ii. Historical hermeneutics

Underlying the philological commentary was an understanding of the purpose of reading ancient texts which reflected both hermeneutic advances, and developments in biblical and classical scholarship across the seventeenth century. The literal meaning of a text was pursued by those who adopted the hermeneutic principle of the historical, or scientific, reading. This method of reading required that a text should be returned to its context, and read as a product of its own historical circumstances, rather than as a continuing, unchanging element, which held an undimmed relevance to the modern reader.⁴⁰ It was an approach which demanded that ancient texts be read as historical documents whose meaning to their original audience needed to be translated. It distanced the reader from the text. The philological commentary worked on the principle that the text was being read for this

⁴⁰ See Grafton (1985) pp. 620-627, (2007) pp. 62-122 on the development of source criticism in historical scholarship, fostering the attitude to reading discussed here; cf. Jeanneret (1999) p. 36 and Styler and Pridmore (2006) p. 1.

purpose, and its contents reflect this assumption, guiding the reader to the text's literal meaning.

This understanding of the purpose of reading ancient texts was among the scholarly principles championed by the Moderns during the Battle of the Books in England. As was the case with textual criticism, the Modern emphasis on philology as an achievement of modern scholarship affected the way in which Moderns approached reading classical works. The techniques of modern scholarship equipped the philologist with vast swathes of material about the formation of the text; this shifted the critic's appreciation of the work from its literary merit to its status as an historical work.⁴¹ It was this process which changed the purpose of reading a classical text for the modern scholar. As a result, the commentary changed. It increased in detail and subject matter, and hence in expanse. All the details necessary to understand the text as an historical product had to be provided for the reader, extending the commentary and the paratextual material exponentially. The Moderns saw reading as an act of scientific research.

It was not only in this battleground of classical scholarship that the historical reading came to have great significance, but in the even more fraught conflicts of biblical scholarship. The war waged here was over the nature of the Scripture, as certain biblical critics fought to identify it as an historical document which should be subjected to criticism in the same way as any other ancient text.⁴² Spinoza was the primary exponent of these efforts in the heterodox sphere, in particular using his

⁴¹ Patey (2005) pp. 50-51; Scodel (1999) pp. 543-544; Levine (1991) pp. 46, 71-78.

⁴² Sharpe (2003) p. 123; Burke (1969b) pp. 50-69.

Theological-Political Treatise to make this case.⁴³ Spinoza's approach was adopted by others who, for far less radical reasons, sought to show the historical origins of the Bible. Simon, for example, used philological exegesis to determine the authenticity of elements of the Scripture, reaching conclusions such as a rejection of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.⁴⁴ Le Clerc also composed commentaries on the Old Testament which were emphatically philological.⁴⁵ These efforts to stress the historical origins of the Bible invited the formation of an accompanying biblical hermeneutic. As it was written in a particular historical context, it should be read according to that context. This reading of the Bible inevitably proved controversial, as it meant that those aspects of the Scripture not appropriate to their historical context could be dismissed. The way in which the reader could engage with the Bible was fundamentally changed.

Toland's own efforts in the field of biblical scholarship reveal his appreciation of these efforts to historicise the Scripture; he too used this stance as a means of challenging those elements of the Bible he rejected, particularly by introducing ancient sources which exposed the unhistorical content of the Scripture.⁴⁶ Toland made the case throughout his *Letters to Serena* that it was by applying philological exegesis to the text that the false additions and meanings accrued by that text since its actual composition could be eradicated. His efforts to discredit elements of Scripture with an historical approach to the material were most notable in the

⁴³ Israel (2001) pp. 447-456; Preus (2001) pp. 1-6.

⁴⁴ Champion (1999a) pp. 77-96.

⁴⁵ Hazard (1953) pp. 213-231; Grafton (1997b) pp. 190-222; Burke (1969b) pp. 50-69.

⁴⁶ Champion (2012) pp. 139-140, (2003) pp. 190-212; Daniel (1984) pp. 120-121, 128.

catalogue of apocrypha he collated in *Amyntor*, and his arguments in favour of the *Gospel of Barnabas* in his *Nazarenus*. Toland championed the historical reading as a significant weapon against the corruptions of the true faith since its original creation.

Toland's attempts to expose theologically important texts with appropriate historical evidence is best demonstrated by his engagement with Moses and the Mosaic tradition, in particular his *Origines Judiciae* in which he attempted to not only prove that the Pentateuch could not have been written by Moses, but to do so by using Strabo to prove the historical impossibility of the orthodox understanding of Moses drawn from the Pentateuch.⁴⁷ Responding to Huet's *Demonstratio Evangelica* (1679), which had championed the orthodox interpretation of Moses as a prophet and the sacred history of the Jewish faith as recorded in the Old Testament, Toland attempted to make Moses an historical figure who could be identified as a political legislator in the tradition of Lycurgus and Solon: "Strabonem assero Moysen cum Minoe, Lycurgo, Zamolxi, et id genus plurimis sine ullo discrimine comparasse; sed eum quoque de Religione Judaica, de Gentis Origine, deque ipso Moyse, narrationem omnino discrepantem ab illa, quae habetur in Pentateucho, instituisse"⁴⁸ As a result, he was able to make the case that the providential revealed history of the Hebrews was false on historic grounds. Toland used historical

⁴⁷ Champion (2003) pp. 173-179, (1990) pp. 333-356.

⁴⁸ Toland, *Origines Judiciae* pp. 104-105: "I say that Strabo compares Moses with Minos, Lycurgus, Zamolxis and many others of the same description, without any distinction, and what is more, that he has given an account of the Jewish religion, the origin of that nation, and of Moses himself, totally different from that which we find in the Pentateuch"(trans. Champion (2003) p. 175).

resources to provide a reading of the text which extrapolated an historic account of Moses as an alternative to the orthodox account found in the Pentateuch.

In both classical and biblical scholarship the historical approach to reading attained increasing significance; as a result so did the philological commentary, as one of the primary means of ensuring that texts were read historically.

iii. Toland and the literal meaning of Cicero

Toland's adherence to this approach was not confined solely to his biblical scholarship; his proposals for his Ciceronian commentary reveal an intention to engage with the Ciceronian text on this basis as well. Those brief but rich annotations Toland planned were to focus on clarifying the sense of the most difficult passages for the reader with historical and literary exegesis.⁴⁹ In addition to notes providing the information necessary for the reader to elucidate the sense of the text, Toland's proposed synopses, prefacing the speeches, philosophical works, and some of the rhetorical works, would contribute to the explanation of the text. Toland acknowledged that these works required details of their historical context and their function if they were to be fully understood in their own right, and intended to supply those details in these synopses. Toland judged such synopses to be particularly necessary for the comprehension of the judicial speeches, as they contain numerous and regular allusions to legal practices specific to Republican Rome, which ought to be elucidated for the reader. He makes explicit at the opening of chapter sixteen the importance of these synopses to understanding the meaning of

⁴⁹ *CI* p. 52.

Cicero's works: "absque his enim omnia intellectu difficillima reperientur, neque cum ullo fructu perlegenda"⁵⁰

Toland's commitment to making the literal sense of Cicero's works available to the reader extends beyond explaining inaccessible details in the work. Toland's synopses were intended to tackle an additional aspect of this literal sense of the text: the authorial voice. Toland planned to use the synopses to identify for the reader where Cicero's true voice could be located in any given text. Endemic within Cicero's works is the problem of attempting to identify Cicero's own views with those expressed in his works.⁵¹ Toland acknowledges the extent to which Cicero's dissembling contributed to the obscurity of his own works, "quoniam non semper quid verè cogitarit, sed quid causa, tempus, locus, et auditores postularant, dicere consueverit"⁵² This was a particularly prevalent feature of the judicial speeches, in which Cicero was prepared to obscure or change his own views according to the requirements of a case; Toland illustrates this point with a passage in the *Pro Cluentio* in which Cicero admits that such pretence was a necessary constituent of the orator's role.⁵³ This was also a problem which recurred in the philosophical and rhetorical works, in particular those structured as dialogues. These works successfully obscured Cicero's own position on the question under discussion,

⁵⁰ *CI* p. 35: "for without these everything will be found most difficult to understand, and not read through with any profit"

⁵¹ The ramifications of these issues for religious discourse are discussed more fully in Chapter Five.

⁵² *CI* p. 35: "since he was not always accustomed to say what he truly thought, but what the case, time, place, and audience demanded"

⁵³ *CI* p. 36 (*Clu.* 139); cf. *Man.* 47-50, *Rab. Perd.* 29; *Verr.* II.4; *De Orat.* I.223-224. See also Lintott (2008) pp. 33-39 and Goar (1972) p. 73.

allowing generations of scholars to speculate on which character might represent Cicero's personal views, or whether the dialogue reflected an exercise in Academic Scepticism which permitted the omission of his own judgments entirely.⁵⁴ Toland particularly focussed on the problem of the dialogues in order to demonstrate how he would use synopses to clarify the text's meaning for his reader.

For example, in the work *De Divinatione* two characters are represented: Quintus, Cicero's brother, is portrayed using the Stoic stance to defend divination, while Marcus, Cicero himself, is depicted challenging the case for divination using strategies associated with Academic Scepticism. For Toland, there is no doubt that the character Marcus articulates Cicero's own views on the question of divination, and that the concluding sections of the second book represent Cicero's beliefs.⁵⁵ Toland argues that those sentiments expressed in *De Haruspicum Responsis* and *De Legibus* in defence of, or adherence to, divinatory practices and prodigies can be bracketed as the insincere stances Cicero was compelled to take according to his audience and purpose: *De Legibus* was a public work, thus he could not be seen to be criticising traditional Roman practice, and in *De Haruspicum Responsis* he was addressing the Senate in a bid to convince them on the matter of his house, and thus adapted his attitude accordingly.⁵⁶ These works did not reflect his true beliefs about these practices, unlike *De Divinatione*. In this work Cicero was writing for philosophers, and was thus able to reveal himself fully to his audience: his advertat

⁵⁴ For a summary of this debate in modern scholarship see Chapter Five.

⁵⁵ *CI* pp. 36-37, 38.

⁵⁶ *CI* pp. 36-37. Toland's distinction between public and private works somewhat suspicious, particularly the assumption that *De Legibus* was a 'public' work.

velim, eum in libris *de Divinatione* (qui, ipso pluries dicente, horum *de Natura Deorum* sunt tantummodo continuatio) larvam sibi apertè detrahere, ac eadem omnino suo ipsius nomine affirmare⁵⁷

In *De Natura Deorum* the problem of Cicero's voice is even more acute, as instead of his own name he uses three characters to present the different philosophical views on the nature of the Gods: Velleius the Epicurean, Balbus the Stoic, and Cotta the Academic. Toland's reading of the text once more leaves no room for prevarication: "nonne ipse Cotta ille est, seu Academicus, in libris *de Natura Deorum*?"⁵⁸ Toland feels confident in assuming that Cicero's own voice would be represented by the character presenting the case of the philosophical school to which Cicero himself belonged, namely the Academics. There is a problem for Toland's reading of *De Natura Deorum*; at the conclusion of book three, Cicero himself appears to join the discussion, and to conclude that of the three cases he has heard, that of the Stoics was most convincing.⁵⁹ Toland is ready with an explanation for this: "si aliquis (inquam) contentionis quàm veritatis cupidior, non videt clausulam hanc idem prorsus esse, ac apud recentiores librum paradoxum Catholicae, ut loquimur,

⁵⁷ *CI* pp. 37-38: "I would like him to notice that Cicero openly removes the mask from himself in the books of *De Divinatione* (which, as he often says to himself are only a continuation of the *De Natura Deorum*), and confirms the same things completely in his own name"

⁵⁸ *CI* p. 37: "surely he himself is Cotta, in other words the Academic, in these books?"

⁵⁹ *DND*.III.95.

Ecclesiae iudicio submittere...⁶⁰ Toland rejected this apparent affiliation of Cicero with the Stoic case as Cicero's attempting to adapt himself for his audience.

Toland intended to use the synopses to clarify an aspect of the text which continues even now to obscure the literal sense of the work: without access to Cicero's true voice, the reader will not be able to understand what the author of these works hoped to achieve.⁶¹ This indicates his acceptance that when obscured, the literal sense of the work needed to be elucidated for the reader if they were to appreciate the work fully.

iv. Elevating the reader over the Critic

In spite of Toland's acceptance of the principle of the philological commentary, he took the opportunity presented by *Cicero Illustratus* to criticise the conduct of its practitioners. Notwithstanding his protestations to the contrary, Toland continued his condemnation of the Critics as begun in the context of textual criticism, shifting its emphasis from their exploitation of that process to their exploitation of the commentary.⁶² Toland accuses the philological commentators of once more using this aspect of scholarship as a vehicle for displaying their own erudition: "sed absque

⁶⁰ *CI* p. 37: "if someone (I say) more eager for a fight than for the truth, did not see that this conclusion was entirely the same, as in more recent times to submit a heterodox book to the judgement of the Catholic Church, as we say..."

⁶¹ Fox (2007) pp. 293-296 claims that Toland was arguing here that Cicero's voice could not be located, and must be read as an exercise in Academic Scepticism, even while acknowledging that Toland identified Cicero's voice with that of Cotta, Marcus, and so on. It is in fact not that Toland believes Cicero's views cannot be found, but that care must be taken to ensure that they are identified correctly.

⁶² *CI* p. 52.

notis his Mythologicis, et Ciceronis, vel aliorum scriptorum, locis parallelis sive geminis, qua ratione (uti dixi) magnum librum, qui magnum saepenumero malum est, fabricare possent notarum Architecti?⁶³ He claims that such Critics fill the margins of their editions with an unnecessary mass of material so that their weight, both physically and intellectually, might be increased. This permits him another opportunity to indulge in a lengthy diatribe against the critics and their inappropriate desire for fame and praise.⁶⁴ The criticisms made of Hotman and Davies are part of this complaint: they each in their own way intruded unnecessary notes into passages not suffering from obscurity.

Toland was not alone in suspecting that these displays of erudition reflected a desire on the part of the editors to construct authority for themselves, or in his condemnation of their negative impact on the text. The concern that scholars expanded their commentary to enhance their own reputations was another feature of the debate between the Ancients and Moderns in the Battle of the Books.⁶⁵ Prominent figures among the Ancients exhibited a deep distaste for the practice of equipping the classical texts with extensive commentary. Temple identified a wish to elevate themselves above the text in the comments of philologists: for Philology, I know not well what to make of it; and less, how it came into the Number of Sciences: If it be only Criticism upon ancient Authors and Languages, he must be a Conjurer that can make those Moderns with their Comments, and Glossaries, and

⁶³ *CI* p. 56: but without these mythological notes, and parallel or twin passages of Cicero, or other writers, are Architects of notations able to construct a large book (as I have said), which is very often a large evil?

⁶⁴ *CI* pp. 57-58.

⁶⁵ Levine (1991) pp. 115-116.

Annotations, more learned than the Authors themselves in their own Languages, as well as the Subjects they treat⁶⁶ Temple identified it as the mark of a gentleman that he possessed intuitively the ability to appreciate the text, without the intrusion of external aids so favoured by the Moderns.⁶⁷

The method of the Moderns, seemingly the target of Toland's ire, was to explicate every detail of the text. This encouraged a fashion for extensive footnotes filled with numerous details.⁶⁸ Such a display of the work undertaken by the scholar, and their own erudition, invited the trust of the reader, and as a result authority for the ideas expressed. This approach was criticised by the Ancients for its encouragement of scholars to seek out every possible detail to explain and illustrate so as to meet this new standard, neglecting in the process to focus their attentions on the needs of their reader. Swift does not neglect an opportunity to mock the conduct of these Critics, so concerned for the expanse of their commentary, in a 'Digression in the Modern Kind': 'now, for myself, I profess to be of the former Sort; and therefore having the *modern* Inclination to expatiate upon the Beauty of my own Productions, and display the bright Parts of my Discourse; I thought best to do it in the Body of the Work, where, as it now lies, it makes a very considerable Addition to the Bulk of the Volume, a Circumstance by no means to be neglected by a skilful Writer⁶⁹ The attacks made on Critics and philologists were therefore driven by the belief that the

⁶⁶ Temple, *Miscellanea* III.299

⁶⁷ Levine (1991) pp. 55-58; Walsh (2009) pp. 687-688; Most (2005) p. 742.

⁶⁸ Grafton (1997b) pp. 1-33, 114-115; Levine (1991) p. 205.

⁶⁹ Swift, *Tale of a Tub* p. 60.

extensive notes they favoured were in large part motivated by a desire to extend their own authority.

Toland's condemnation of this approach stems not only from his belief that it is further evidence of the vanity of the critics, but also from his contention that such an approach to commenting on the text does a great disservice to the reader. He reproduced the judgment of Roland Maresius in his *Epistolae Philologicae*, printed in 1650, on the matter: *quis ergo (ut cum Rolando Maresio querar) tot notas, tot observationes ferat? quousque tot variis, ac saepe vanis lectionibus omnes librorum margines implebuntur? in his enim parergis magna sit temporis jactura; quibus dum vacat juvenus, et circa voces haeret, res plerumque (quod praecipuum est) non satis attendit: et aliquando e manibus excutiuntur scriptores ipsi, antequam plenè sint perpensi et perlecti*⁷⁰ By explicating every single detail of the text, as opposed to solely those passages which truly required it, the philologists were hindering the opportunity for the reader to navigate and appreciate that text.

This was a sentiment also expressed strongly by Le Clerc in his *Parrhasiana*, in which he undertook to explain how philologists were making it impossible for young men to become educated in the classics. As Toland would later, Le Clerc called for short, clear and methodical notes for difficult passages, extending his own

⁷⁰ *CI* p. 56 (Maresius, *Epistolae Philologicae* I.17): *who then (as I complain with Roland Maresius) would tolerate so many notes, so many observations? For how much longer will all the margins of books be filled with so many varying and often useless readings? For in these extra ornaments is a great loss of time; and while they spend time on these things and are in difficulty concerning the words the youth generally does not attend carefully enough to the content (which is the most important thing): and sometimes the writers themselves were cast out of their hands, before they were fully weighed and read through carefully* Roland Maresius/Desmarets (1594-1653) wrote *R. Maresii Epistolarum philologicarum libri duo* in Paris, the first book published in 1650, the second in 1655 after his death; cf. Bravo (2006) pp. 179-180.

philological approach in biblical scholarship to classical scholarship.⁷¹ Le Clerc too regretted the extent to which the philologists had allowed their own motivations to overwhelm the interests of the reader: "when the Text of an Author is clear, they will often speak much and enlarge upon it; but when it is difficult and obscure they say nothing at all. There are some Criticks, who think it beneath them to make such Notes; they say that they are only good for young Men, and that those who have made some Progress, may easily be without æm: But neither of them is altogether true."⁷² Le Clerc, like Toland and Maresius, expressed concern for the needs of the reader when it came to commentary writing, a need they judged to have been neglected by the philological commentators.

Toland intended to explicate the text using philological exegesis, but only where the text truly required that intervention on account of obscurities emanating from its historicity or the way in which it was composed by its author. Anything beyond these necessities would make the text either inaccessible or difficult, or both, for the reader. Toland's rejection of this possibility, together with his wish to eliminate obscurities in the text, suggest that he was taking care to show that in his commentary, the reader would be his priority, not his own reputation.

III. The 'pedagogical' approach to the text

Toland not only seeks to discuss the benefits and flaws of the philological method of explaining the text, he also draws his reader's attention to the alternative method of illuminating the text's meaning by focussing on its significance and attempting to

⁷¹ Le Clerc, *Parrhasiana* p. 168.

⁷² Le Clerc, *Parrhasiana* p. 168. See Grafton (1997b) pp. 190-222.

communicate that significance to the reader, hence referred to here as the pedagogical commentary.

i. Interpreting the text

One particular commentary provokes Toland's ire sufficiently in the eighteenth chapter of *Cicero Illustratus* to become the focus of a series of criticisms: Franciscus Sylvius's commentary on Cicero's *Pro Cluentio*.⁷³ The commentaries composed by Sylvius certainly fall into the category of commentary identified above as explanatory; on almost every page a small portion of the Ciceronian text is overwhelmed by Sylvius's extensive notes, and each speech is equipped with a lengthy summary of its argument (see figure 3). The nature of the commentary Sylvius wrote is illustrated by the three examples which Toland isolates for criticism; these reveal a commentator seeking to equip the reader not only with the tools necessary to understand the literal sense of the text, but also with the guidance to appreciate the significance of specific elements of that text.

Toland begins with Sylvius's comment on the following excerpt from the *Pro Cluentio*: "quid ergo? Negasne illud iudicium esse corruptum? Non nego; sed ab hoc corruptum non esse confirmo. A quo igitur est corruptum? Opinor, primum, si incertum esset"⁷⁴ In this passage Cicero addresses the complaints of the prosecutors that his client Cluentius bribed the jury in the trial of Oppianicus, going on to offer

⁷³ Franciscus Sylvius of Amiens wrote numerous commentaries on Cicero's speeches (and the *Cato Maior*) in the 1530s and 1540s.

⁷⁴ *Clu.*63 (*CI* p. 53).

II.
 F. SYLVIVS CLARISSIMO VIRO IOANNI
 NI MORINO PARIISIENSIVM
 PROPRAETORI, S.

ARCVS TVLLIVS CICERO ADO

M lefcens multas causas priuatas ante hanc P. Quintii defenfio-
 nem fufcepit, fed eas (vt alias eiuſdem authoris multa s) aut
 iniuria temporis, aut inſcitia hominum perdidit: aut eas cer-
 tē Cicero ipſe nō edidit, quod magis probabile exiſtimo. Di-
 gnas enim arbitratus non eſt, quā in manus doctorum homi-
 num venirent. Hæc autem prima eſt earum, quæ editæ ha-
 beantur. Qua virum bonum, ſimplicem, parcum, multis vitæ ornamentis præ-
 ditum P. Quintium annos ſexaginta natum contra Sex. Næuii hominis impro-
 bi, potentis, malitioſi, fraudulentæ calumniam defendit. Ex qua oratione Ci-
 cero ſpecimen dedit, quātus orator futurus eſſet. In hanc orationem proximis
 his diebus Commētariis ſcripſimus, quos nomini tuo nuncupamus: propter
 ea quod tu cauſis non ſolū publicis, ſed etiam priuatis diiudicandis præfectus,
 huiuſmodi fraudes & calumnias, vt qui optimè, noſti. in his enim cauſis litiga-
 torum iniuria ſæpe verſantur. Quocirca huius orationis Commētariis aliqua
 ex parte illuſtrata lectionem arbitror tibi fore iucūdiorem. In bonam partem
 vt accipias oro te & obſecro. Vale, Pariſiis, ex ſchola Tornaca, die IX men-
 ſis Septembris, M. D. XXXII.

F. SYLVII AMBIANI IN ORATIONEM CIC.
 PRO P. QUINTIO, ARGVMENTVM.

C AIVS Quintius Publij frater earum rerum quas in Gallia Narbonenſi habebat,
 ſocietatem fecit cū Sex. Næuii præcone. Multis annis poſt Quintius in Gallia mo-
 riens fratrem hæredem facit. P. Quintius in Galliam venit, ibi cum Næuii annū vi-
 xit familiariter. Eo toto tempore Næuius nullam fecit mentionē pecuniam ſibi de-
 bitam eſſe à C. Quintio. Suſpicatus eſt P. Quintius Næuium aliquod ſibi ex ſocieta-
 te debere. Eum igitur appellauit, vt quod deberet diſſolueret. Vt res quā primū & quā minima cū
 moleſtia tranſigaretur, arbitros ſumpſerunt, qui de re decidere non potuerūt. Res in iudicium allata eſt.
 dilata ſæpe vadimonia ſunt. Biennio poſt C. Quintij mortem Næuius dicit velle ſe omni lite deſiſtere, &
 ſiquid agere ſecum Quintius velit, ſe non recuſare. Qua ratione vterque ſoluit vadimonium. Nō mul-
 to poſt Quintius rem Gallicanam reuſit. Id vbi reſciuit Næuius, tanquam vocatus in ius Quintius va-
 dimonium ſibi promiſſiſſet, obit vadimonium, à Prætorè Burrieno vt Quintij bona ex edicto poſtulare
 liceat, petit, quia vadimonium deſeruerit. Ea proſcribit. Sex. Alphenus Quintij procurator impedit quo-
 minus Quintij bona vendantur. Aduentum Quintij expectandum dicit, eūque Id. Septemb. ſiſti pro-
 mittit. Quintius ad diem præſtitutum reuerſus eſt. Duos annos quieſcit Næuius. Tandem à Cn. Dol-
 bella Prætorè poſtulat, vt ſibi Quintius iudicatu ſolui ſatiſſet, quod eius bona ex edicto Prætoris Bur-
 riene XXX. dies Romæ poſſeſſa eſſent. Quintiū aut ſatiſdare, aut ſponſionē facere Dolabella iubet. Spō-
 ſionem facere Quintius maluit. C. Aquilius iudicem ſumpſit. Quintium Cicero defendens, in hac de-
 fenſione tria oſtēdit. Primū cauſam nō fuiſſe, cur Næuius à Prætorè Burrieno poſtularer, vt bona Quin-
 tij poſſideret, quod ei Quintius nihil debuerit: & quanuis ei debuiffet, nullum ei promiſſiſſe vadimonium:
 itaque non deſeruiſſe. Deinde Næuium ex edicto Prætoris Quintij bona poſſidere non potuiſſe, quia
 Quintius quum proſectus in Galliam eſt, proſectus non eſt, vt Næuium fraudaret. Romæ enim procu-
 ratorem Sex. Alphenum reliquit, qui proſcriptionis libellos deiecit, vadimonium pro Quintio promi-
 ſit, quin pro Quintio iudicium acciperet nō recuſauit. Poſtremo, Næuium Quintij bona non poſſediſ-
 ſe, quod edicto cautum ſit, ne dominus inuito detrudatur, quod omnia bona non poſſederit. Poſtea Ci-
 cero per enumerationem capita repetit eorum quæ in probatione dixit. Poſtremo concludit per cōmiſe
 rationem. In exordio oſtēdit quā ſibi ſit hæc defenſio difficilis, contra magnam Næuii gratiam, &
 ſummā Hortenſij eloquentiæ: quod hæc cauſa ſibi familiariter cognita nō ſit, quod ante accuſatorē agere
 cogatur. Genus cauſæ iudiciale eſt. Status cōiecturalis. Cauſa priuata eſt. Accuſatores ſunt Q.
 Hortenſius & L. Philippus: Cicero defenſor. Hæc autē cauſa acta eſt anno quarto ſerè exacto poſt C.
 Quintij mortem. Hæc actam eſſe M. Tullio & Cn. Dolabella Coſs. Cicerone annos ſex & viginti nato,
 A. Gellius cap. xxvij. libri. xv. author eſt. Hanc ſuſcepit victus precibus Q. Roſcij tomædi.

A ij

Figure 3. Sylvius, *Orationes*

three reasons why it is implausible that Cluentius bribed that jury, rather than Oppianicus himself. Sylvius added a note to the passage which paraphrased these explanations given by Cicero for why it was more likely that Oppianicus had bribed the jury than Cluentius. Presumably Sylvius's intention in this note was to clarify for the reader the exact nature of the argument being made by Cicero. Toland rejects the necessity of such a note entirely, on the basis that it merely repeats what might be read more clearly and concisely in the speech, in Cicero's own words. Indeed, in Toland's view the only possible explanation for such a note can be a wish by the editor to fill up all available space: *tales notationes quid aliud sunt, nisi supervacanea textus in margine iteratio? ubi tamen superfluum nihil, aut longè petitum inesse debuit. Sed quomodo aliter fieri poterat, si grande volumen omnino conficere statuit Sylvius, aut notulas ubique indiscriminatim congerere sui esse officii, ad aliorum instar, existimavit?*⁷⁵ The implication of Sylvius's approach was that there were occasions on which the text required the intervention of an interpreter, that the meaning was not accessible to the reader independently. The suggestion of such an overtly interpretative role for the editor was soundly rejected by Toland, and the reasons for this become clear with the other two examples selected by Toland from Sylvius's *Pro Cluentio* commentary.

The next passage Toland selects for criticism is as follows: *nemo est enim qui invidiae, sine vestro ac sine talium virorum praesidio, possit resistere*⁷⁶ Forming

⁷⁵ *CI* p. 53: *what else are such notations, except unnecessary repetition of the text in the margin? Where nothing unnecessary or far-fetched ought to be included. But how could it have happened otherwise, if Sylvius determined to complete a great volume by any means, or he thought that it was his duty to pile up little notes from everywhere without discrimination, on the model of others?*

⁷⁶ *Clu.3 (CI p. 54).*

part of the speech's *exordium*, in this passage Cicero addresses the jury, suggesting to them that a guilty verdict for Cluentius would imply prejudice on their part, a favoured means of manipulation by Cicero. Sylvius takes the opportunity to focus on the moral implications of this statement on prejudice, rather than its rhetorical implications. He makes the moral point that prejudice is an evil attribute, and supports this with a general reflection on the nature and origins of prejudice, reinforced by a reference to a passage in Aristotle's *Ethics* which makes a similar point. Toland rejects such a comment as both unnecessary to the comprehension of the text, and out of place in the context of commentary, being more suitable to a monograph on ethics. This passage prompts the following pledge: *omnes ergo morales illi loci communes, qui maximam partem Annotationum in imperfecta Graevii editione adsolvunt (ut et aliorum Criticorum, qui in istam congeriem non sunt admissi, centones) ex nostra prorsus sine ulla gratia aut exceptione ejicientur, cum de legentium captu liberalius multo sentiamus*⁷⁷ The interpretative role of the editor already rejected by Toland is here used by Sylvius to suggest that there was a significant moral point in this passage, one which requires his intervention to draw out and illustrate to the reader if they are to appreciate it.

The third comment taken from Sylvius's *Pro Cluentio* deals with the following phrase used by Cicero in an address to the jury: *pro vestra humanitate*⁷⁸ As Sylvius points out in his note, this is the type of comment Cicero often insinuated

⁷⁷ *CI* p. 54: *Therefore all the universal morals of this passage, which constitute the greatest portion of the Annotations in the unfinished edition of Graevius (as also the patchworks of other Critics, who were not admitted into that mass) shall be thrown right out of our edition without any favour or exception, since we have a much more generous estimate of the capacities of our readers*

⁷⁸ *Clu.*29 (*CI* p. 54).

into his speeches to flatter the jury, thereby making them more amenable to both himself and his client. It is a common feature of the more extensive explanatory comments to delve beneath what is immediately clear in a Ciceronian speech and identify the rhetorical lesson behind it, so as to provide the reader with instruction in rhetorical composition. Toland, however, sees no place for such expansion of the significance of the text in a commentary, dismissing the necessity of such a comment: "quasi Rhetoricae praecepta tradere, non Ciceronianos exsolvere nodos teneretur"⁷⁹ Toland once more rejects an attempt by Sylvius to identify in the text a point not immediately obvious, but which with his interpretation can be deployed for the education of the reader.

These passages serve as examples of an approach to commentary writing which seeks to elucidate the significance of the text for the contemporary reader so that they might more effectively learn from the text. Necessary to this method of exegesis is the commentator's incarnation as the interpreter of the text on the reader's behalf. Such efforts to impose supplementary meanings onto the text which were instructive to the reader were features of one of the primary forms of explanatory commentary in evidence in scholarship: the pedagogical commentary. Commentators who undertook a pedagogical approach to the text sought to ensure that text became a vehicle for the education of moral young men capable of conducting a public career. They wanted the reader to draw every possible meaning from the text which might enhance their moral, literary and rhetorical education.⁸⁰

⁷⁹ *CI* p. 54: "as if he was bound to teach the rules of Rhetoric, not to solve Ciceronian difficulties"

⁸⁰ Grafton (1985) pp. 627-629. Moss (1999) pp. 66-76 describes the efforts made by commentators on Horace's *Ars Poetica* to draw from it literary instruction. See Feld (1978) p. 98 on Erasmus's use of the commentary to direct the reader towards lessons in the text; cf. Grafton (1997a) p. 154.

With this aim in mind, commentaries needed to emphasise for the reader the ideas worth imitating, and elucidate the obscured values of the text, so that the reader could be left in no doubt of what they should be learning from the work.⁸¹ This could be achieved by such means as paraphrase and the introduction of digressions on broader questions loosely related to the text. The interpretative efforts of Sylvius, as refuted by Toland, fall into this category, with their attempts to point out to the reader not only the moral and rhetorical lessons that might be drawn from the text, but also the need for the commentator to act as an interpreter of that text for its full value to be appreciated. In this, Sylvius continues a lengthy tradition in Ciceronian commentary writing, most fully exemplified by Camerarius' efforts to direct his commentaries towards rhetorical education.

In order to be effective, the pedagogical commentary had to adhere to the principle that the text had a second level of meaning, an allegorical sense. The literal sense only provided the first, most obvious, example of the meaning of the text; beyond that were additional meanings not immediately obvious, but which could be interpreted by the initiated.⁸² As a theory of interpretation this was strongly associated with biblical exegesis in the Middle Ages, when it was applied to pagan texts so as to draw from them a meaning more suitable to Christian theology.⁸³ Its influence was maintained into the Renaissance, and extended into classical

⁸¹ Jeanneret (1999) pp. 36-38.

⁸² Grafton (1985) pp. 627-629.

⁸³ Bolgar (1954) pp. 216-229; Champion (2006a) pp. 213-221. See Jeanneret (1999) p. 36 and Häring (1982) pp. 195-199 on the four levels of meaning granted to the Bible in medieval exegesis.

scholarship.⁸⁴ This is most apparent in the context of pagan mythology, in particular Ovid's *Metamorphoses* or similar works, in which the stories and the images they contained were read as fables with a Christian moral lesson concealed beneath the pagan dressings.⁸⁵ Tacitus was also subject to the sort of allegorical interpretation evident in Sylvius' *Pro Cluentio*, as across the seventeenth century his history was not only identified as a source of moral instruction, but also valued for the lessons it contained useful to the conduct of contemporary politics.⁸⁶ This concept that the text might have additional levels of meaning beyond the immediate provided the means by which commentators who wished to direct the text to functions for which it was not initially intended, such as rhetorical and moral instruction, could achieve those ends.

ii. Classical hermeneutics

The success of the pedagogical commentary required acceptance of another hermeneutical tradition: the principle of the classical reading. This was an approach to reading which located the value of the text in its relevance to the contemporary reader, as opposed to the historic reading's emphasis on the distance of the text from the contemporary reader.⁸⁷ Ancient texts were not foreign entities tied to the context in which they were produced, a distance which made their content irrelevant to the conduct of the immediate reader, but depositories of knowledge so powerful that it is

⁸⁴ Grafton (1997a) pp. 163-167; Seznec (1981) pp. 95-99; Murrin (1980) pp. ix-xii, 173-196.

⁸⁵ Moss (1982) pp. 44-53. Myth in Homer was also heavily allegorised, a tradition mocked by Pope in *The Dunciad*; cf. Levine (1991) p. 206 and Murrin (1980) pp. 177-179.

⁸⁶ Burke (1969a) pp. 156-163.

⁸⁷ Grafton (1985) pp. 627-629.

timeless. It was this stress on the eternal relevance of the ancient texts that permitted them to be read for the education of the contemporary reader.

As was the case with the historic reading, the on-going influence of the classical reading was in large part due to those elements within classical scholarship which continued to advocate it, namely the Ancients. While the Moderns had understood the purpose of reading classical texts to be historical, the Ancients maintained the classical belief that those texts should be read for the useful knowledge they contained.⁸⁸ Gentlemen, when reading the classics, sought out the lessons and examples of good conduct which they might then imitate in their own lives. As this was the purpose of their reading, they had minimal use for all the apparatus of modern scholarship, a sentiment imaginatively expressed by Henry Felton in 1709: Learning is dressed to a great Disadvantage, by Critics and Grammarians; like a beautiful Lady ill-painted, she maketh a frightful Figure: And then she is cloistered up, my Lord, like a Fairy Princess in an enchanted Castle, encompassed with Motes and Walls, and guarded by *Paynim* Knights, monstrous Giants, and burning Dragons. But my Lord, if a Man hath but Wit and Courage enough not to be daunted at these grim Appearances, the Charm is dissolved, the Bugbears vanish, and the Way is open.⁸⁹ The Ancients felt that the paraphernalia of modern scholarship separated the reader from the text, particularly by emphasising the historical distance between author and reader, and hence hindered the engagement necessary to benefit from its

⁸⁸ Patey (2005) pp. 50-51; Scodel (1999) pp. 543-544; Levine (1991) p. 46.

⁸⁹ Felton, *Dissertation* pp. 49-50.

content.⁹⁰ The concern of the Ancients was therefore to facilitate the reader's ability to acquire useful knowledge from the text.

This approach to hermeneutics was also perpetuated by the conflicts dominating the field of biblical scholarship. It was in the Church's interest to counter the increasingly influential efforts to treat the Bible as an historical document. The Bible's significance for the Anglican Church had been ensured by Protestants during the Reformation, when it was established as a source of religious knowledge intended to rival the Pope himself.⁹¹ Developments in scholarship saw the gradual erosion of the authority of the Scripture; the tools of philology were used to challenge the authenticity of numerous passages in the Bible, passages which often had immense doctrinal importance for the established Church. It was of the utmost importance to the Church that the continued relevance of the Scripture was championed. It produced innumerable commentaries and guides to reading which were designed to show the extent to which the teachings of the Bible continued to be integral to the moral well-being of society, as long as it was read for that purpose.⁹² The Church advocated the classical approach to reading because it ensured the ongoing power of the Bible in contemporary society.

This campaign proved highly controversial, as it was not only the power of the Bible which was strengthened, but the influence of the Church and its clergy. If

⁹⁰ Levine (1991) p. 119. See Dryden's 1697 edition of Virgil for the standard Ancient approach to presenting the text; cf. Levine (1999) pp. 115-116.

⁹¹ Hall (1963) pp. 38-48, 76-78; Preus (2001) pp. 17-20; Sharpe (2003) p. 123.

⁹² On the commentaries produced to direct the laity's reading of the Bible discussed here see particularly Champion (2006a) pp. 208-230, also Preus (2001) pp. 1-6, 17-20, 22-31, Sharpe (2003) pp. 122-126, 146-147 and Israel (2001) pp. 447-456.

those reading the Bible were to appreciate fully the lessons contained therein, clerical interpreters argued, the spiritual sense of its words would need to be interpreted for them. This spiritual sense was essentially allegorical; it was a secondary meaning which required inspiration or the special understanding of the clergy to be deciphered. As the only ones with the means to comprehend the spiritual sense of the Bible, the clergy therefore became indispensable to the laity if they were to fully appreciate the words of God. The fact that this contradicted some of the fundamental ideals underpinning the Reformation was not lost on heterodox figures such as Toland. The close association between the classical reading and the pedagogical commentary was thus enforced by the biblical criticism of the Church.

The extent to which orthodox interpreters called upon this hermeneutical strategy to reinforce their authority and their necessity to the lay reader inevitably provoked a reaction against this hermeneutic practice amongst the heterodox. This reaction manifested itself in two primary forms: the rejection of the idea that the true sense of the Scripture was inaccessible to the lay reader, and the increasingly fervent assault on Revelation, which represented the epitome of this practice. Locke represents one aspect of this reaction, when in his *Reasonableness of Christianity* he extensively made the case against a hidden and inaccessible meaning in the text, arguing instead that the fundamentals of Christian truth were accessible to anyone who read the Gospels. Subsequently Anthony Collins, in his *Discourses on Free-thinking* in 1713, made a more explicitly heterodox case by challenging the allegorical interpretations made of Old Testament prophecy, and denouncing them as attempts by the clergy to accrue authority for themselves. The attack on Revelation which dominated seventeenth century theological debate drew heavily on the argument that

the Bible was a text like any other, and thus should require no special inspiration or theological knowledge for its meaning to be accessible.

Toland numbered amongst those heterodox writers who reacted against the use of this hermeneutical principle by the Church, judging it to be an attempt to enhance their own power. His contempt for the idea that there was a spiritual meaning obscured in the Bible is a recurring theme of his works, but appeared most explicitly in *Christianity not Mysterious* in which he argued for the right of the individual to read and understand the Scripture without interpretative guidance from the Church.⁹³ Toland continually made clear his wish to liberate readers from the authority of Church and state as interpreters on their behalf; this was the basis of his questioning of Revelation, and of the Scriptural canon.⁹⁴

For an example of how Toland directly tackled cases of allegorical interpretation in the Scripture, his treatment of the Mosaic tradition once more provides an interesting case. In 1720 as part of the work *Tetradymus* Toland published an essay entitled *Hodegus: or, The Pillar of Cloud and Fire not Miraculous*.⁹⁵ In this essay Toland addressed the extent to which the clergy worked to control understanding of the Old Testament, lamenting that the reader must still for the most part read them with the spectacles of their own Priests, and guess at their meaning by certain rules of these Priest's framing.⁹⁶ Toland's example of this practice is the interpretation

⁹³ Champion (2003) p. 190; Berman (1997) pp. 224-225; McGuinness (1997) p. 231; Clarke (1997) pp. 293-302.

⁹⁴ Sharpe (2003) p. 136; Champion (2003) p. 69; Daniel (1984) p. 121.

⁹⁵ This essay was originally written for Prince Eugene in 1710.

⁹⁶ Toland, 'Hodegus' *Tetradymus* p. 5.

traditionally given to *Exodus* XIII.21 in which a pillar of cloud and fire guide Moses and the Israelites through the desert. In the orthodox tradition, this pillar was interpreted as the miraculous hand of God. Toland instead worked to develop the meaning of this image in its literal sense: understanding it as a Pillar of *Smoke*, and not a real *Cloud*, that guided the Israelites in the wilderness; and that they were not two (as most believød) but one and the same Pillar, directing their march with the *Cloud* of its *Smoke* by day, and with the *Light* of its *Fire* by night⁹⁷ Thus all manner of prophecy and allegorical sense to this image was stripped by Toland, leaving only a literal image, accessible to all.

For those classical or biblical scholars who wished to make the case that the text under examination held relevance for the modern reader, the principle of an allegorical sense in the text was fundamental. It was in the allegorical sense that the deeper meaning and significance of the text, the aspect of the text often intended to instruct the reader, was located. The controversial nature of the allegorical reading emanated from the need for an interpreter to identify and communicate this meaning to the reader. The authority and influence thus granted to the interpreter inevitably provoked a response, as had been the case in biblical scholarship.

iii. Defying the interpreter

This was particularly true of Toland, whose hostility to the idea that any text necessitated an interpreter to be fully appreciated was amply apparent not only in his works on biblical scholarship, but in *Cicero Illustratus*. In spite of the theoretical justifications for this approach to identifying meaning in the texts, Toland's critique

⁹⁷ Toland, *Hodegusø Tetradyms* p. 6.

of Sylviusø efforts made clear his rejection of the pedagogical interpretation in commentary writing.

In addition, Tolandø hostility to interpreters is demonstrated in the context of his efforts to locate the true voice of Cicero for his reader. He accuses the interpreters of the texts of using their position between the reader and Cicero to assign to Cicero views that were not in fact his own in the dialogues: *sed exactissimè hoc in Dialogis animadvertendum est, quoniam ad ea, quae ex diametro cum veris ipsius sentiis pugnant, confirmanda, vulgò allegantur; quasi sufficeret, nulla loquentis ratione habitâ, ut hoc vel illud in Cicerone offendatur*⁹⁸ If the reader himself was not enlightened as to the difference in the text between the true voice of Cicero and Ciceroø efforts to either protect his reputation or present the alternative point of view, he would be forced to take on trust the interpreterø judgment of what Cicero himself believed in any given work. Evidently, Toland felt that this granted far too great an opportunity to interpreters to mislead the reader for their own ends, and sought to provide the means for the reader to be able to judge the ideas contained within the text for themselves. This is again stated in the context of his discussion of Ciceroø true voice: *non quòd sollicitus sim quænam fuerit Ciceronis de ulla re sententia (cùm nullius in verba jurandum censeam) sed ut criticè tantùm et historicè lecturis de vera ipsius mente, seu erraverit necne, constaret*⁹⁹ It is by the means of

⁹⁸ *CI* p. 36: *but this should be noticed particularly in the Dialogues, since these are commonly cited, in order to confirm things, which are diametrically opposed to his true opinions; as if it were sufficient, that this or that was stumbled upon in Cicero, without taking into account who was speaking*

⁹⁹ *CI* pp. 38-39: *not because I am worried about what the opinion of Cicero was about any matter (since I do not believe one should swear allegiance to the words of any man) but so that it should be*

these synopses that all the dissembling of the critics, the efforts of those critics to interpose themselves between the meaning of the text and the reader which so frustrated Toland, could be subverted.

Toland rejected an approach to reading the texts which first imposed additional meanings on that text, and then by doing so implied that an interpreter of the text was necessary if its full meaning and value was to be understood. He condemned entirely in biblical scholarship the attempt to forge an obstacle between the reader and the text, and *Cicero Illustratus* shows that this was a sentiment he maintained in the context of classical scholarship. In this, Toland's defence of the reader's right to an independent hermeneutic is evident. For Toland, it was fundamental that a reader should be able to understand the meaning of a text for themselves, rather than understand that meaning as communicated by another. He argued that if a reader did not understand something, they could not truly believe it.¹⁰⁰ Throughout his works he championed the right of the individual to engage with texts, in particular the Bible, independently, so that their own reason may be exercised in achieving comprehension.¹⁰¹ In the biblical context, it was this notion which allowed Toland to claim that he was not attempting to destroy religion, but actually to enhance its connection with the people by reinforcing their faith through this hermeneutic principle.

clear to anyone, provided they read critically and historically, what his true opinion was, whether he went astray or not

¹⁰⁰ This is an attitude to belief that can be traced to Grotius's *De veritate* and Le Clerc's 1709 edition of that work; cf. Champion (2012) pp. 119-143.

¹⁰¹ Toland, *Socinianism Truly Stated* (1705), *Christianity not Mysterious* p. 139.

Facilitating the reader's ability to interact with and access the true meaning of the text is the most important aim of the commentator, anything which hinders this interaction must be overcome. Toland makes a case in *Cicero Illustratus* for encouraging an independent hermeneutic for the reader which is echoed throughout his works: if a reader is to fully appreciate the meaning of a work, they must understand it for themselves.

IV. Conclusion

Toland's engagement with the Ciceronian commentary tradition in *Cicero Illustratus*, together with the aims he identified for his own efforts, demonstrate that he perceived the need for explanatory notes to extend beyond the formation of the text, and into enabling the reader's comprehension of the meaning of that text. When Toland's proposals are examined more closely, he can be perceived responding to two different approaches to commentary writing, and the scholarly stances they represent: one which seeks to explain the text's literal meaning to the reader, and one which seeks to interpret the text's significance for the reader, primarily so that the reader could learn from the text. When dealing with the first, Toland's response in his biblical scholarship and in *Cicero Illustratus* demonstrates that while he adheres to this approach in principle, he is concerned by the way in which it is conducted by Critics more concerned for their own reputation than the needs of the reader. Toland rejects entirely the second approach, due to the way in which it makes an interpreter of the text for the reader a necessity, thereby eliminating the possibility of the reader establishing an independent hermeneutic and judging the meaning of the text for themselves.

In his treatment of each approach to commentary writing, Toland takes pains to put his concern for the reader at the forefront of his treatment of each theory. The explicit aim of Toland's discussion of commentaries, then, was to use the appropriate tools to eradicate the true obscurities in the text, so that the reader's own judgment and reason was elevated, allowing them to interact with the text freely. This would serve his broader aim of rehabilitating Cicero by facilitating the reader's understanding of the text, supposedly diminishing the power of the editor to control or influence the reader's comprehension. The implicit result of this is again significant; Toland as editor would continue to exercise his judgement to decide which obscurities needed to be clarified, and what the reader required to understand the text. The ramifications of this are most apparent in Toland's discussion of Cicero's voice; even as he claimed to be allowing the reader to engage with Cicero's true voice, and preventing the manipulations of its obscurity by other scholars, he was exercising his own influence to determine where Cicero's true voice was located for the reader. Toland continued to construct a scholarly defence of his methods based around minimising the interpretative role of the editor, which served to obscure his own interpretative interferences.

CONCLUSION TO SECTION ONE

Toland claimed that the edition proposed in *Cicero Illustratus* was intended to rehabilitate Cicero's reputation, so that he might once more assume a position of influence in early modern intellectual and political culture. The examination contained in these chapters of Toland's plans, and the scholarly arguments he deployed to justify those plans, appear to confirm his claim. The reputation of Cicero himself would be repaired by making Cicero's own explanations of his actions available to the reader, allowing him to serve as a model for political conduct. This apparently uncritical approach to the historical evidence was supported with arguments drawn from the scholarship of both Ancients and Moderns, which framed it in terms of the pursuit of historical truth. Affection for Cicero's works was to be restored by freeing the text of all the unnecessary accoutrements, shown to be potentially damaging in a survey of contemporary scholarly methods, and by making the author the primary determinant in decisions regarding textual criticism. The influence of Cicero's works was to be re-established by allowing their meaning to be fully appreciated by the reader, a goal which would direct the composition of notes to accompany the text. Throughout *Cicero Illustratus* the scholarly arguments, and the methods they are used to validate, are directed towards limiting the role of the editor, so that Cicero's voice might be liberated from the editors and scholars and made accessible to the reader. This was how Toland proposed to restore Cicero to his former influence.

This account reveals only part of Toland's goal in writing *Cicero Illustratus*, for while the scholarly strategies utilised in the work serve the purpose of legitimising

the means by which he hoped to achieve his explicit aim of rehabilitating Cicero, they also had an implicit result for Toland himself. In spite of his apparent efforts to limit the influence of the editor over the author, his arguments in fact authorised him to exercise his judgement over his subject. The methods Toland presents in *Cicero Illustratus* shift the emphasis away from the editor by advancing the importance of authorial intention, and seeking to locate his truth in that intention.¹ This necessitates Toland as editor to act as the interpreter of Cicero's intention, so that it may be presented to the reader. Throughout *Cicero Illustratus* Toland is implicitly constructing authority for his knowledge and understanding of Cicero, and for his ability to judge Cicero's intentions and to allow that judgement to direct his presentation of Cicero. This was Toland's particular *ingenium* as editor; it was his skill to identify the real Cicero and allow that identification to direct his conduct as editor. Toland seeks cultural influence and authority for the real Cicero, while simultaneously developing himself as the arbiter of this real Cicero.

Cicero Illustratus therefore provides an important insight into Toland's relationship with scholarship. Toland recognised that authority could be constructed from scholarly arguments, and engagement with contemporary scholarly debates, and exploited the opportunity this presented. The authority seemingly developed for his editorial methods was simultaneously enabling his ability to influence and control the Ciceronian tradition. Justin Champion has demonstrated that such exploitation of erudition was a prominent feature of Toland's engagement with

¹ See Skinner (1972) pp. 393-408 and McLaverty (1984) p. 122 on the role of authorial intention in interpretation of texts.

biblical scholarship.² Champion has shown that Toland manipulated the scholarly sources of authority in biblical scholarship until they became a weapon in his clandestine works. The exploitation of erudition in evidence in *Cicero Illustratus* was therefore not without precedent, in fact confirming the nature of Toland's engagement with scholarship.

This explanation of Toland's approach to editing in *Cicero Illustratus* reveals the fundamental flaw in Matthew Fox's account.³ In his reading of the work, Fox accepts Toland's claims to be reproducing Cicero without editorial intervention at face value. He argues that Toland's reading of Cicero reveals an appreciation of Cicero's rhetoric which would be eradicated in the decades following, an argument based on Toland's claims concerning the presentation of Cicero's voice. Fox's reading of *Cicero Illustratus* further allows him to claim that the essential purpose of the work was to endorse this approach to engaging with Cicero and his works, an approach intended to assist the relationship between Cicero and his readers. The implications of Toland's strategy are not elucidated. The absence of any in-depth consideration of John Toland or the significance of the scholarly methods *Cicero Illustratus* endorses permits only a superficial engagement with the purpose of the work.

This examination of the purpose of *Cicero Illustratus*, and Toland's use of scholarship to achieve that purpose, revealed the nature of that scholarship: it was fundamentally humanist. The theme uniting Toland's approach to each aspect of the editorial project was the wish to elevate the classical text and its author, to recover

² Champion (2003) pp. 190-210, (2006b) pp. 111-141.

³ Fox (2007) pp. 274-303.

their importance to contemporary culture, and to liberate them from anything which might detract from or inhibit their value, most notably the critical tendencies of modern scholarship. Toland sought to diminish the power of the scholar and editor, so that the authority of the classical text might be restored. In seeking to achieve this, Toland was willing to engage with both sides of the Battle of the Books, in accordance with the case made by Giuntini. While in principle his approach cohered with the ideas of the Ancients, seeking to liberate the classical text from the pedantic critics and restore its authority, he was also able to engage some of the methods of the Moderns, within certain limitations. In *Cicero Illustratus* Toland was able to bridge the gap between Ancients and Moderns, demonstrating that their approaches were not mutually exclusive, and that the development of modern scholarship did not prohibit humanist scholarship. *Cicero Illustratus* therefore confirms the on-going influence of humanism; in the next section of this thesis, when the broader function of *Cicero Illustratus* is elaborated, the role of humanism in early modern intellectual history will therefore also be illuminated.

In *Cicero Illustratus* Toland had to construct himself as an editor. In many ways, he proved himself ill-equipped for the task: his handling of the variant readings he selected for discussion was erratic at best, and he offered no indications of how he intended to tackle the practicalities of editing, such as the manuscripts he proposed to use. It is in fact plausible that he never intended to complete the edition, a suspicion only enforced by the revelation at the conclusion of *Cicero Illustratus* that his main aim in completing the edition was the enhancement of his Latin so that he may write a history of the recent conflicts in Europe.⁴ Why then go to these lengths in *Cicero*

⁴ *CI* pp. 67-73.

Illustratus to construct authority for Cicero, and for himself as an interpreter of Cicero? This is the question I intend to address in the next section of this thesis.

SECTION TWO

TOLANDIAN CICERONIANISM

INTRODUCTION TO SECTION TWO

I. Cicero in Toland's works

The previous section demonstrated that Toland went to some considerable lengths to authorise himself as an interpreter of Cicero; this allowed him legitimate control over the 'true' Cicero he had identified for the reader. It remains to determine precisely why Toland sought to achieve this end in *Cicero Illustratus*, and its consequences for Toland's project. This section will attempt to address these questions by examining the significance of Cicero to the formation and expression of Toland's thought in his broader corpus.

At the beginning of *Cicero Illustratus* Toland said of his own relationship with Cicero that 'Ciceronem mihi semper talem fore, qualis Ciceroni extiterat Plato'¹ It is, he explains, this personal engagement with Cicero evident in his writings which motivated an associate to encourage him to undertake the proposed editorial project. For Toland, Cicero was a figure to be admired, whose actions could be consistently referred to for guidance in one's own conduct. Toland demonstrated this throughout his works, revealing on many occasions a sense that he identified himself with Cicero, that he sought to forge a link between Cicero and himself. In *The Art of Governing by Partys* (1701), for example, Toland introduces a quote from the twelfth *Philippic* with the statement that 'Cicero, who (making a due Allowance for Times and Persons) engag'd in the same work that I do now'² When not imagining himself as Cicero, Toland would identify the efforts of his allies with the work of

¹ *CI* p. 3: 'as Plato was for Cicero, so Cicero will always be for me'

² Toland, *Art of Governing* p. 178.

Cicero, as he did with Robert Molesworth: in like manner, MY LORD, that excellent work, wherein you have made such progress, and which seems to resemble so nearly *CICERO de Republica*, will be a nobler task, and more useful to mankind, than any Senatorial efforts³ Throughout his works Toland emphasised his deep personal affection and respect for Cicero.

This particular affinity with Cicero in Toland's works ensured that his presence was a consistent fixture. *Cicero Illustratus* indeed is not the only work which features Cicero as its primary subject. In 1714, Toland produced a translation of *The Art of Canvassing at Elections*, written for Cicero by his brother Quintus. This work further represented Toland's goal to see Ciceronian material used for the education of contemporary men, as he described in the preface to the translation his hope that it would provide guidance to the men seeking success in the forthcoming elections. Toland also wrote a brief essay entitled *Conjectura verosimilis, de prima Typographiae Inventione*, which was only published in 1726 in the posthumous collection edited by Pierre Des Maizeaux. In this essay Toland drew upon the Ciceronian evidence to discuss the dissemination of texts following the invention of printing. It is, however, in Cicero's role as a source and exemplar in Toland's general works that Toland's engagement with Cicero is deployed most conspicuously.

As described in the introduction to this thesis, Toland disseminated his thought in a variety of literary forms, encompassing poetry, political tracts, works of biblical scholarship, philosophical treatises, and editorial efforts. Toland's extensive use of Cicero permeates throughout these different genres. In the poem *Clito*, written in

³ *Collection* II.492.

1700 as both a celebration of William III and an attempt to advise him on his conduct, Cicero's counsel concerning the importance of eloquence to the statesman is prominent from the quote from *De Oratore* on the title-page to the celebrations of oratorical prowess throughout the poem itself. In the political works, from *Militia Reform'd* in 1698 to *The State-Anatomy* in 1717, Cicero is repeatedly invoked, whether as a source of advice, as an example of appropriate conduct, or as an allegory for Toland's own efforts in any given work.⁴ Toland's familiarity with Cicero is deployed throughout the scholarly and philosophical works, both as evidence of Toland's own classical learning, and as a source for doctrines and arguments which constitute the bedrock of his arguments.⁵ In the editions, the key figures of seventeenth century political thought are aligned with Cicero in a bid to further enhance their influence.⁶ In *Pantheisticon*, a work produced by Toland in 1720 to explain his Pantheistic philosophy, Cicero assumes his most intriguing role. In a pseudo-liturgical for the Pantheists Cicero's works feature extensively, to the point that he is essentially manifested as a priest for the philosophy described therein. Toland shows no discrimination in his use of Cicero, using his letters, speeches, philosophical and rhetorical works to construct him as a model, a parallel for his own efforts, and as an historical, political, and intellectual source. Cicero is not reserved

⁴ Cicero is used in *The Militia Reform'd* (1698); *Anglia Libera* (1701); *The Art of Governing by Partys* (1701); *Vindicius Liberi* (1702); *The Memorial of the State of England* (1705); *High Church Display'd* (1711); *The Grand Mystery Laid Open* (1714); *Reasons for Naturalizing the Jews* (1714); *The State-Anatomy of Great Britain* (1717); *The second part of the state anatomy* (1717).

⁵ Cicero is used in *Two Essays* (1695); *Christianity not Mysterious* (1696); *Letters to Serena* (1704); *Adeisidaemon* and *Origines Judiciae* (1709); *Nazarenus* (1718); *Pantheisticon* (1720); 'Clidophorus', *Tetradymus* (1720).

⁶ Cicero is used in *The Life of John Milton* (1698) and *The Oceana of James Harrington* (1700).

for particular genres, works, or subjects; his presence can be discerned in every aspect of Toland's thought, whose engagement with the material betrays a consistent awareness of the man he perceived as his classical predecessor.

The sheer breadth and variety of Cicero's presence in Toland's works makes an examination of his influence a daunting prospect. As the purpose of this section is to determine how important Cicero was to Toland's thought, it will focus on the Ciceronian contribution to the two primary discourses which underpinned Toland's project: his political and religious arguments. The first chapter in this section will examine how Cicero features in Toland's construction of his republicanism, and the second chapter will establish Cicero's role in Toland's war on priestcraft. In this way, it will be possible to determine whether Cicero had an active role in the formation of the most significant aspects of Toland's thought, and if so, how that role related to Toland's efforts in *Cicero Illustratus*.

II. The intellectual context

The idea that Cicero might be a significant influence on Toland has not been acknowledged in scholarship on Toland's work. The fascination with identifying the sources of his thought which has dominated Toland studies has only rarely extended to classical sources. Chiara Giuntini's study once more provides the sole example of an attempt to consider the classical roots of Toland's ideas in any depth, yet she fails entirely to identify Cicero as an influence.⁷ The focus of Giuntini's discussion on attempting to elucidate Toland's attitude to the respective schools of Ancient and Modern learning means that a genuine attempt to determine the role of classicism in

⁷ Giuntini (1999).

Toland's thought is absent. Giuntini's study does provide, however, evidence for Toland's belief in the continued relevance of classicism, and hence a principle with which to support a more extensive investigation into its actual function in his work.

The influence of Cicero has been noted by other Toland scholars, although in limited terms, confined to single aspects of his thought. Stephen Daniel claimed that Cicero provided the inspiration for the kind of virtuous citizen that Toland wished to become.⁸ Robert Rees Evans too defined Toland's relationship with Cicero in terms emphasising his identification of Cicero as a model for his own endeavours in the public sphere.⁹ Other works have provided more useful indications of where Cicero might have exerted more influence on Toland's thought. Günter Gawlick's study of Cicero's popularity among the Deists includes a survey of Cicero's appearances in Toland's work, and the suggestion of an active role, but without sufficient development to determine the nature of that role.¹⁰ Justin Champion has also acknowledged that Cicero featured in Toland's religious works, providing some conceptual structures for Toland to adopt.¹¹ This section presents an opportunity to build on these works and to determine whether Cicero, and by implication classicism, had a more influential role in the formation of Toland's thought than has previously been acknowledged.

This investigation acquires further significance on account of the nature of Toland's work. As explained in the introduction to this thesis, Toland's intellectual

⁸ Daniel (1984) pp. 226-229.

⁹ Evans (1991) pp. 153-155.

¹⁰ Gawlick (1963) pp. 657-682.

¹¹ Champion (1992) pp. 186-195.

project was essentially radical, challenging traditional sources of power and authority and elevating the importance of reason. By determining the role of Cicero in Toland's thought, these chapters will also be investigating the role of the Ciceronian tradition in the development of radical thought in the early Enlightenment. The traditional narrative of the Enlightenment depicts it as the triumph of an age of reason over an age dominated by faith and traditional authority.¹² The narrative of the Radical Enlightenment championed by Margaret Jacob and Jonathan Israel endorses this conceptualisation of what the Enlightenment represented.¹³ Israel locates the beginning of the Enlightenment in the process by which tradition, authority, and belief all came to be challenged by philosophical reason. He divided the Enlightenment into two streams: a moderate stream, represented by Newton and Locke, and a radical stream, in which atheists and deists, including Toland, dominated. Israel argued that the radical stream was driven by a rejection of the past and all existing structures. The emphasis on radicalism evident in Israel's and Jacob's contributions has in turn been questioned by a historiographical tradition which identified in the Enlightenment, particularly within England, an intention to reform rather than to overthrow existing structures entirely.¹⁴ The place of classicism in the progress of the Enlightenment remains a point of dispute; if the Enlightenment was solely defined by the rejection of tradition and the celebration of reason, the classical tradition's influence should have been minimal. Toland's relationship with Cicero has the potential to suggest otherwise,

¹² Cragg (1950) partic. pp. 225-230, (1964); Gay (1966) pp. 322-357.

¹³ Israel (2001) pp. 3-13; Jacob (1981) pp. 20-27.

¹⁴ Young (1998) pp. 1-15; Pocock (2004) pp. 1-10.

however, and to demonstrate the active role classicism could have in the formation of radical thought.

CHAPTER FOUR

CICERONIANISM AND REPUBLICAN DISCOURSE

SUCH Sort of Men are *English Republicans*, nor are they improperly distinguish'd by this Denomination. A COMMONWEALTH, says CICERO, is the Common-weal of the People, when it is well and justly manag'd, whether by one King, a few Nobles, or the whole People. But when the King is unjust (whom I call a Tyrant) or the Nobles are unjust (whose Combination is a Faction) or the People themselves are unjust (for whom I find no usual Appellation unless I call 'em Tyrants) then it is not a faulty Commonwealth, but really none at all: for it is not the Weal of the People, when a Tyrant or a Faction disposes of 'em; and the People themselves are no longer a People when they becom unjust, because they are not (according as People are defin'd by Legislators) a Multitude associated by Consent of Law, and a Communication of Advantage. A COMMONWEALTH therefore is the general Denomination of all *free Governments*, and I think the particular Form of the *English Commonwealth* to be the best in the World.¹

¹ Toland, *Vindicius Liberius* pp. 142-144, quoting Augustine, *City of God* II.21.47-66. Toland here is in fact paraphrasing Augustine's paraphrase of *Rep.*III.43-45. The fragments of *De Republica* were first collected together with the complete works of Cicero in Stephanus (1538). Stephanus's efforts were refined by Carolus Sigonius/Carlo Sigonio in 1559 when he published the fragments of Cicero in Venice, and by Andreas Patricius, Bishop of Venden, in 1561 with his own collection of Ciceronian fragments. These were then reproduced in the complete editions of Cicero's works, including Lambinus (1566), Gruterus (1618) and Graevius (1684).

In *Vindicius Liborius*, published in 1704, Toland was on the defensive. The controversial nature of his work *Christianity Not Mysterious* had continued to warrant attention, most recently within the House of Convocation, where it had been roundly condemned. *Vindicius Liborius* for the most part countered the charges of atheism brought against Toland by that establishment, necessitating further explication of the text of *Christianity Not Mysterious* itself. Atheism was not the only allegation against his character which Toland felt driven to reply to in this work. Shortly before its conclusion, Toland constructed a response to the charge of being a *Commonwealthman*, “the Truth wherof I freely own, and value my self upon being so²” It is as part of this endeavour that Toland enlists the above summary of Cicero’s definition of the Commonwealth, as deployed in the *De Republica*. It contributes to Toland’s argument that to be a *Commonwealthman* is something to claim proudly.

In this way, Toland’s use of Cicero to defend his own politics in *Vindicius Liborius* reveals him involving the Ciceronian tradition in the most vital aspect of his political and intellectual identity. As I will demonstrate, this was not an isolated incident; Toland drew heavily on Cicero and his works for the material with which to express and legitimise his politics, as he intended the readers of his edition of Cicero’s works to do. By examining precisely how Toland uses Cicero in this political context, and to what end, I hope to achieve two things. The first is a contribution to the efforts in Toland studies to clarify the nature of Toland’s politics: questions abound over the consistency and authenticity of his adherence to commonwealth politics, the extent of his debt to Harrington, and the significance of his contribution to English

² Toland, *Vindicius Liborius* p. 125.

republicanism.³ While I do not suggest that Toland's Ciceronianism will answer these questions, it might at least contribute some further insights. The second aim of this chapter is to ascertain the nature of Toland's relationship with Cicero in the political context: the role he assigned the Ciceronian material, how he used it, and with what results.

First, the precise nature of the political project to which Toland was recruiting Cicero must be established. When addressing the term *Commonwealthman* in *Vindicius Liberius* Toland offers the following summary of what he understood this to mean: "I have bin wholly devoted to the self evident Principle of *Liberty*, and a profest Enemy to *Slavery* and *arbitrary Power*." Toland identified the term *Commonwealthman* with the possession of republican principles, namely the commitment to liberty and the abhorrence of tyranny.⁵ This is clear as he further expands on his definition of a *Commonwealthman* in *Vindicius Liberius*, identifying it with a belief that government is entrusted by the people to the magistrates, and should that trust be violated the people are entitled to remove those magistrates from power. It is for this reason, Toland relates, that *Commonwealthman* has been used as a term of attack by those who served tyrants, as they resented those who championed

³ Sullivan (1982) p. 13 doubts the validity of Toland's republicanism and associated commitment to the Whig cause, judging Toland an opportunist on the basis of his perceived inconsistency. Champion (2003), on the other hand, has made a compelling case for Toland's commitment to republicanism and the lasting influence of his contributions.

⁴ Toland, *Vindicius Liberius* p. 125.

⁵ Robert Molesworth lamented the association between being a *Commonwealthman* and being an opponent to monarchy in the preface to his translation of Hotman's *Francogallia*; see Molesworth, *An Account of Denmark* p. 173. On *Commonwealthmen* see Robbins (1968) pp. 3-21.

liberty and defended the constitution against the growth of arbitrary power.⁶ This discussion of the *Commonwealthman* therefore relates to a key feature of Toland's political discourse, namely his commitment to republican principles.⁷ Toland's *Anglia Libera*, published in 1701 in the context of the Act of Succession, was a vitally important expression of these political principles, and included an extensive account of the dangers of arbitrary power: 'these and the like Reasons make arbitrary Power so farr from being preferable to other Constitutions, or indeed from being properly any kind of civil Government (since all political Authority is design'd for the good and not for the hurt of Men) that it is infinitely worse than the very state of Nature'⁸

This commitment to a republicanism defined not by its allegiance to anti-monarchism but by its dedication to liberty and the defence of the constitution allowed Toland to ally himself in the political sphere with the Country Whigs.⁹ Once he had established the meaning of being a *Commonwealthman* in *Vindicius Libericus* Toland stated that 'this is what I mean by being a *Whig*, and what I have ever understood from all those People call'd *Whigs* either by themselves, or by their Enemies'¹⁰ The Country Whigs were those among the Whig party who were committed to the defence of the independence of Parliament against the power of the executive, formed broadly in response to the actions of the Junto Whigs in the

⁶ Kenyon (1977) p. 76; Robbins (1968) p. 7; Champion (2003) pp. 95-96.

⁷ Champion (2003) p. 64; Sullivan (1982) p. 149; Venturi (1971) pp. 47-69.

⁸ Toland, *Anglia Libera* p. 8.

⁹ Robbins (1968) pp. 3-21; Worden (2001) p. 112; Champion (2003) pp. 64, 96-112.

¹⁰ Toland, *Vindicius Libericus* pp. 133-134; cf. *Memorial of the State* p. 76 and *Art of Governing*.

1690s.¹¹ As such, they shared many principles with the republican or commonwealth ideology championed by Toland.¹² Foremost amongst these was a belief in the importance of balance in the constitution, and the maintenance of that balance, so as to protect the independence of Parliament, and the constitution itself. In order to achieve this, the power of the Ministry needed to be controlled, which meant that the political activity of the Country Whigs in this period was directed towards preventing extensions of the power of the executive. This included measures against corruption in Parliament, against the creation of a standing army, and in favour of limitations on the monarchy. In addition, virtue became an important feature of their ideology, as a counter to courtly corruption, and as a quality which could be associated with the men of property they represented. Although Toland, and those committed to republican principles, were identified as radical Whigs, they were still able to act in the political sphere in association with the Country Whigs. Toland's republicanism therefore led him to associate with Country Whigs such as Harley and Shaftesbury, and to support their cause in a variety of literary endeavours intended to champion republicanism.

Toland's most notable contribution to English republicanism was his work as an editor in the late 1690s and early 1700s, when he was responsible for the publication

¹¹ On the Country Whig ideology see Speck (1998) pp. 23-25; Kenyon (1977) pp. 35-360; Goldie (1980) pp. 195-234; Dickinson (1977) pp. 9-10. On the respective importance of the Court/Country and Whig/Tory polarities in this political era see Hayton (1984) pp. 37-86; Rubini (1978) pp. 193-208; Hoppit (2000) pp. 136-137.

¹² For the commonwealth ideology of the Whigs see Wootton (1994) pp. 8-13; Robbins (1968) pp. 3-21; Scott (2004a) p. 338; Goldsmith (1994) pp. 200-207; Dickinson (1977) pp. 102-118; Worden (1991) pp. 443-444.

of numerous works from the key figures of seventeenth century republicanism.¹³ This was a project supported and abetted by several of those radical Whigs with whom Toland had associated himself.¹⁴ On behalf of these men, Toland undertook the challenge of rendering the republicanism expressed in these works both reputable, and palatable to Country Whigs.¹⁵ This involved a certain amount of exploitation of his editorial position, as discussed in Chapter One, as the more radical and theologically puritan aspects of this seventeenth century republican discourse needed to be modified for a post-Revolution audience. In this way Ludlow's Puritanism all but disappeared, Milton's hostility to the monarchy became a hostility to tyranny, and Harrington became a champion of commonwealth principles.¹⁶ This project proved a success not only for the Country Whigs, but for the perpetuation and survival of republicanism into the eighteenth century; it is broadly accepted amongst scholars that Toland's editions were crucial to the successful transmission of republicanism to the eighteenth century, not just in Britain

¹³ See Introduction pp. 3-7.

¹⁴ Among those supporting Toland in these works were John Holles, the Duke of Newcastle, Robert Harley, Sir Robert Clayton, Anthony Ashley Cooper, the third Earl of Shaftesbury, and Robert Molesworth; cf. Carabelli (1975) p. 44. Sullivan (1982) pp. 12-13 points out Toland's celebration of Sir Robert Clayton's work as director of the Bank of England in his preface to the edition of Harrington's *Oceana*. It is interesting to note that Toland sent a translation of Cicero's letter of consolation to Servius Sulpicius to Sir Robert Clayton on the death of his nephew, *Collection* II.325-331.

¹⁵ Worden (2001) pp. 112-114; Champion (2003) pp. 95-112; Daniel (1984) pp. 62-63.

¹⁶ Lindenbaum (1997) p. 6; Sullivan (1982) p. 148.

but further afield in France and America.¹⁷ Toland took every opportunity presented to him as editor to construct republican principles as a viable political ideology in a post-Revolution reality.

In addition to his editorial efforts, Toland engaged in the dissemination of republican ideas by means of pamphlets, treatises, and polemical engagement with key political issues, acting on behalf of those radical Whigs who sponsored him.¹⁸ In the last years of the seventeenth century this primarily consisted of pamphlets contributing the questions of corruption in politics: the standing army debate in *The Militia Reform'd* (1698), or the need to prevent the opportunity for corruption by introducing more regular Parliaments in *The Danger of Mercenary Parliaments* (1698).¹⁹ The war against corruption in politics was one of the standard features of Country Whig politics, as it was through such corruption that the balance of the government was upset.²⁰ In the 1700s Toland contributed a series of tracts which dealt more broadly with such republican and Whig interests as the defence of the limitations imposed on the monarchy, an important feature of the pursuit for a

¹⁷ Pocock (1975) p. 476; Worden (1994) p. 177; Scott (2004a) p. 350; Venturi (1971) pp. 47-69; Wootton (1994) pp. 20-26; Hayton (1984) p. 38; Champion (2003) pp. 95-112; Robbins (1968) pp. 6, 125-126.

¹⁸ Worden (1991) pp. 449-464; Champion (2003) pp. 96-98; Pocock (1975) p. 426. Those radical Whigs who worked with Toland included Walter Moyle, Robert Molesworth, Shaftesbury, and Robert Harley (prior to his shift to the Tories).

¹⁹ There has been debate about the authorship of *The Danger of Mercenary Parliaments*: Heinemann (1943) p. 185 is sure that the work was written by Shaftesbury himself, and the association with Toland only occurred due to a later edition, while Carabelli (1975) pp. 41-42 concludes that it was in fact written by Toland.

²⁰ Dickinson (1977) p. 103; Pocock (1965) pp. 549-583, (1975) pp. 404-419.

balanced constitution.²¹ Following the accession of George I in 1714, Toland's political works became more programmatic, expressing strategies for political reform and toleration coherent with his republicanism.²² Consistent throughout this engagement with political debate was Toland's commitment to the defence and circulation of republican ideals, as was his use of Cicero to formulate those ideals.

I. The Ciceronian tradition in republican politics

In deciding to invoke Cicero in support of the republican cause, Toland was not innovating. Cicero had been a prominent source for those engaged in republican discourse for generations, including that group whose work figured so conspicuously in Toland's own project: the classical republicans of the seventeenth century. In order to fully appreciate Toland's engagement with Cicero in the republican context, it is first necessary to establish the form the Ciceronian tradition took when Toland encountered it within that classical republican discourse.

i. Identifying the classical republican tradition

First, the nature of that discourse must be identified. In 1945 Zera Fink shifted the course of scholarship on political thought in seventeenth century England by identifying a group of theorists whose republicanism was heavily influenced by the

²¹ *Anglia Libera* (1701); *The Art of Governing by Partys* (1701), sponsored by Shaftesbury; *The Memorial of the State of England* (1705). There are differing accounts regarding sponsorship of *The Memorial*: Daniel (2004) suggests that Godolphin entrusted Toland with the task of answering the High Church work, Penn is identified elsewhere, and Champion (2003) p. 58 identifies it with Harley.

²² *Reasons for naturalizing the Jews* (1714); *The State-Anatomy of Great Britain* (1717). See Champion (2003) pp. 141-163.

works of classical writers and the examples provided by antiquity.²³ This group included John Milton, James Harrington, Henry Neville and Algernon Sidney, and their classical republicanism provided an alternative to the natural law theory, primarily associated with John Locke, which had dominated interpretations of this period of political thought prior to Fink. Fink was not the first to identify the significance of this classical influence; in 1679 Hobbes located the root of the upheaval of the civil war in a classical education: "they must punish then the most of those that have had their breeding in the Universities: for such curious Questions in Divinity are first started in the Universities, and so are all those Politick Questions concerning the Rights of Civil and Ecclesiastick Government, and there they are furnished with Arguments for Liberty out of the Works of *Aristotle, Plato, Cicero, Seneca*, and out of the Histories of *Rome and Greece*, for their Disputation against the necessary Power of their Sovereigns"²⁴ Fink differs from Hobbes in a crucial point: the identification of those classical sources which most strongly influenced the classical republicans. For Fink, classical republicanism was primarily defined by an adherence to the constitutional form of the mixed government, and as a result Polybius and the Republic of Venice formed the source and model from which the classical republicans principally drew.²⁵ Fink's contribution was therefore important for its recognition of the importance of the classical influence on republicanism, but

²³ Fink (1945) pp. vii-viii; cf. Scott (2004a) pp. 19-24.

²⁴ Hobbes, *Behemoth* p. 54.

²⁵ Fink (1945) pp. 1-27; cf. Pocock (1965) pp. 549-583. Fukuda (1997) attempted to reorient the understanding of Harrington's classical republicanism to focus on Polybius and the mixed constitution, with only limited success.

the terms of that classical influence limited Cicero's contribution to that of an expresser of Polybian ideas.

While Fink's identification of the classical republicans was immensely influential, the details of his theory were swiftly exposed as problematic, primarily due to the lack of literary evidence for such an extensive debt to Polybius. In place of Fink's Polybian and Venetian influences an increasing focus on Machiavelli was noted, in particular by Felix Raab in 1964. Raab's survey of English Machiavellianism prepared the way for John Pocock's seminal contribution *The Machiavellian Moment* in 1975. Here Pocock built on Raab, and on the work of Caroline Robbins which had demonstrated the continuity of Whig classicism, to offer a synoptic account of classical republicanism, tracing its development from antiquity, through the civic humanism of Baron and Gilbert, as encapsulated in the work of Machiavelli, then reinterpreted for an English audience by Harrington and the neo-Harringtonians, before being transmitted across the Atlantic.²⁶ These modifications, in particular the reorientation of focus to Machiavelli, allowed Plato and Aristotle to come to the fore as sources for the classical republicans, and in turn Cicero as an interpreter of those works for Machiavelli.

It is the work of Quentin Skinner, however, which has done most to show the significance of Cicero in his own right to classical republican discourse. First, Skinner's scholarship restored the importance of Rome to the development of

²⁶ Pocock (1975) pp. 383-400; cf. Scott (2004a) pp. 25-26, Worden (1991) pp. 443-448, (2002) p. 308. For criticisms of aspects of Pocock's account see Wootton (1974) pp. 13-19 and Davis (1981) pp. 683-697. For Robbins's theory see Robbins (1968) pp. 3-21 and Pocock (1965) pp. 549-550. For the civic humanist theories see Baron (1966) and Gilbert (1965); cf. Grafton (1991b) pp. 15-20.

republican thought, in particular in the context of theories on liberty.²⁷ Second, and more importantly in the Ciceronian context, Skinner has built upon Pocock's restoration of the importance of moral philosophy to the classical republicans to demonstrate the significant influence of Roman sources, in particular Cicero, to the formation of those moral aspects of republicanism.²⁸ Pocock acknowledged the important modifications by Quentin Skinner to his thesis in the afterword to the 2003 edition of *The Machiavellian Moment*: "as against what I had argued in my work, he emphasized that the language in which this civic discourse was couched was less Aristotelian than Ciceronian, a distinction of real theoretical importance"²⁹ Cicero's position in the classical republican tradition has therefore been increasingly acknowledged in the most recent scholarship on that tradition.

ii. Cicero's constitutional contribution

This restoration of Cicero's importance in the classical republican tradition has extended to the constitutional features of the discourse. While the model of the mixed government was not so central to the classical republicans as Fink argued, when discussing definite constitutional forms they did tend to employ the language of the mixed or balanced government as a means of framing their discussion.³⁰ Indeed, if a particular constitutional form was encouraged, it did tend to be the mixed

²⁷ Skinner (1998) pp. 1-57, (2008) p. 9.

²⁸ Skinner (1978) l.xiv-xv, (1996) pp. 1-16, (1990) pp. 121-141, (1987) pp. 128-131. In Pocock's theory (1975) pp. 49-80 the moral philosophy which dominated had been primarily Aristotelian in its formation.

²⁹ Pocock (1975) pp. 556-557.

³⁰ Pocock (1975) pp. 361-400; Peltonen (1995) p. 2; Worden (2002a) p. 313; Fukuda (1997) pp. 123-133.

form. The influence of Machiavelli is here notable, as his discussion of the mixed government in the second book of his *Discorsi* was important to the dissemination of that theory.³¹ In this discussion of mixed government, Machiavelli regularly calls upon the Roman Republic as a prime example of the mixed constitution in action, declaring that in the case of Rome “the blending of these estates made a perfect commonwealth.”³² The classical republicans of the seventeenth century inherited not only admiration for the mixed government, but association of that constitutional form with the Roman republic. As a source for the details of this model constitution few could rival Cicero. While Cicero’s most detailed discussion of the mixed government in the first book of *De Republica* was in large part lost to the classical republicans, this did not preclude his use as a source.³³ Cicero was used extensively by the classical republican writers as a source for the details of the Roman Republican constitution, drawing on the practical details provided by his speeches, together with the aspects contained within the *De Legibus*.³⁴ One aspect of Cicero’s role in the tradition was therefore as a source for material on a model constitution.

Cicero’s contribution was not confined to that of a source, however, but extended into the expression of general constitutional principles which were of great importance to the classical republicans. Foremost among these was the principle that

³¹ Machiavelli, *Discourses* I.2 (pp. 104-111); cf. Fink (1945) pp. 10-18.

³² Machiavelli, *Discourses* I.2 (p. 111).

³³ On Cicero and the mixed constitution see Sabine and Smith (1929) pp. 56-64; Atkins (2000) pp. 489-498; Powell (2012) pp. 25-26. See von Fritz (1975) for the influence of the Polybian mixed constitution in antiquity.

³⁴ Harrington, *Oceana* pp. 33-34 (*Planc.*16), 65, 74 (*Leg.*III.19), 149 (*Flac.*9 ff.), 170, 226; Sidney, *Discourses* p. 150.

any government should be directed towards the public good.³⁵ Algernon Sidney invoked the authority of Plato and Aristotle and Cicero to justify his statement that "this shews the Work of all Magistrats to be always and every where the same, even the doing of Justice, and procuring the Welfare of those that create them"³⁶ In his *Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio* John Milton paraphrased Cicero's famous dictum from the *De Legibus* to this effect, to justify the actions of the people against their king: "cum itaque salus populi suprema lex sit non salus tyranni, ac proinde populo in tyrannum non tyranno in populum prodesse debeat"³⁷ It was integral to the fortunes of the commonwealth that the public good be elevated above any private interests, particularly those of the ruler, to lessen the threat of absolutism. This was the fundamental requirement of a commonwealth, not any particular constitutional form.

Central to a government which pursued the public good above all else was the rule of law, as it was only through justice that the people might be protected.³⁸ One aspect of this theory which saw Cicero invoked as an authority was the principle that for a law to be valid, it must be approved by the people; both Harrington and Milton

³⁵ Skinner (1987) pp. 126-128; Scott (2004a) pp. 34-39, (2004b) p. 591, (1992) pp. 38-39.

³⁶ Sidney, *Discourses* p. 55; cf. Nedham, *The excellencie of a free state*, published in 1656, pp. 33, 175.

³⁷ Milton, *Defensio*, H2: "because it is the safety of the people, not the safety of the tyrant, which is the highest law, and such law should be for the advantage of the people against a tyrant, not a tyrant against the people" (trans. Wolfe). The Ciceronianism Milton paraphrases is *salus populi suprema est lex*, *Leg. III.8*.

³⁸ Worden (2002a) p. 313; Scott (2004a) p. 133.

referred to Cicero's *De Lege Agraria* to make this point.³⁹ If the principle of justice was neglected, then once more arbitrary rule is risked.⁴⁰ Algernon Sidney again looks to Cicero for an expression of the importance of justice in the constitution: "and, tho' Cicero says, that Commonwealths were instituted for the obtaining of Justice, he contradicts them not, but comprehends them all in that word; because 'tis just that whosoever receives a Power, should employ it wholly for the accomplishment of the Ends for which it was given"⁴¹ Justice was necessary for the public good, and as a result a just government, governed by law, was necessary for a commonwealth.

Cicero's role in the classical republican discourse of the seventeenth century is therefore in part as a source for important aspects of the constitutional theories of these men. But, as indicated by the changing views of scholarship, classical republicanism was not primarily a constitutional programme, but an approach to politics greatly concerned with the moral aspects of political discourse.

iii. Cicero's civic virtue

One of the main features of the civic humanism identified by Baron was its emphasis on civic virtue.⁴² Civic humanists were to exercise their virtue in the service of the republic, as by the pursuit of community interests the republic would prosper. In his treatment by the civic humanists, Cicero became a prominent example of such civic

³⁹ Harrington, *Oceana* p. 16, referring to *Agr.*II.30. Milton, *Defensio* I4, referring to *Agr.*II.17; cf. D9, referring to *Flac.*15.

⁴⁰ Nedham, *The excellencie of a free state* p. 149.

⁴¹ Sidney, *Discourses* p. 4.

⁴² Baron (1966) pp. 446-451; Pocock (1975) p. 405; Pagden (1987) pp. 6-11.

virtue in action.⁴³ In his account of Cicero's life, Leonardo Bruni in particular commended the way in which Cicero used even his literary endeavours to serve the republic. Coluccio Salutati together with Leonardo Bruni celebrated Cicero's contribution to both literature and the business of state, lauding the way in which he directed his whole life seemingly to the service of the republic. In this way Cicero became a model for civic virtue within the civic humanist tradition, and it was from that tradition that he was transmitted to the classical republicans. There was a significant moral philosophy underpinning classical republicanism, and Ciceronian ethics had played a prominent role in the formation of that philosophy.

The vital element of this civic virtue amongst the classical republicans, drawn from Machiavelli and the humanists, who in turn learnt it from the Romans, particularly from Cicero, was that of the *vita activa*.⁴⁴ The possession of private virtue, acquired through contemplation, was insufficient; virtue must be used by the whole civic community in the service of the republic. Machiavelli had championed this need for active civic virtue, arguing that the common good could only be achieved when the public was privileged over the private.⁴⁵ Machiavelli goes on to declare that the contemporary religion celebrates men of contemplation, rather than men of action, and as a result there are insufficient men striving for glory in this way. This distinction between *otium* and *negotium*, so prominent in Cicero's *De Officiis*, was adopted extensively in classical republican discourse, where *negotium* was used to

⁴³ Baron (1966) pp. 99-101; Viroli (1990) pp. 165-266; Seigel (1966) pp. 3-9.

⁴⁴ Skinner (1990) p. 130, (2002) pp. 6-7, 218-219, (1978) I.176; Wootton (1994) pp. 8-13; Goldsmith (1994) p. 197; Pocock (1975) pp. 401-405; Burt (1992) pp. 1-14; Scott (2004b) p. 593.

⁴⁵ Machiavelli, *Discourses* II.2.

reflect the necessity of the whole civic community contributing to political life in a commonwealth.⁴⁶ It was in the nature of the commonwealth that the community must pursue virtue; it could not engage in *otium*, relying upon an individual leader to conduct a *vita activa* on their behalf.⁴⁷ Harrington reflects this emphasis on the virtue of the community amongst the classical republicans, building upon Machiavelli but shifting the emphasis entirely from the individual to the political society: “wherefore if we have anything of piety or of prudence, let us raise ourselves out of the mire of private interest unto the contemplation of virtue.”⁴⁸ In this way the Ciceronian tradition was transmitted to the classical republicans as a valuable exponent of active civic virtue.

The classical republicans further argued that education was a vital tool for forging this virtuous citizenship capable of serving the commonwealth. Machiavelli had made the point that the virtue of a state was in large part contingent on its citizens, and had inherited from the civic humanists and their reading of Cicero an appreciation of the responsibility of the statesman to encourage the virtue of his citizens.⁴⁹ This was adopted by the classical republicans in the form of calls for education of the commonwealth’s citizens by the state in order to ensure their virtue.⁵⁰ Harrington turned to Cicero when making the case for the importance of

⁴⁶ Skinner (1987) pp. 128-131; Pagden (1987) pp. 6-11. See Cornish (1978) pp. 80-93 on Machiavelli’s use of *De Officiis*.

⁴⁷ Burt (1992) pp. 1-14; Goldsmith (1994) p. 209.

⁴⁸ Harrington, *Oceana* p. 19; cf. Pocock (1975) pp. 401-405.

⁴⁹ Machiavelli, *Discourses II proemio* (pp. 265-269); cf. Viroli (1990) pp. 161-171.

⁵⁰ Goldsmith (1994) pp. 207-210.

education in virtue in a commonwealth: the vices of the people are from their governors; those of their governors from their laws or orders; and those of their laws or orders, from their legislators. *Ut male posuimus initia, sic caetera sequuntur.* What ever was in the womb imperfect as to her proper work, comes very rarely or not at all to perfection; and the formation of a citizen in the womb of the commonwealth is his education⁵¹ The significance to the commonwealth of the education of its citizens in virtue was a belief important to the classical republican tradition, and Cicero's expression of this principle suited their needs well.

In the classical republican tradition Cicero was recruited to serve two primary functions: to provide evidence on the Roman Republic as a model commonwealth, and as a contributor to the tradition which made civic virtue a primary feature of Commonwealth politics. The influence on Toland's own republican writings of this Ciceronian tradition as represented by the classical republicans was extensive.

II. Defining the Commonwealth

In Toland's discussion of the Commonwealth in *Vindicius Liborius* he lamented the way in which the nature of that Commonwealth had been misunderstood, often wilfully, particularly the use of the term *Commonwealthmen*, by which they insinuated them to be irreconcilable Enemies to regal Government, and men, who, if they did not design a downright *Anarchy*, yet were intirely for a *Democracy*⁵² When Toland introduced Cicero's definition of the Commonwealth from *De Republica* it was for the purpose addressing this failure to comprehend precisely

⁵¹ Harrington, *Oceana* pp. 196-197, quoting *ad Att.*X.18.

⁵² Toland, *Vindicius Liborius* p. 127, a concern repeated in *Art of Governing* pp. 31-55. See Evans (1991) p. 154.

what was meant by term in question. It was to this end that Toland deployed Cicero in the constitutional context; he looked to Cicero to provide the definition of a Commonwealth, a definition that Toland would adopt extensively and deploy repeatedly in his theoretical and polemical literature.

i. The *Common-weal*

The Ciceronian passage chosen by Toland to define the Commonwealth in *Vindicius Liborius* constitutes one of the most famous and influential expressions of Cicero's understanding of the *res publica*.⁵³ In *De Republica*, at I.39 and III.43, Cicero defines the *res publica* as the *res populi*, or the property of the people; the goal of the republic should be the maintenance and preservation of the interests of the people.⁵⁴ This is a conception of the Commonwealth which was deployed with regularity by Toland, defining the aim of the Commonwealth as the preservation of the *Common-weal* or the common good.⁵⁵ For example, in *The Art of Governing by Partys*, this definition is employed to show the contrast between a Commonwealth and arbitrary rule: in opposition to such arbitrary Governments, those have been called Commonwealths, where the common good of all was indifferently designed and pursued.⁵⁶ Toland also refers directly to Cicero's definition in order to make

⁵³ Schofield (1995) pp. 63-83; Kempshall (2001) pp. 99-135.

⁵⁴ Preserved in Augustine, *City of God* II.21: while paraphrasing book III, Augustine also refers back to the appearance of this definition at I.39; cf. *Sest.*103. On Cicero's definition of the republic see Powell and North (2001); Schofield (1995) pp. 69-77; Wood (1983) pp. 746-750; Brunt (1988) pp. 346-349; Morstein-Marx (2004) pp. 222-223.

⁵⁵ Toland, *Anglia Libera* pp. 92, 107, *Art of Governing* pp. 80-81, *Memorial of the State* pp. 76, 80, *Collection* I.205.

⁵⁶ Toland, *Art of Governing* p. 32.

this point again, most notably on the frontispiece of his *State Anatomy*, a work in which he discussed the English constitution at length: *–sic huic MODERATORI REIPUBLICAE beata Civium vita proposita est*⁵⁷ Toland finds Cicero particularly useful as a formulator of the equation of the end of government with the public good, an equation pertinent to his own political endeavours.

The precise purpose of this definition in Cicero's works has been subject to extensive investigation. An important contribution from modern scholarship towards appreciating the significance of Cicero's attempt to define the *res publica* as the *res populi* was provided by Malcolm Schofield in 1995.⁵⁸ Schofield demonstrated that in these passages of *De Republica* Cicero did not just provide a definition of the *res publica*, but a criterion for its legitimacy. In his definition, and his explanation of the terms of that definition, Cicero provided the means of determining whether a state could be judged a legitimate *res publica*. Schofield argues that this criterion has two constituents: the identification of the *populus*, and the argument that the *res publica* is the *res populi*. Cicero provided an understanding of the nature of the *populus*, and established the ramifications of that understanding for the *res populi*, so that there was a clear way of judging whether any government met this criterion and possessed legitimacy. There are parallels to this concern for legitimacy in the political discourse of Toland's period. Following the disruption to the constitution caused by the Glorious Revolution in 1688, when such fundamental concepts as hereditary succession were undermined, the need to

⁵⁷ Quoting *ad Att.*VIII.11, in which Cicero is quoting *Rep.*V.8a. See also *Jacobitism* p. 6, in which Toland paraphrases Cicero's statement *salus populi suprema lex esto* in *Leg.*III.8.

⁵⁸ Schofield (1995) pp. 63-83.

justify the rival concepts of political order became paramount.⁵⁹ It would therefore be worthwhile to apply the ideas of Schofield's reading of Cicero to Toland, in order to determine whether the question of legitimacy guided his use of Cicero's definition of the republic.

The first step in establishing this definition as a criterion for legitimacy was the identification of the *populus*. The *populus*, Cicero claimed at *De Republica* I.39, was a society formed by people who came together out of a shared understanding of justice, and in order to share in the advantage that comes from living in a society.⁶⁰ Cicero's understanding of the impulse to form this civil society was essentially a naturalist explanation, which had a long tradition in Aristotelian theory.⁶¹ Cicero gives his clearest exposition of this principle in *De Legibus*, where he explains that the instinct that compels men to form a society is a natural one.⁶² Regarding the alternative contractualist theory of the origins of civil society, which claimed that the instinct was not natural but a contract born of weakness, Cicero did on occasion express sympathy for that explanation, but judged it incompatible with the naturalist explanation.⁶³ The source of authority in a civil society was also a key point of contention in the political discourse contemporary to Toland in the post-revolution

⁵⁹ Dickinson (1977) pp. 1-10

⁶⁰ *Rep.*I.39. See Schofield (1995) pp. 69-77 and Powell (2012) pp. 26-28.

⁶¹ Aristotle, *Politics* 1.2, 36.

⁶² *Leg.*I.35; cf. *Rep.*I.39, *Off.*I.12, 157-158, II.73, *Amic.*19. Augustine's paraphrase of I.39 is quite contractual, perhaps influencing Toland.

⁶³ Cicero expressed this sympathy at *Rep.*III.23; *Inv.*I.2-3; *Sest.*91-92. The contractualist account was best expressed by Plato, *Republic* II.369b and Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura* V.1005 ff.

period, as viable alternatives to the theory of divine right were pursued.⁶⁴ One alternative theory of the origins of society developed was that of contract theory, primarily propounded by John Locke. This contract theory, in contrast to Cicero, reconciled the ideas of a society formed by a contract, and the natural impulse to make that contract: while the civil society was an artificial construction, it was created to preserve natural rights. Locke's theory had a significant influence on Toland, and is evident in Toland's explanation of the origins of civil society which opens his *Anglia Libera*: "it being therefore for the good of the whole Community, and for every individual Member thereof, that Men enter into Society, they agree among themselves (or by such as they authorize to represent them) on certain Rules and Laws, which are to be the Measure and Standard of every Man's Actions"⁶⁵ For both Toland and Cicero, the *populus* was a civic society which was formed out of a desire to pursue justice, a justice identified with natural law. While they may have differing views of the impulse which drove men to form that society, the fundamental importance of justice as a defining principle of that society was a shared concept.

The identification of the *populus* with the pursuit of justice by each author was vital to the subsequent understanding of the *res populi*, and the resultant conception of the responsibility of government. When in book III of *De Republica* Cicero, through Scipio, reintroduced his definition of the *res publica* as the *res populi* it was following a lengthy discussion of the role of justice in government. This provided

⁶⁴ Dickinson (1977) pp. 59-70, (2002) p. 4; Lloyd (1991) pp. 258-264; Schwoerer (1993) pp. 232-252. See Tully (1991) pp. 622-625 on this theory in Locke's thought, and Tuck (1993a) pp. 175-177 on the roots of contract theory in the thought of Hugo Grotius.

⁶⁵ Toland, *Anglia Libera* p. 2; cf. Champion (2003) pp. 120-124.

the occasion, as described by Augustine, for Cicero to explain his understanding of the *res populi* as possible only where government is dictated by justice: “docet deinde quanta sit in disputando definitionis utilitas, atque ex illis suis definitionibus colligit tunc esse rem publicam, id est rem populi, cum bene ac iuste geritur sive ab uno rege sive a paucis optimatibus sive ab universo populo”⁶⁶ Toland extended his use of Ciceronian language when defining the Commonwealth to integrate this association of a true Commonwealth with the protection of justice: “but if we may compare Ancient and Modern instances, there is not a more ready or surer way at this time of distinguishing the certain Friends or Enemies of our free Government, than by observing who are for maintaining the public Faith, and who for breaking it on any pretence whatsoever”⁶⁷ For both Toland and Cicero the definition of the *res publica* as *res populi* provides a vital means of judging the legitimacy of a commonwealth: if it did not pursue and protect justice, it was forsaking the *populus*, and hence its right to call itself a government.

In the discourse of Toland and the radical Whigs, the responsibility of a government to protect justice was particularly identified with the protection of liberties and property.⁶⁸ The influence of Ciceronian republicanism on Toland’s understanding of the Commonwealth extends into his deployment of arguments based on these responsibilities of a legitimate government.

⁶⁶ Augustine, *City of God* II.21: “he then explains the great advantage of definition in debate, and he infers from these definitions of his own that a commonwealth ó that is, the property of a people ó exists when it is well and justly governed, either by a single king, or by a few of the highest men, or by the people at large” (trans. Dyson); cf. Powell (2012) p. 33.

⁶⁷ Toland, *Art of Governing* p. 134; cf. *Anglia Libera* pp. 1-6.

⁶⁸ Dickinson (1977) pp. 79-90.

ii. The *Res Populi* and *Libertas*

Cicero integrated the protection of liberty into his conception of a just government. According to the laws of nature, which the *populus* was formed to protect, the right to justice is possessed equally by all rational men.⁶⁹ This means that no one element within a society can be privileged by laws over another, as that would be contrary to justice. In *De Officiis* Cicero expresses this in his assertion that the state must not champion the interests of one group over another, expressing justice in terms reflecting the right of all men to freedom from oppression by laws inconsistent with natural law.⁷⁰ This includes the subjugation of some or all of the *populus* to the arbitrary rule of a man or group, to whom they have not entrusted their safety, as this amounts to existing in a state of servitude.⁷¹ In this way liberty becomes a natural right of the *populus*, and one whose protection is the responsibility of a just government. This is compounded by the argument that the *populus* came together to ensure their mutual security against threats to their safety and happiness; a just state would ensure their freedom to exist in safety.⁷² A prominent aspect of the *res populi* was the right to exist free of subjugation to the interests of another group, and free from threats to their physical well-being.

⁶⁹ *Leg.*I.28-34.

⁷⁰ *Off.*I.85.

⁷¹ *Off.*II.41-42; *Leg.*II.11; *Rep.*III (cf. Augustine, *City of God* II.21). See Wirszubski (1968) pp. 24-30 on Cicero's case for the individual's right to freedom, and in general on the notion of *libertas* in antiquity.

⁷² *Leg.*II.11, III.8.

Toland locates this identification of liberty with just government in Cicero's work and deploys it in his own: *for life does not consist in Breathing, and consequently there is no Life at all in a SLAVE. All other Nations may indure SERVITUDE, but our Commonwealth cannot suffer it...so glorious a Thing is the gaining of LIBERTY, that Death ought not to be shunn'd in Restoring it!*⁷³ In this *Philippic* Cicero had been arguing that the Senate should not submit to the veterans' wishes to hinder Marcus Brutus' claim to the province of Macedonia. This would be equivalent to entering a state of servitude, and contrary to the just government of the Commonwealth. Toland employs this passage from the tenth *Philippic* in *Anglia Libera* to demonstrate the importance of maintaining an alliance with Holland. This is an argument dominated by concern for the liberty of members of the Commonwealth, most particularly its Protestant elements. Holland and England together champion Protestant liberties in Europe against the threat of Catholicism, and must continue to do so, for as the passage from Cicero demonstrates, it is the responsibility of every Commonwealthman to preserve the liberties of the people. In this way, Toland uses the Ciceronian definition of the Commonwealth to exhort the English people to action, by presenting the matter as an issue of liberty, and thus the preservation of the state.

Toland also employs liberty in Ciceronian terms, as a responsibility of a just and true government, in his polemical efforts against the proposed formation of a standing army at the end of the seventeenth century. Toland, together with many who wrote against the proposed standing army, described the threat such a development would pose to the liberty of the people. This threat would take two

⁷³ Toland, *Anglia Libera* pp. 173-176, quoting *Phil.X.20*.

forms: first, it would be directed against the people, and limit their right to resist any threat to their safety, and second, it would enhance the power of the Crown over the Parliament, as it would grant to the Crown numerous opportunities for corrupting members of that Parliament.⁷⁴ Each of these threats would undermine liberty as understood by Cicero. Toland also bases his arguments for the advantages of a militia over a standing army on questions of liberty, arguing that a free man will fight with much more commitment for his country than one essentially acting as a slave.⁷⁵ If the government were to institute a standing army, it would infringe on the liberties of society; this would mean that that government could no longer claim to be just, and would therefore be threatening its own legitimacy. Toland's use of arguments based on the liberties of the people reveals that he employed the Ciceronian understanding of the *res populi* as a means of engaging with questions of legitimacy in his political discourse.

iii. The *Res Populi* and Property

Another responsibility of just government identified by Cicero was the protection of private property.⁷⁶ Cicero argued in *De Officiis* that the acquisition of property was a natural impulse among men, and the protection of that property was one of the

⁷⁴ Toland, *Militia Reform'd* pp. 6-11. This was the case also made by Trenchard, *Argument on a Standing Army* pp. 1-2. On the standing army debate see Pocock (1975) pp. 406-422; Dickinson (1977) pp. 105-108; Goldsmith (1994) pp. 200-207; Schwoerer (1974) pp. 155-187; Scott (2004a) p. 348; Sullivan (1982) p. 166.

⁷⁵ Toland, *Militia Reform'd* pp. 11-13, 17; cf. Miller (1946) pp. 306-313.

⁷⁶ Wood (1983) pp. 741-750 has argued that Cicero identified the protection of property as a fundamental aspect of the state, which I think is to overstate the case ó Cicero did argue that protection of property was important for justice, which is in turn important to the state; cf. Scott (2004a) pp. 32-33. For the contra Wood case see Jackson Barlow (2012) pp. 212-241.

reasons that men formed into societies.⁷⁷ As the right to protect private property existed in natural law, it also functioned as a civil law.⁷⁸ It therefore followed that a responsibility of a just government was to protect the property of its citizens. The final conclusion from this process is best articulated by Cicero in *De Officiis*: *hanc enim ob causam maxime, ut sua tenerentur, res publicae civitatesque constitutae sunt. Nam, etsi duce natura congregabantur homines, tamen spe custodiae rerum suarum urbium praesidia quaerebant*⁷⁹ The failure of a state to protect the property of its citizens is constructed as another means of determining whether it meets the requirements of a just government and thus legitimacy.

Toland's adoption of the Ciceronian conception of the responsibility of the state for the protection of property is made explicit in *The Art of Governing by Partys*, when Toland quotes the most relevant passages of *De Officiis* in full: *it will not be amiss to hear what Doctrin one of their chief Magistrats has preach'd on this Occasion: I mean Cicero, who discourses largely of it to his Son, and among other things he says, that It must be the principal care of him, who is at the head of the Government, that every one be secur'd in his Property, and that the Estates of privat Men be not diminish'd under pretence of a public good*⁸⁰ This passage appears

⁷⁷ *Off.*I.11-12.

⁷⁸ *Off.*II.78, III.21-24; *Top.*II.9; *Dom.*33.

⁷⁹ *Off.*II.73: *for political communities and citizenships were constituted especially so that men could hold on to what was theirs. It may be true that nature first guided men to gather in groups; but it was in the hope of safeguarding their possessions that they sought protection in cities* (trans. Griffin and Atkins).

⁸⁰ Toland, *Art of Governing* pp. 128-129, quoting *Off.*II.73; across pp. 128-134 Toland quotes or paraphrases *Off.*II.73-85, which is in turn repeated almost word for word in *The Grand Mystery laid open* pp. 42-46.

when Toland is performing the role of a protector of private property, a role incumbent upon any who associated themselves with the Country Whigs.⁸¹ The party divisions which form the subject of this tract are condemned for the threat they pose to the security of private property. Toland uses these passages from *De Officiis* to attack the parties for allowing their own rivalries to drive them to exploit financial issues, such as the question of public credit. Toland uses *De Officiis* here to argue that to rescind the public debts would be an attack on private property, and would thus undermine faith and justice. He uses the Roman Commonwealth as a point of comparison, as “the Debts of the public, tho’ never so great and burdensom, were never discharged or lessen’d by any Law, which strict observation of their Faith and Justice never let ‘em want Money on any occasion, and made the richest Citizens think their Wealth safer with the Government than in their own hands”⁸² The protection of property therefore becomes a question of justice.

The emphasis on protection of property as a quality of just government also appears in *Anglia Libera*, as a contrast to the conduct of an arbitrary power. Here Toland describes the nature of arbitrary rule, and its ramifications for those natural rights of a citizen, such as the protection of his property: “the Rule of Men’s Actions is unconstant, dubious, or altogether unknown, since the Prince (without being accountable to any) can abolish tomorrow what has bin solemnly establish’d to day; he may be hurried by the Impetuosity of his Passions to vary every Moment; and, if he’s not himself of the worst Temper, yet to gratify a Mistress, a Favorit, or a Minister, he may not only frequently change his own Decrees, but also dispense with

⁸¹ Dickinson (1977) pp. 57-59, 70-79, 103; Wood (1983) pp. 741-746.

⁸² Toland, *Art of Governing* p. 128.

the very Laws of God, and oppose the clearest Dictats of Nature. This renders the Condition of the Subjects extremely miserable, no Body having any Security for his Estate, which destroys all Frugality of Course⁸³ The failure of a government to ensure justice thus has ramifications for the moral fortitude of the citizenry.

Toland, in the tradition of the classical republicans, looked to Cicero for guidance on the constitutional features of a commonwealth. He found this guidance in an understanding of what constituted a commonwealth which provided terms by which to judge the legitimacy of a government and its actions. A true commonwealth did not just pursue the public good, it was the public good; its whole authority and power emanated from that definition, and if it was compromised, the commonwealth ceased to exist.

III. Establishing civic virtue

Toland not only employs the Cicero of the classical republican tradition by structuring his constitutional republicanism in Ciceronian terms, but also by granting Ciceronian virtue a central role in his political discourse. Throughout Toland's works, Cicero features as a source for understanding the nature and function of the virtuous citizen, particularly in a political context, and as an example of that virtue in action.

i. The virtuous citizen

Towards the end of *Pantheisticon*, a work published in 1720 which imagines and describes a philosophical society of Pantheists, Toland introduced the question of the

⁸³ Toland, *Anglia Libera* pp. 6-7; cf. Pocock (1975) pp. 406-422.

virtuous man, claiming that the members of his Pantheistic society can claim such an accolade.⁸⁴ For a description of this ideal man, which members of the society should aspire to emulate, Toland quotes at length from Cicero's *De Legibus*: "hujus autem viri optimi et ornatissimi Idea à CICERONE, cui tot ac tam egregia debet SODALITAS, luculenter suppeditatur, sub finem libri primi *de Legibus*. Legant Eruditi, et ad hanc se regulam formentur"⁸⁵ The passage then quoted from *De Legibus* is a description provided by Cicero of the virtuous man; having made the case to Quintus that the laws should encourage virtue and protect against vice in the citizens of the republic, Marcus provides an account of the knowledge of how to live which the laws should encourage in citizens.⁸⁶ For an account of the ideal, virtuous citizen it is Cicero to whom Toland turns, not only in *Pantheisticon*, but throughout his works.

As a means of establishing what Toland, and Cicero, perceived to be the qualities of the virtuous citizen, the passage from *De Legibus* and Toland's treatment of it provide invaluable insight. Throughout the *De Legibus* passage Toland highlights the key features he identifies in the margins, including *sui recognitio, animi facultates, ideae et notiones, Ethica, Religio, Physica, Cosmopoliteia* and *Dialectica*. Summarised by these points is Cicero's argument that in order to cultivate virtue, the citizen must first recognise his capacity for knowledge, and then he must desire to

⁸⁴ Toland, *Pantheisticon* pp. 75-87.

⁸⁵ Toland, *Pantheisticon* pp. 82-83: "Cicero, to whom our Society is indebted for so many, and such excellent Things, towards the end of his first book *On Laws*, has furnished us with *A distinct, and exact idea of the best and most accomplished man*. Let the learned then read, and form themselves according to this rule"

⁸⁶ *Leg.I.58-62*; Toland, *Pantheisticon* pp. 83-85 quotes *Leg.I.59-62* in full.

pursue that knowledge as far as possible. It is only by acquiring this knowledge that a citizen will be able to recognise virtue and reject vice.⁸⁷ Cicero's commitment to wisdom as fundamental to virtue is most clearly expressed in his examination, largely Stoic in its nature, of the cardinal virtues in *De Officiis*, where knowledge and the desire to pursue knowledge is once more made central to a person's ability to become virtuous: "omnes enim trahimur et ducimur ad cognitionis et scientiae cupiditatem, in qua excellere pulchrum putamus, labi autem, errare, nescire, decipi et malum et turpe ducimus"⁸⁸ The annotations Toland makes to the passage from *De Legibus* illustrate his understanding of the fundamental importance of knowledge to the acquisition of virtue, an understanding reflected not only in his discussions of virtue, but also in his portrayal of Cicero, indicating the extent to which Cicero takes on an exemplary role in Toland's works.

An instructive example is a reference made to John Locke in Toland's *Life of Milton*. Toland praises Locke for the learning he displayed in his book on *Human Understanding*, and in order to emphasise the extent of his wisdom he calls him the greatest philosopher after Cicero, "for he's throly acquainted with human Nature, well vers'd in the useful Affairs of the World, a great Master of Eloquence (Qualities in which the *Roman* Consul excel'd) and like him also a hearty lover of his Country, as appears by his Treatises of *Government* and *Education*, not inferior in their kind to the divinest Pieces of TULLY"⁸⁹ Not only is Locke's learning praised in terms

⁸⁷ *Leg.*I.58.

⁸⁸ *Off.*I.18: "for all of us feel the pull that leads us to desire to learn and to know; we think it a fine thing to excel in this, while considering it bad and dishonourable to stumble, to wander, to be ignorant, to be deceived"(trans. Griffin and Atkins).

⁸⁹ Toland, *Life of Milton* p. 147.

reminiscent of the *De Legibus* passage, but Cicero is introduced as the paradigm of the learned man, against whom others can be measured. Cicero reappears in this role in Toland's *Adeisidaemon*, where Toland, in the prefatory letter to Anthony Collins, in order to demonstrate the extent of Livy's skill in the learned arts declares that he was only surpassed in his learning by Cicero.⁹⁰ The extent of Cicero's learning is also a theme of *Cicero Illustratus*, where Cicero is regularly praised for excelling in those aspects of wisdom identified above.⁹¹ When Toland invokes Cicero's knowledge, it serves a double purpose in his works: it both reiterates the point that knowledge is vital to virtue, and demonstrates that principle in the person of Cicero himself.

Celebration of Cicero's learning is matched, if not outdone, by celebration of Cicero's eloquence. *Cicero Illustratus* expresses this admiration most fulsomely: "quanta orationis dignitas, efficacia, suavitas!"⁹² It is in the poem *Clito* that this quality of Cicero is most extensively celebrated by Toland, and it is here that the deeper significance of Cicero's eloquence to Toland is indicated. In amidst his description of the Ciceronian eloquence his imagined *Clito* will possess is included a vast knowledge of of the universe and the nature of man.⁹³ This, together with the passage from *De Oratore* adorning the title page of the poem, identifies Toland's celebration of Cicero's eloquence as an extension of his regard for Cicero's

⁹⁰ Toland, *Adeisidaemon*, in the *Epistola*.

⁹¹ *CI* pp. 10, 11, 12-14.

⁹² *CI* p. 13: "how great the dignity, efficacy, pleasantness of his speeches!" see also pp. 3-4, 16; *Life of Milton* pp. 63-64; *Canvassing* p. v.

⁹³ Toland, *Clito* pp. 8-9.

knowledge, and hence an important constituent of his idealisation of Cicero as a virtuous man.⁹⁴ For in the theory of the ideal orator outlined by Cicero in *De Oratore*, including in the passage prefacing *Clito*, the truly eloquent man must have a full working knowledge of all elements of life, including civil law and philosophy.⁹⁵ In fact, Cicero's explanation of the philosophical knowledge required by the orator coheres with Toland's reading of the *De Legibus* passage, identifying for particular attention ethics, physics and dialectic.⁹⁶ Considered in this light, Toland's depiction of Cicero's qualities all contribute to identifying him with the ideal man of *De Legibus*, and in turn *Pantheisticon*.

ii. True *virtus* as moral action

In his description of the virtuous citizen in *De Legibus*, as quoted in *Pantheisticon*, Cicero emphasises that the possession of this knowledge is not sufficient to be fully virtuous; that knowledge must be put into action. At the moment at which a man realises that he is as a member of a civil society, he must start to employ the knowledge he has acquired in the service of that society.⁹⁷ This is a conception of *virtus* which is prominent in Cicero's political and ethical works. Virtue is not simply knowledge to be possessed, virtue exists in the use of that knowledge: *virtutis enim laus omnis in actione consistit*⁹⁸ The contemplative virtue of the

⁹⁴ *De Orat.* II.35; cf. Powell (2012) p. 16.

⁹⁵ *De Orat.* I.41-47, 80-95, 166-200; III.56-143.

⁹⁶ *De Orat.* I.68.

⁹⁷ *Leg.* I.62 and Toland, *Pantheisticon* p. 105.

⁹⁸ *Off.* I.19: *all praise that belongs to virtue lies in action* (trans. Griffin and Atkins); cf. *Rep.* I.2 and *DND.* I.10. See Jackson Barlow (1987) p. 358.

Stoics and the emphasis on pleasure by the Epicureans are rejected in favour of this active virtue.⁹⁹ The belief that true virtue can only be achieved through the use of that virtue rather than the mere theoretical awareness of virtue is central to Cicero's understanding of virtue and of virtuous citizenship, as recognised by Toland's predecessors the classical republicans.

Cicero extends this understanding of the importance of an active virtue to encompass the best possible use of virtue, namely in the service of the state. This is most clearly expressed in the *De Republica*.¹⁰⁰ At the beginning of Book I of *De Republica*, having made his case that virtue is formed through its use, Cicero states that the most important use to which virtue can be put is the government of the state. While this discussion in its entirety was not available to early modern readers, Augustine was able to communicate the fundamental point: "quod nullus sit patriae consulendi modus aut finis bonis"¹⁰¹ More readily available to the early modern reader was the *Dream of Scipio* from Book VI of *De Republica*, which represented the culmination and fullest exposition of this view of virtue from Cicero. Here, it is explicitly shown that it is the good statesman who will be guaranteed their place in heaven, for it is they who have completed the task for which they were put on earth: "sunt autem optimae curae de salute patriae; quibus agitatus et exercitatus animus velocius in hanc sedem et domum suam pervolabit"¹⁰² This is the reward for those

⁹⁹ *Fin.*IV.21-27; *De Orat.*I.57; *Rep.*I.2.

¹⁰⁰ Powell (2012) pp. 17-25; Zetzel (1999) pp. 25-29.

¹⁰¹ Augustine, *Epist.*91.3: "there is for good men no limit or end of looking out for one's country" (trans. Zetzel).

¹⁰² *Rep.*VI.29: "and the best concerns are those that involve the safety of the fatherland; the soul which is aroused and exercised by them will fly more swiftly to this, its dwelling and home" (trans. Zetzel).

who follow the instructions contained within Cicero's works to exercise their virtue in the service of the state.

The idea of a virtue put into the service of the state had a great deal of influence within Toland's works, and within Country Whig ideology in general.¹⁰³ The need to construct a virtuous citizenship was a core concept in the on-going battle with corruption; the virtuous citizen needed to be politically active, as it was only by filling government with virtuous citizens that corruption could be prevented. It was by corruption that the Crown or Court element of government increased its power, thereby threatening the balance at the heart of the constitution, making the rhetoric of corruption fundamentally linked to the preservation of the state. Virtuous citizens would not be liable to corruption, and would therefore protect the government from the inevitable degeneration which would result from corruption at its heart. The need for a virtuous citizenship to serve the state and therefore prevent corruption was a recurring theme of Toland's political tracts.¹⁰⁴ In *The Militia Reform'd* Toland formulates his argument against a Standing Army in the rhetoric of corruption and virtue: "then the only Question is, Whether it be safest to trust Arms continually in the hands of ignorant, idle, and needy Persons; or, only when there's occasion for it, in the hands of sober, industrious, and understanding Freemen"¹⁰⁵ It is assumed that virtuous men will be the most capable members of civic society.

¹⁰³ Scott (2004a) pp. 170-175; Pocock (1975) pp. 401-405; Goldsmith (1994) pp. 207-210; Dickinson (1977) pp. 103-104; Ayres (1997) pp. 4, 22-29; Burt (1992) pp. 1-14, 16-24.

¹⁰⁴ Toland, *Anglia Libera* pp. 6-12; *The Art of Governing by Partys* catalogues the corruption of the state by Charles II.

¹⁰⁵ Toland, *Militia Reform'd* p. 17.

iii. Guidance for the virtuous citizen

The importance of virtuous citizens for the state established, it remains for Toland to demonstrate precisely how a virtuous community might be achieved. The conclusion of the passage from *De Legibus* selected for the ideal man in *Pantheisticon* provides some guidance, as summarised by Toland in the margins of the text: *Politica et Eloquentia, Reipublicae procuratio, Historia* and *Summa sapientia*.¹⁰⁶ Virtue can be accumulated for the service of the state through the use of eloquence in a political context, through the just and proper administration of the state, and through the use of historical examples to undertake the further education of citizens in virtue. It is therefore incumbent on the statesman to use his own virtue and his eloquence to ensure the circumstances amenable to the formation of virtue. Once more, Toland not only looks to Cicero for instruction on how this virtue might be developed, but as an important example of the statesman's role in this process.

The virtuous man must use eloquence to encourage citizens to virtue: æumque se ad civilem societatem natum senserit, non solum illa subtili disputatione sibi utendum putabit sed etiam fusa latius perpetua oratione, qua regat populos.¹⁰⁷ This is the theme of the poem *Clito* (1700), in which the responsibility of the orator to persuade citizens to virtuous action, and deflect them from vice, is the central message of the poem. Mirroring the sentiment expressed by Cicero's Antonius in the quote from *De Oratore* on the title page, 'Clito declares that he will 'sooth the

¹⁰⁶ Toland, *Pantheisticon* p. 85, referring to *Leg.I.62*.

¹⁰⁷ *Off.I.62*: 'and when he realizes that he is born for civil society, he will realize that he must use not just that refined type of argument but also a more expansive style of speaking, through which to guide the peoples (trans. Griffin and Atkins).

raging Mob with mildest words, or sluggish Cowards rouse to use their Swords. As furious Winds sweep down whatever resists, So shall my Tongue perform whatever it lifts, With large impetuous Floods of Eloquence Tickle the Fancy, and bewitch the Sense; Make what it will the justest Cause appear, And what's perplex or dark look bright and clear¹⁰⁸ Toland in this poem depicts the virtuous statesman in action, and that action is largely dependent on the statesman's ability to guide the citizens to virtuous action with his oratory.¹⁰⁹ Toland again imagines himself in this role in *Anglia Libera*: "O that my words could effectually rouse the Souls of those who droop or despair, and engage them so far in their own Interest as resolutely to vindicate their Freedom, or nobly to perish in the Attempt¹¹⁰ In this way Cicero himself, whose eloquence was always at the disposal of the Roman republic, inevitably appears as a source of inspiration for how the orator-statesman might contribute. It is often in this guise that his works appear in Toland's writings, quoting extensively from speeches so that Cicero's eloquence might continue to exert some influence.

It is also the responsibility of the virtuous statesman to oversee the proper administration of the state, so that the structures are in place to encourage citizens to virtue: "...qua stabiliat leges, qua castiget improbos, qua tueatur bonos, qua audet claros viros, qua praecepta salutis et laudis apte ad persuadendum edat suis civibus¹¹¹ The title page of the *State-Anatomy* adopts one of Cicero's most

¹⁰⁸ Toland, *Clito* p. 7.

¹⁰⁹ Smith (1996) pp. 1-18; Champion (2003) pp. 110-111.

¹¹⁰ Toland, *Anglia Libera* p. 188.

¹¹¹ *Leg. I.62*: "...to establish laws, to chastise the wicked and protect the good, to praise famous men and to issue instructions for safety and glory suited to persuading his fellow citizens"

eloquent expressions of the statesman's duty in this respect: *ut enim Gubernatori Cursus secundus, Medico Salus, Imperatori Victoria; sic huic MODERATORI REIPUBLICAE beata Civium vita proposita est: ut Opibus, Copijs locuples, Gloria ampla, Virtute honesta sit*¹¹² Toland repeats throughout his works this image which associates the state with a ship, and the statesman with the helmsman of that ship, thereby depicting the virtuous statesman's responsibility as steering the state to virtue through his administration.¹¹³ For example, Toland's description of the efforts to repair the state following the rule of Charles II: *but they were wiser in those Times, and the Consideration of the dreadful Shipwreck they had so lately escap'd, made them chuse Pilots of a quite contrary Disposition, who, as far as in them lay, and as long as they were permitted to sit at the Helm, repair'd the shatter'd Vessel of the Commonwealth, restor'd its Honour, reviv'd its drooping Genius, gave Force to its Laws...*¹¹⁴ The trust Toland places in Cicero as an example of such a statesman is reflected in the extent to which he draws on Cicero as an advisory figure throughout his political works. On questions of education, finance, governance, even foreign affairs, Toland looks to Cicero for advice on how best to manage these elements of the commonwealth.

¹¹² *Rep.* V.8a, recorded in *ad Att.* VIII.11: *as a helmsman aims at a good voyage, a doctor at saving his patient, a general at victory, so this guide of the commonwealth aims at the blessedness of the life of his citizens, that they should be solid in their resources, rich in property, well endowed with glory, honourable in virtue* (trans. Zetzel). On Cicero's conception of the statesman as *rector rei publicae* see Powell (2012) p. 15 and (1994) pp. 19-29; cf. Jackson Barlow (1987) pp. 353-374.

¹¹³ Toland, *Art of Governing* pp. 1-2, *Mystery of State* p. 5, *Second part of the State Anatomy* p. 73.

¹¹⁴ Toland, *The Danger of Mercenary Parliaments* p. 7.

Finally, there is the idea that the virtuous man would be able *factaque et consulta fortium et sapientium, cum improborum ignominiâ, sempiternis monumentis prodere*¹¹⁵ The statesman will provide his citizens with an education in virtuous action drawn from figures in history, and will in this way contribute to the creation of a virtuous citizenship. Toland deploys this aspect of Cicero's virtuous statesman in *The Militia Reform'd*, to show how a virtuous citizenship could be developed to which the defence of the state might be entrusted. To this end, he not only quotes Cicero's appeal to Luceius to immortalise the achievements of his consulship for the inspiration and edification of future generations, but also draws on Cicero's justification of his philosophical project in *De Divinatione* as a service to the state.¹¹⁶ As Toland explains, *this Digression (if any thing that makes for my purpose may be so call'd) is intended to excite our Youth to pursue Fame by noble and useful Performances. TULLY, whose Eloquence and Quality of a Roman Senator made him an Advocate for Kings, disdains not to acknowledg that he wrote the best part of his incomparable Works to reform and instruct the Youth; which in that declining State of the Commonwealth, was strangely corrupted*¹¹⁷ In addition, in *Cicero Illustratus* Toland makes explicit his belief that Cicero himself should serve as such an historical example, calling on all men in public office to reintroduce themselves to Cicero's works and keep them as a guide to appropriate action at all times.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁵ *Leg. I.62*: *to enshrine in eternal memorials the deeds and opinions of brave and wise men together with the disgrace of the wicked* (trans. Zetzel). See Jackson Barlow (1987) p. 353 on Cicero's commitment to education of citizens.

¹¹⁶ Toland, *Militia Reform'd* pp. 64-66, quoting *ad Fam. V.12* and *Div. II.4*.

¹¹⁷ Toland, *Militia Reform'd* pp. 65-66.

¹¹⁸ *CI* pp. 16, 20-21.

In his political works, Toland readily employs Cicero as a source for the place of virtue in civic society, a role in which Cicero had been extensively utilised by the classical republicans. In that capacity, Toland was able to construct from Cicero's works, and from the example set by Cicero himself, a case for the vital importance to the state of virtuous citizens, and advice for how to create those citizens.

IV. Toland's reorientation of Republican discourse

Toland's extensive deployment of Ciceronian tradition in a manner concordant with the classical republican tradition does not necessarily signify a lack of innovation on Toland's part, or a wish to transmit that tradition in pristine condition. The constitutional context in which Toland wrote demanded modifications to that republican tradition, if it were to survive, and the Ciceronian tradition proved vital to this process.

i. Adapting to the post-Revolution reality

The constitutional reality of England in the years after the Glorious Revolution in 1688 was that of a limited monarchy. In 1689 the Declaration of Rights had initiated this process by introducing limitations on the crown in the form of the interruption of the hereditary succession, the cessation of the Crown's right to establish laws, and the abolition of a standing army in peacetime.¹¹⁹ Meanwhile, the powers of Parliament increased, as its responsibilities were extended, its meetings were made more regular, and it was granted significant control over the Crown's funds. The task begun by the Declaration of Rights was sustained by the Act of Settlement in

¹¹⁹ Hoppit (2000) pp. 23-27, 37-38, 143; Dickinson (1977) pp. 79-90, (2002) p. 55; Scott (2004a) p. 343.

June 1701, whose foremost purpose was to allot the succession to the next Protestant in the line of succession, Sophia, Electress of Brunswick-Lüneburg, of the House of Hanover.¹²⁰ Included in the Act were numerous limitations on the powers of future monarchs. Some of these were concerned with the problems of a foreign monarch made evident by William III, such as the restriction on the monarch's ability to leave their realm without the agreement of Parliament. Others were directed against the means by which a monarch might extend their control over Parliament, such as a ban on placemen and pensioners from the Commons. The limitations on the power of the monarch represented by these Acts, and the enhancement of the power of Parliament, advanced the English constitution towards a balance of power.

It was for this reason that the protection of the post-1688 constitution became a core tenet of Whig ideology.¹²¹ While the Whigs believed that neither stability nor liberty could exist under absolute rule, the guarantees on both fronts represented by the balanced government created by the limitations on the monarchy in large part satisfied their concerns.¹²² It was also viewed amongst republicans as a triumph for their cause, on the basis that it had not only obstructed the existence of absolute rule, and hence tyranny, in England in favour of constitutional government, but it had also protected the country from the threat posed by Catholicism.¹²³ It was depicted as an achievement for republicanism and Protestantism, particularly by Toland, whose

¹²⁰ Hoppit (2000) pp. 39-41, 161-165; Kenyon (1977) pp. 55-60; Dickinson (2002) p. 61; Champion (2003) p. 116.

¹²¹ Robbins (1968) p. 8; Worden (1991) pp. 443-448; Pocock (1975) pp. 406-422; Goldsmith (1994) pp. 200-207; Dickinson (1977) p. 103, (2002) pp. 6-7.

¹²² Dickinson (1977) pp. 57, 59-70; Venturi (1971) pp. 47-69.

¹²³ Goldsmith (1994) pp. 200-207; Champion (2003) p. 116; Scott (2004a) p. 343.

political tracts provided extensive defences of both the limitations on the monarchy, and the Protestant succession. In *Anglia Libera*, a text which celebrates at length the importance of the Act of Settlement for the future of England, Toland declares that now of all these put together it may be truly affirm'd, that there is not a nobler Body of Laws, or a better Fence for Liberty and Property in any Commonwealth in the World¹²⁴ In this way, and with works such as this, Toland became a pre-eminent champion of the limited monarchy in England.

The problem for Toland and other republicans was the strong association between their political tradition and regicide. There was an anti-monarchical tendency in the works of the classical republicans after 1649, which conflicted with the adherence to limited monarchy being championed by their heirs.¹²⁵ Once the republic had already been established, theorists propounded the argument that monarchies by their very nature must be equated with tyrannies, as no free state could be subject to the will of a single person.¹²⁶ This was most explicitly stated by Marchmont Nedham, who used his editorial pieces in the *Mercurius Politicus* to call for the abolition of monarchy.¹²⁷ In the work of John Milton, it was his emphasis on resistance theory

¹²⁴ Toland, *Anglia Libera* p. 40. This text was a public defence for a Europe-wide audience, translated into French, Dutch and German.

¹²⁵ There is debate within modern scholarship concerning the origins of the anti-monarchical tendency in English republican thought. Worden (1991) pp. 449-564, (2002) pp. 308, 315-318, argues that the idea of a constitutional republic did not gain currency, even within republican circles, until after the regicide, when such an ideology was made necessary; cf. Wootton (1994) pp. 5-7, Scott (2004a) p. 35. Peltonen (1995) pp. 12-13 and Norbrook (1999) pp. 1-22 have traced the origins of this constitutional republicanism to the period before the civil war.

¹²⁶ Goldsmith (1994) pp. 197-200; Scott (2004b) pp. 596-597.

¹²⁷ Worden (1991) pp. 449-464, (2002) pp. 324-325; Scott (2004a) pp. 43-44, (2004b) pp. 597-598.

and the right to overthrow a monarch, that granted him a reputation for anti-monarchical tendencies which was later used as a weapon against the Whigs by the Tories.¹²⁸ Harrington's imagined commonwealth Oceana rejected monarchy, establishing a democratic government constituted from two elected assemblies.¹²⁹ An explicit call for the abolition of monarchy or the murder of kings may not have been a consistent feature of republican discourse in the seventeenth century, but there was sufficient material within that tradition to ensure the association between republicanism and anti-monarchism.

Toland's efforts to re-orientate that republican discourse so that it might become consistent with a limited monarchy have been subject to extensive debate in modern scholarship. Dominant for a long time was the hostile tradition emanating from Leslie Stephen that Toland's contribution to political thought was minimal.¹³⁰ Pocock rehabilitated Toland to an extent when he identified him with his 'neo-Harringtonians' as a continuator of the republican tradition represented by Harrington's work.¹³¹ Venturi made an important contribution to appreciation of Toland's political thought when he identified Toland as the founder of the modern republican tradition, rather than the continuator of existing classical republicanism.¹³² Toland transmitted the ideas of the classical republicans to a new

¹²⁸ von Maltzahn (1995) pp. 30-36; Scott (2004b) pp. 595, 599.

¹²⁹ Worden (1991) pp. 449-464, (2002) p. 317.

¹³⁰ Stephen (1876) pp. 101-102.

¹³¹ Pocock (1985) pp. 232-233, (1975) pp. 431-432, (1980) p. 93. On the neo-Harringtonians Worden (1994) pp. 140-144; Davis (1981) p. 685; Phillipson (1993) pp. 211-216.

¹³² Venturi (1971) pp. 47-69; Wootton (1994) pp. 20-26.

generation through his editorial work, while also recognising their unsuitability to the present reality and adapting them accordingly, creating something new and influential. Champion has built upon Venturi's conclusions, identifying the means by which Toland constructed this new republican theory.¹³³ By adapting classical republicanism to the limited monarchy of English reality, Toland successfully forged a means of authorising, and therefore defending, a monarchical commonwealth. Toland's use of the Ciceronian tradition was an essential part of this process.

ii. Legitimising a limited monarchy

As already shown, Toland extensively employed Cicero's definition of a republic as the *res populi*, or the common good. This definition became a vital constituent of Toland's argument that a limited monarchy could meet the criteria of a true commonwealth. This is made apparent in *Anglia Libera* when Toland explains that a republic does not need to take a particular constitutional form, it needs only to meet Cicero's definition: "but to avoid Ambiguity, let it be remember'd that in this Section, as well as before and after, I mean by the word *Commonwealth* not a pure Democracy, nor any particular Form of Government; but an independent Community, where the Common Weal or Good of all indifferently is design'd and pursu'd, let the Form be what it will"¹³⁴ This statement appears as part of an argument by Toland that republicans can be satisfied with the limitations placed on the monarchy by the Act of Settlement, as liberty and the common good remain at

¹³³ Champion (2003), esp. pp. 96-112.

¹³⁴ Toland, *Anglia Libera* p. 92.

the heart of the constitution.¹³⁵ As long as the common good was safeguarded by the constitution, that constitution could take any form, including a monarchy.

Toland extends this argument into the battle against tyranny which permeates his works. It is a tyranny, not a monarchy, which cannot be a true republic, as a tyrant does not protect the common good. This is evident in Toland's editorial modifications to the works of the classical republicans.¹³⁶ On the frontispiece of his edition of Harrington's *Oceana* Cicero's definition of the republic from *De Republica* was displayed. By this technique, together with an emphasis on Harrington's hostility to arbitrary rule within the edition, Toland was able to associate Harrington's republicanism with his own understanding of a Commonwealth, rather than a particular constitutional stance. Milton's works were subject to a similar modification, as in his *Life of Milton* Toland took care to shift attention away from Milton's republicanism and commitment to resistance theory towards his hostility to the clergy.¹³⁷ Toland used his position as editor of these works to direct emphasis away from hostility towards monarchy as a constitutional form, and towards opposition to arbitrary rule which transgressed the common good. If classical republicans were primarily concerned with the prevention of tyranny or arbitrary government, as Toland suggests, then the definition of legitimate government Toland drew from Cicero should meet their requirements.

¹³⁵ See Worden (1994) pp. 175-193 for a reading of Toland based on the rejection of the idea that a republic can be monarchical and (2002) pp. 307-308 on 'constitutional' republicanism, and Dzelzainis (2002) pp. 27-42 arguing the case against the separation of republicanism and regicide in modern historical scholarship.

¹³⁶ Worden (2001) pp. 112-114; Champion (2003) pp. 112-115.

¹³⁷ von Maltzahn (1995) pp. 230-236, 241-252; Lindenbaum (1997) pp. 6-9.

The portrayal of tyranny as the true enemy of the Commonwealth, as opposed to monarchy, extends into Toland's own works, most notably *The Art of Governing by Partys*. Toland structures his critique of factional politics around a comparison between the tyrant Charles II's exploitation of these factions to enhance his own power, and the efforts of William III since to reconcile those elements. Toland takes every opportunity to demonstrate the extent to which the arbitrary rule of a tyrant works against the common good, claiming that under a tyrant "the people are beggarly and slavish, but the Monarch is Great and Mighty, the prime Nobility and Gentry being reduc'd to depend on his liberality, the stoutest of the commons forc'd to serve his Troops for Bread, and all degrees of Persons made the Instruments of gratifying his Vanity, Rapaciousness, or Lust"¹³⁸ William, on the other hand, was not driven by his own interests, but by those of his people, for example in the case of political conflicts: "next to our Preservation, his chiefest Care will be to bring us all into the same Interest, which is the only thing that can heal our Divisions"¹³⁹ By constructing his version of Charles II in these terms, then setting William as a direct contrast, Toland was able to show that it was arbitrary rule which undermined the republic, not the institution of monarchy itself.

The definition of a republic Toland adopted from Cicero allows him to make one further claim: not only is it entirely possible for a republic to be governed by a constitutional monarchy, but England itself represents such a Commonwealth. This is made most explicit in the *State-Anatomy*, in which Toland quotes Cicero's constitutional theory once again: "such a constitution as this of ours, is reckon'd the

¹³⁸ Toland, *Art of Governing* pp. 3-4.

¹³⁹ Toland, *Art of Governing* p. 51.

best of all others by the most judicious of the ancients, as *Aristotle, Polybius, and Cicero*. *I judge that Government to be the best-constituted* (says this last) *which consists in a proportionable mixture of those three kinds, the Monarchical, Aristocratical, and Democratical: which Government must neither by sobriety irritate fierce and unruly Minds, nor yet, in passing over every thing, make the subjects worse by encouraging Licentiousness*. This is the very Picture of our present State¹⁴⁰ According to Toland and the Whigs, the balance represented by the mixed constitution had been achieved with the limitations placed on the monarchy by the Glorious Revolution and the Act of Settlement, and the resultant elevation of Parliamentary sovereignty. Under these new conditions, the monarchy represented an element of the constitution, rather than the constitution itself.

Toland's adoption of the Ciceronian definition of a Commonwealth, consistent with the classical republican tradition, therefore serves an important purpose within his own republican discourse. It allows him to legitimise the limited monarchy as coherent with republican principles. The limitations which had been applied to the monarchy had achieved balance and control in the constitution, and ensured that it would be consistent with the protection of the public good, and hence legitimate. For it was not a particular constitutional form which defined a republic, but its ability to protect the public good.

iii. A virtuous monarchy

Constitutional limitations on the monarchy which ensure the protection of liberty and the common good are one means of safeguarding the commonwealth, the other is the

¹⁴⁰ Toland, *State-Anatomy* p. 9, quoting a fragment of *De Republica* book II preserved by Nonius Marcellus 342.39; cf. *Art of Governing* p. 31.

virtue of the monarch. Toland continues the integration of the monarchy with republican discourse by depicting the monarch as the virtuous statesman so vital to the commonwealth. The statesman will ensure the citizenship is virtuous; Toland demonstrates that the monarch can assume the role of the *moderator reipublicae*. In order to further deploy the authority of the Ciceronian tradition to construct legitimacy for the limited monarchy Toland presents the monarchs as examples of Cicero's virtuous statesmen. This extends to William III and George I, and to the House of Hanover, but not to Anne, whose association with the High Church precluded Toland's committed support. A further sense of Toland's conception of the role of the King as similar to that of a statesman, and to his ideal statesman Cicero, is evident in *The Art of Governing by Partys*, when Toland explains that a King must not show favour to factions -for thereby he becomes only the King of a Faction, and ceases to be the common Father of his People¹⁴¹ The gift of this title to Cicero was an indication of the extent to which he, as a prominent statesman in the Roman Republic, put the common good above all considerations. For Toland, it is entirely plausible that a king may assume such a role.

William's character receives extensive attention, particularly in Toland's *Anglia Libera*. The aim of this treatise, to champion the Protestant Succession as established in the Act of Settlement, is in large part served by a portrayal of the virtue of the Protestant monarch who has established the succession, and for whom the succession was last interrupted. The fact that William was chosen as King on account of his merits, and in recognition of his ability to protect the rights and liberties of the people, is repeatedly asserted -so they may safely conclude, that no

¹⁴¹ Toland, *Art of Governing* p. 41.

King can ever be so good as one of their own making¹⁴² This was a decision proved correct by William's conduct, as references to his ability to administer the Commonwealth effectively demonstrate. On the question of the succession, for example, William had pursued the Protestant Succession because he had realised the importance of the protection of the Protestant religion for the good of his people: -it evidently demonstrates with what a generous Ardor his Majesty's inflam'd to perfect the Deliverance he so magnanimously begun, and so gloriously continu'd; and that he did not com from one free Country into another with the mean Design of procuring more Power to Himself, but with the godlike Resolution of acquiring more Liberty to them¹⁴³ William represents an example of a King whose virtue meant that he administered the state for the benefit of his people.

Toland enhances the association between William and Cicero's virtuous statesman by depicting him as the orator-statesman so celebrated by Cicero and himself. The poem *Clito* portrays William's rule in terms related to the image of the statesman using his eloquence to guide his people to virtuous action: -BUT what in faint Ideas I conceive, A matchless Hero will by Facts achieve; That Freedom he restor'd he will maintain, Incourage Merit, and leud Vice restrain. Our Laws, Religion, Arms, our Coin and Trade, All flourish under him, before decay'd; In this more safe, more mighty, and renown'd, Than if ten thousand Successors he crown'd: For oft a just and valiant Prince's Name Degenerat Sons by horrid Crimes defame¹⁴⁴ Toland goes on to elaborate in verse the nature of William's rule: he will with his eloquence

¹⁴² Toland, *Anglia Libera* p. 26.

¹⁴³ Toland, *Anglia Libera* p. 36.

¹⁴⁴ Toland, *Clito* pp. 11-12.

defend British interests abroad, and protect her shores, defending her against such domestic threats as priestcraft and popery. Even though the poem was written in 1700, before the Act of Settlement, the extent of Toland's belief in the power of a virtuous monarch is palpable. In a poem which depicts in detail the way in which the virtuous statesman should rule, William's rule is depicted as entirely conducive to those aims.

Toland's association of Cicero's virtuous statesman with the possibility of a virtuous monarch is made most apparent in his *State-Anatomy* in 1717. In the conclusion of this work, Toland uses the quote from *De Republica* which adorned his title page defining the virtuous statesman to describe King George: "upon your arrival, you'll find that I have given you right information in every matter, and particularly that I have reason to apply literally to King *GEORGE*, what *Cicero* conceiv'd of a Prince in *Idea*"¹⁴⁵ The King hence takes on the role of *moderator reipublicae*. George is constructed further into an example of how the virtue of a monarch will affect favourably his manner of ruling: "if you weigh all this, I repeat it, and the unexampled mild use, which the King has made of the extraordinary power that was more than once put into his hands, which shows his resolution of ever making the Law his rule"¹⁴⁶ This treatment of the first Hanoverian king marks the culmination of Toland's lengthy service as a source of propaganda for the House of Hanover, presenting the Hanoverians in these virtuous terms, as he supported their

¹⁴⁵ Toland, *State-Anatomy* p. 103.

¹⁴⁶ Toland, *State-Anatomy* p. 103.

claim to the succession.¹⁴⁷ The Protestant Succession, when it finally took place, had provided the country with the promised virtuous king.

While in constitutional terms there is no inconsistency between a monarchy and a republic, provided limitations on the monarchy are instituted to safeguard the Commonwealth, the republic still requires virtuous statesmen to ensure the pursuit of the common good so vital to its legitimacy. The monarch is capable of assuming the role of the virtuous statesman, thereby contributing the strength of the Commonwealth. England is a true Commonwealth, because her monarchy is limited, and her kings are virtuous.

V. Conclusion

Toland's most prominent contribution to republican discourse was its reorientation, or reinvention, to advocate the legitimacy of a limited monarchy. In his political works he was able to portray the post-Revolution constitution as conducive to republican principles, as it achieved balance in the constitution and protected the public good. Even more significantly, he was able to adapt the classical republican tradition to this limited monarchy, by shifting the emphasis of their polemic from monarchy to tyranny, and once more focussing on the primary importance of the public good and civic virtue.

Cicero was a fundamental tool for Toland in this process. In Cicero he identified a definition of the *res publica* which transferred attention from the constitution of the commonwealth to its conduct, identifying its primary goal as the protection of the

¹⁴⁷ Toland's personal friendship with the future queen Sophia may have played some role in encouraging his pro-monarchical stance.

common good through the promotion of justice. Cicero also acted as a theoretical source and an historical model for the importance of virtue in the commonwealth to further preserve the common good. Toland drew upon Cicero to demonstrate the necessity of virtuous citizens and statesmen for the survival of the republic, and to identify the means by which this virtuous community might be developed. These two manifestations of Ciceronian influence in Toland's political discourse combined in his efforts to legitimise the limited monarchy: Cicero provided the constitutional theory to show that a limited monarchy could be a legitimate republic, and an understanding of the role of the virtuous statesman which could be applied to the monarch to further enhance their authority.

In order to achieve these ends Toland drew upon the Ciceronian tradition as it was constructed and deployed in the classical republican tradition. Toland's editorial efforts and use of the classical republicans in his own works demonstrate the extent to which he sought to adapt that tradition to the changed constitutional circumstances following the revolution. Toland's use of the Ciceronian tradition demonstrates this process: he took a familiar understanding of Cicero's philosophy, imbued with the authority of the classical republicans, but he used that authority to modify and redefine significant elements of that very tradition.

CHAPTER FIVE

CICERONIANISM AND PRIESTCRAFT

Ut verè loquamur, Superstitio fusa per gentes oppressit omnium ferè animos, atque hominum imbecillitatem occupavit; quod et in iis Libris dictum est, qui sunt de Natura Deorum, et hac Disputatione id maximè egimus: multum enim et nobismet ipsis et nostris profuturi videbamus, si eam funditus sustulissemus. Nec verò (id enim diligenter intelligi volo) superstitione tollendâ Religio tollitur: nam et majorum instituta tueri, sacris caeremoniisque retinendis, sapientis est; et esse praestantem aliquam aeternamque Naturam, et eam suspiciendam admirandamque hominum generi, pulchritudo mundi ordoque rerum coelestium cogit confiteri. Quamobrem, ut Religio propaganda etiam, quae est juncta cum cognitione naturae; sic superstitionis stirpes omnes ejiciendae.¹

The above passage from the end of Cicero's *De Divinatione* features extensively in Toland's works. Toland uses the excerpt *ut RELIGIO propaganda etiam, quae est juncta cum cognitione Naturae; sic SUPERSTITIONIS stirpes omnes ejiciendae* to adorn the frontispiece of *Adeisidaemon*, a work published in 1709 which challenged the tradition that Livy was a superstitious man.² It would appear again in 1720 in the liturgy of Toland's imagined religion, as described in *Pantheisticon*, introduced as a means of reminding the congregation that they will not permit superstition in any

¹ *De Divinatione* II.148-149, as quoted by Toland, *CI* p. 38.

² The passage was also quoted in Toland, *Origines Judiciae* pp. 101-103, the partner work of *Adeisidaemon*.

form to infiltrate their philosophy. Toland's deployment of this passage as a means of indicting superstitious practices reveals a significant incarnation of Cicero in Toland's works: as the enemy of superstition. Toland admitted this explicitly in *Cicero Illustratus*, when he said of Cicero "profectò prae cunctis mortalibus Superstitionis malleus dici poterat"³ For Toland, Cicero was a vital precedent for his efforts to undermine the power possessed by superstition.

This is further demonstrated by the extent to which Cicero appeared in this guise in the context of Toland's own war on superstition, in which the superstition being besieged was priestcraft. Toland utilised Cicero's key theological texts *De Divinatione* and *De Natura Deorum*, and the sceptical arguments they contained, in those of his philosophical works which sought to illustrate the false basis of priestly authority, so that it might be eradicated. From Toland's *Two Essays*, written in 1695 on the questions of creation and the rise of fables, to his *Pantheisticon* in 1720, in which he detailed his ideal pantheistic religion, Toland drew on Cicero for philosophical arguments and historical evidence to support his theories. In Toland's *Letters to Serena* in 1704, in which he made many of his most important arguments against priestly authority, Cicero features extensively in his guise as the enemy of superstition: "can any Man be so stupid as to count CICERO...a heathen, who, in his admirable Treatises *of Divination* and *of the Nature of the Gods*, has demonstratively subverted their Polytheism, Sacrifices, pretended Revelations, Prophecys, and Miracles; their Oracles, Augurys, Oneirocriticks, Incantations, and all Fopperys of

³ *CI* p. 59: "ruly [he] can be called the hammer of Superstition before all mortals"

the like sort?⁴ As Toland established the philosophical bases of his war on priestcraft, it was Cicero to whom he turned for both inspiration and material.

This war on priestcraft was a fundamental feature of Toland's broader republican project. Toland understood the greatest threat to the Commonwealth to emanate not from the monarchy, safely restrained by its constitutional limitations, but from the clergy.⁵ As far as Toland was concerned, the clergy was inseparable from tyranny, hindering liberty in both the civil and spiritual sphere, and hence undermining the commonwealth concern for the public good by pursuing its private interests. Priestcraft became the exploitation of clerical authority to further the interests of the clergy to the cost of the interests of the state. As a result, anticlericalism became a prominent feature of both republicanism and Whig ideology in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century, with Toland in the vanguard.⁶ Toland's hostility to priestcraft was dominant in both his political and philosophical works, as he sought to demonstrate the extent to which the clergy posed a threat to the Commonwealth he championed.

The spiritual tyranny the clergy established was instituted by their influence over the minds of men, for *Popery in reality is nothing else, but the Clergy's assuming a*

⁴ Toland, *Letters to Serena* III.17.

⁵ Champion (1992) pp. 1-24, 173-179, (2003) p. 97; Worden (1991) p. 473; Goldie (1993) pp. 209-211; Scott (2004a) pp. 41-44.

⁶ Goldie (1993) pp. 220-225; Klein (1993) pp. 291-295; Scott (2004a) pp. 49-54; Champion (2000a) p. 548, (2000b) p. 42; Barnett (1999) pp. 129-151. Ashcraft (1995) pp. 73-74 uses Locke to make an alternative case for the place of anticlericalism in political thought.

*Right to think for the Laity*⁷ The clergy interposed themselves between the laity and the divine in order to make themselves indispensable to the laity's understanding of religion, morality, and society. Their claim to sacerdotal authority imbued them with an immense power to demand obedience and trust from the laity, further extending their power over the minds of men. In the works of writers as varied as Herbert of Cherbury, Hobbes, and Robert Howard, the clergy were accused of imposing creeds, sacraments and other manifestations of their supposed sacerdotal authority intended to enhance their power over the laity.⁸ Toland exercised every opportunity to perpetuate the accusation that the clergy exploited the position they held in order to enhance that spiritual power. It was a particular feature of his more controversial or philosophical works to undermine the claims made by the clergy to this special authority. In the *Letters to Serena* Toland sought to expose the roots of this myth concerning their power, constructing a theory of priestly imposture which was extended in his heterodox accounts of Moses in *Origines Judiciae*, the *Traité des Trois Imposteurs*, *Hodegus* and *Nazarenus*. Toland also forged a theological argument, most famously associated with his *Christianity not Mysterious*, that as nothing in religion should be inaccessible to man's reason, those aspects of Christianity which supposedly required priestly interpretation must have been invented by them to extend their power over the laity: "in the process of time, when the Clergy began to be excited even above the supreme Magistrat himself, they burnt

⁷ Toland, *Appeal* p. 38; see also "Memorial" in *Collections* II.230. On this concept of a spiritual tyranny see Goldie (1993) p. 220; Champion (1992) pp. 137-160, (2003) pp. 83, 245, 249-251; Popkin and Goldie (2006) p. 85; Israel (2007) pp. xvii-xviii. On the role of the Church in society see Gregory (1993) pp. 67-85.

⁸ Champion (1992) pp. 133-137.

and destroy'd every thing that did not favor their Power or Superstition, and laid a restraint on Reading as well as Writing, without excepting the very Bible⁹ The threat posed to the Commonwealth was in the first place based on the influence the clergy possessed over the minds of its citizens, hindering their personal liberties.

It was the possibility of that spiritual tyranny being deployed in the service of civil tyranny that provoked the particular concern of republicans.¹⁰ Toland associated religion, and the clergy particularly, with the ability of a tyrant to establish absolutist rule, a case most clearly put in his account of arbitrary rule in *Anglia Libera*, and his account of Charles II's tyranny in the *Art of Governing by Partys*. The clergy was accused of exploiting its power over the laity to perpetuate the doctrines of tyranny on Charles's behalf: "the Pulpits immediatly sounded with nothing else but *Passive Obedience* and *Non-resistance* to all the King's Commands, of what nature soever under the pain of Eternal Damnation; that if our Property, Religion, or Lives should be attack'd by him, we must have recourse to no defence but Prayers and Tears; and that Monarchy as well as Episcopacy was of Divine Right, with the like extravagant Doctrins"¹¹ Toland accused the clergy of encouraging such tyrannical power to serve their own interests. His *Life of Milton* provoked great controversy when it returned to the question of the authorship of *Eikon Basilike*, claiming that it was the work of the King's chaplain, and indicting it as an example of the clergy's efforts to

⁹ Toland, *Life of Milton* p. 64; cf. *Appeal* p. 38 and "Memorial" in *Collections* II.230.

¹⁰ Goldie (1987) pp. 197-206, 212-218, (1993) p. 212; Champion (1992) pp. 173-179, (2003) p. 247, (2000a) pp. 549-551; Scott (2004a) pp. 49-54.

¹¹ Toland, *Art of Governing* pp. 14-15; cf. *Anglia Libera* pp. 11-31, *Reasons for Naturalising* p. 36.

maintain tyranny.¹² He further used his influence as editor of Milton, Harrington, and the republicans to accentuate the hostility to the clergy as props of absolutism already evident within those works.¹³ Toland repeatedly emphasised the threat posed to the integrity of the commonwealth by a clerical body whose interests lay with absolutist rulers, dependent on the Church for their own authority.

The war against priestcraft, responding to the perceived threat posed by clerical power to spiritual and civil liberties, formed a central part of Toland's broader republican project. His depiction of Cicero as an enemy to superstition, and his deployment of that Cicero, particularly in the philosophical contributions to his discourse, indicate that Cicero performed more than one role in Toland's works. The means by which Toland adapted Cicero for the war on priestcraft, and the consequences for Toland's project, will form the subject of this chapter.

I. Establishing Cicero as an arbiter of reason

Toland's wish to use Cicero as a means of constructing arguments to challenge the established Church was not without difficulties, as his own claims concerning Cicero's role in Christian discourse demonstrate. Even while ascribing scepticism to Cicero concerning religious practices, Toland also suggests Cicero as a means of defending Christianity, proposing in *Cicero Illustratus* to include an index cataloguing the passages in Cicero which might be used on behalf of Christianity.¹⁴ He goes on to dwell on the extent to which the early Christian writers relied on

¹² Toland, *Life of Milton* p. 83; cf. *Amyntor* pp. 103-104.

¹³ Worden (2001) pp. 115-116; Champion (2003) pp. 97, 101, (1999b) p. 20.

¹⁴ *CI* p. 59.

Cicero for ammunition in their campaign against paganism, identifying Minucius, Cyprian, Tertullian and Lactantius as particular examples. A passage from Arnobius especially appeals to Toland, previously deployed in this context in the *Letters to Serena*: "ARNOBIUS, after doing Justice to others, maintains that if TULLY's Works were read, the Christians need not trouble themselves with Writing"¹⁵ Essentially, Arnobius claims that Cicero had already done so much to undermine pagan practices, that to burn his books as the Senate proposed to do would do far greater damage to Christianity than maintaining them. The fact that Toland is able to claim Cicero as both a weapon against the clergy, and at the same time a defender of Christianity, illustrates a problem with the Ciceronian evidence Toland proposed to use.

i. The problem of the Ciceronian evidence

The nature of Cicero's philosophical works has made it near impossible for generations of Ciceronian scholars to identify for certain which views expressed coalesce with Cicero's own, as discussed in Chapter Three. This has caused particular problems when attempting to locate Cicero's personal philosophical and theological views. Cicero wrote the majority of his philosophical works in the form of a dialogue, often apportioning the roles in those dialogues to historical or contemporary characters, and assigning himself only small roles. In addition, the different voices in the dialogue were often deployed to represent differing philosophical views in the manner of a debate. In *De Natura Deorum*, there are three key interlocutors: Velleius the Epicurean, Balbus the Stoic, and Cotta the

¹⁵ Toland, *Letters to Serena* III.118-119 quoting Arnobius, *Seven Books against the Gentes* III.6-7; cf. *CI* pp. 60-61.

Academic. In order to confuse matters further, Cicero appears briefly at the end of the discussion to offer his judgement on their respective arguments. *De Divinatione*, meanwhile, depicts a debate between Cicero and his brother Quintus, in which Cicero makes a case which seems to directly contradict the conclusion reached in *De Natura Deorum*. It is little wonder, then, that the truth of Cicero's views has exercised scholars for two thousand years.

This issue is in part addressed with the question of Cicero's philosophical affiliation. While Cicero repeatedly professed himself to be an Academic Sceptic, the nature of that Scepticism, and the continuity of Cicero's adherence to the school, have both been subject to question. A case was put forward by Glucker in the 1980s that Cicero had abandoned his Sceptical stance for a period in the 50s in favour of the Old Academy of Antiochus.¹⁶ Antiochus claimed to be reconstructing the doctrine of the original Academy, a doctrine which was largely Stoic, but with elements of Platonic and Aristotelian ideology; this involved the rejection of scepticism, and the opportunity for positive support for doctrines.¹⁷ Glucker points to the political works of the 50s, and various statements apparently proving his support for the Old Academy, as evidence that Cicero for a period in his life adopted this more dogmatic approach to philosophy.¹⁸ The argument that Cicero was consistent in his adherence to Academic Scepticism is more broadly championed.¹⁹

¹⁶ Glucker (1988) pp. 34-69.

¹⁷ Dillon and Long (1988) pp. 1-13.

¹⁸ *Leg.*I.39; *Mur.*63-64; *Div.*I.17-22; *ad Fam.*15.4.

¹⁹ Görler (1995) pp. 85-113; Powell (1995) pp. 18-23; Lévy (1992) pp. 96-126; Thorsrud (2012) pp. 133-151; Long (1974) p. 230; Wilkinson (1982) pp. 82-92. For Cicero's statements to this effect see *Inv.*II.10, *DND.*I.6, 11, *Off.*II.7-8, *Ac.*I.13.

The nature of this scepticism is generally judged to be the more mitigated scepticism of the Philonian tradition, which agreed with the radical scepticism of Arcesilaus and Carneades that no philosophical knowledge was certain, but did allow that some things were probable, or close to the truth, and could therefore be adopted as philosophical principles.²⁰ This approach allowed Cicero to select those aspects of alternative philosophical schools and champion them as close approximations to the truth, if not truth itself. The matter is further confused by evidence that Cicero adhered to the more radical scepticism, and hence complete suspension of judgement regarding philosophical knowledge, in his *Academica*, a work which he claimed elsewhere expressed his own personal philosophy.²¹ The result of the contradictory evidence for Cicero's personal philosophical affiliation, and of the eclectic nature of the Academic school in general, is that the task of identifying Cicero with a particular philosophical stance in his dialogues is rife with difficulties.

The ramifications of this are felt particularly strongly in the case of Cicero's theology, and in attempts to identify that theology in the key texts *De Natura Deorum* and *De Divinatione*. Cicero's affiliation to the Academic school might permit his voice to be identified with that of Cotta the Academic in *De Natura Deorum*, in spite of the conclusion. This would suggest that Cicero concurred with the Academic critique of Stoic and Epicurean philosophies, identifying his view as that of a religious sceptic. The apparent confirmation of his sceptical religious

²⁰ Powell (1995) pp. 18-23; Rawson (1985) pp. 282-297; Thorsrud (2009) pp. 84-101, (2012) pp. 133-151; Long (1974) pp. 229-231. On Philonian scepticism see Dillon and Long (1988) pp. 1-13. Scepticism concerning sense perception, as opposed to scepticism concerning philosophical knowledge, did not fully develop until Sextus Empiricus.

²¹ *Ac.*II.113; *DND.*I.11; *Tusc.*II.4; *Div.*II.1; *Off.*II.8. On radical scepticism see Long (1974) pp. 88-94.

beliefs under his own name in *De Divinatione* further enforces this conclusion. More recent readings of these texts, however, have championed the idea that rather than attempts by Cicero to display the Academic philosophy, they represent illustrations of the Academic method.²² In each work, differing views are represented to the reader, and that reader is invited to reach a conclusion. Cicero's conclusion in *De Natura Deorum* becomes an example of this Academic approach, while in *De Divinatione* the approach is implied by the organisation of the work into two books, each representing an alternative view. There are passages in *De Natura Deorum* which seem to confirm this reading, as Cicero advised readers not to seek his own view, explaining his approach as cohesive with the Academic methodology.²³ If this approach to the texts is followed, then the association of Cicero's personal views with the Academic philosophy expressed therein becomes difficult.

The extent of these debates in modern scholarship illustrates the fundamental problem Toland faced when claiming Cicero as a weapon against superstition: the contradictory and elusive nature of Cicero's views made this association problematic to claim with any certainty. This is further illustrated by the diversity of the uses to which the Ciceronian evidence was put in early modern religious discourse. Toland would have to confront not only the problems of his evidence but also of the debate into which he was entering.

²² Beard (1986) pp. 33-46; Schofield (1986) pp. 47-65; Gawlick (1963) p. 660. For a modification to these views see Krostenko (2000) pp. 353-391.

²³ *DND*.I.6, 10; cf. Powell (1995) p. 23 and Fosl (1994) pp. 103-120.

ii. Within the establishment: clergymen and Cicero

Amongst the different elements contributing to religious debate within the early modern period, Cicero was used most extensively by those groups who adhered to the concept of a natural religion.²⁴ This included some prominent theologians from within the established Church, most notably Samuel Clarke, Ralph Cudworth and Richard Bentley.²⁵ Enthused by the contributions to science made by Newton, these Anglicans deployed natural religion as a means of supporting orthodoxy rather than undermining it, earning themselves various titles including Latitudinarians and Low Churchmen, so as to differentiate them from more conservative High Churchmen.²⁶ As modern science revealed more about how the universe worked, these Anglicans adopted these findings as evidence of the all-powerful nature of the divine. In their efforts to construct a version of Anglicanism which cohered with natural philosophy, the natural religion of Cicero proved an appealing source. In particular, *De Natura*

²⁴ It is for this reason that such studies that exist of Cicero's role in early modern discourse focus on how he was used by the Deists; cf. Gawlick (1963) and Zieliński (1929) pp. 210-232. Another example is G. A. Burnett (1947) 'The Reputation of Cicero Among the English Deists (1696-1776)' (PhD diss., University of Southern California); unfortunately I have been unable to consult with this work, except through the ideas transmitted by Gawlick (1963). Within 'Deism' there was a great deal of diversity, however, hence the division of this section into establishment and non-establishment thinkers. On Deism in this period see Herrick (1997); Hudson (2009); Wigelsworth (2009).

²⁵ Regarding this movement within the Church see Jacob (1976) pp. 15-21, (2006) pp. 268-271; Cragg (1960) pp. 65-80; Gawlick (1963) p. 662; Young (2012) p. 238; Harrison (1990) pp. 5-7.

²⁶ The problem of determining appropriate terminology for discussing these men, particularly the 'rationalism' of their ideas, is discussed by Spurr (1988), particularly pp. 569-581. Examples of the Low Churchmen referred to here are Samuel Clarke (1675-1729), John Wilkins (1614-1672), William Chillingworth (1602-1644), Ralph Cudworth (1617-1688) and Richard Bentley (1662-1742), while among the High Churchmen hostile to this approach counted Edmund Tew (1700-1770), Henry Dodwell (1641-1711), and Francis Atterbury (1663-1732).

Deorum was used extensively, as it had been by the Latin Fathers and throughout the Renaissance in support of Christian philosophy.²⁷

For these clergymen, the Ciceronian evidence posed no problem: Cicero's voice could easily be identified on account of his appearance under his own name in the conclusion of *De Natura Deorum*, offering his support to particular positive statements of doctrine. Ralph Cudworth, in *The True Intellectual System of the Universe* published in 1678, offered guidance on how to appropriately read Cicero's religious discourse. Cudworth acknowledged Cicero's declared Scepticism, but qualifies this with the statement that Cicero –whom though some would suspect to have been a *Sceptick* as to *Theism*, because in his *De Natura Deorum*, he brings in *Cotta the Academick*, as well opposing *Q. Lucil. Balbus the Stoick*, as *C. Velleius the Epicurean*; yet from sundry other places of his writings, it sufficiently appears, that he was a *Dogmatick and Hearty Theist*²⁸ In Cudworth's reading, it was entirely possible to identify positive, dogmatic elements within Cicero's philosophy. This was a view explained further by Richard Bentley in his reply to Anthony Collins's *Discourse on Freethinking*, both of which were published in 1713. Bentley argues fervently for Cicero's mitigated scepticism, for his ability to identify the most probable course in any discussion and state his support, equating the probable in Cicero with the dogmatic in any other philosopher: –if we seek therefore Cicero's

²⁷ Pease (1955-58) pp. 52-61. Individual editions of the *De Natura Deorum* were relatively scarce (Petrus Marsus, Venice 1508; several editions in Paris in the 1540s and 1550s; Alexander Scot, Lyons 1606; Petrus Lescaloperus, Paris 1660; John Davies, Cambridge 1718); access to the work was primarily through the collected editions. There were also some English translations: *Three books touching the nature of the Gods done into english*. London 1683; *Of the nature of the Gods in three books*. London 1741.

²⁸ Cudworth, *True Intellectual System* I.434.

true Sentiments; it must not be in his Disputes against Others, where he has licence to say any thing for opposition sake: but in the Books where he dogmatizes himself; where allowing for the word *Probable*, you have all the Spirit and the Marrow of the *Platonic, Peripatetic, and Stoic Systemes*; I mean his Books *De Officiis, Tusculans, De Amicitia, De Senectute, De Legibus*; in which, and in the Remains of others now lost, he declares for the Being and Providence of God, for the Immortality of the Soul, for every Point that approaches to Christianity²⁹ In this tradition, Cicero's views are identified with those stated under his name, and granted the status of dogma on the basis of a particular understanding of the Academic concept *probabile*.

The result of this reading of Cicero's philosophical works for these clergymen was their ability to employ Cicero for the defence of certain key tenets of a Christianity which cohered with aspects of a natural religion. Foremost amongst these tenets was their understanding of the divine, and the belief that God was an intelligent being who set in motion those occurrences being identified as natural, who was thus the Creator.³⁰ When constructing his argument against the radical view that God does not control nature, may even be subject to its will, Cudworth used *De Natura Deorum* to disprove this approach: -but if there were this further meaning in the Passages before cited, that a Necessity without God, that was invincible by him, did determine his Will to all things; this was nothing but a certain Confused and Contradictious Jumble of Atheism and Theism both together; or an odd kind of Intimation, that however the Name of God be used in compliance with Vulgar Speech and Opinion, yet indeed it signifies nothing, but Material Necessity; and the

²⁹ Bentley, *Remarks* II.81-82.

³⁰ Israel (2001) pp. 461, 599-609; Jacob (1976) pp. 15-21; Cragg (1960) pp. 65-80.

blind Motion of Matter is really the Highest *Numen* in the World. And here that of *Balbus* the Stoick in *Cicero* is opportune...³¹ In order to further support their argument that God's existence could be proved, these theologians drew material from the Stoic portions of *De Natura Deorum* as evidence for theories such as universal consent and innate notions, and for the immortality of the soul.³² Their belief that Cicero's statements under his own name may be taken as equivalent to dogma allows them to draw on these Stoic arguments as Ciceronian, on the basis of Cicero's apparent statement of support for Stoic theology at the conclusion of *De Natura Deorum*.

This conception of the divine and his relationship to the laws of nature was vital for forming a rational Christianity which still maintained a role for revelation, by demonstrating that divine providence was an active force in the universe.³³ This was shown not only by the control exercised by the divine over nature, but also by those occurrences which defied rational explanation, necessitating the role of revelation. Samuel Clarke, in his *Discourse* on natural religion in 1706, was among the foremost theologians who read in Cicero the doubts which created space for revelation: "for if God be an All-Powerful, Omnipresent, Intelligent, Wise, and Free Being, (as it hath been before demonstrated that he necessarily Is) he cannot possibly but *know* at all times and in all places every thing that *is*, and *foreknow* what at all times and in all places it is fittest and wisest *should be*, and have perfect *Power to bring to Pass* what

³¹ Cudworth, *True Intellectual System* I.5-6, goes on to quote *DND*.II.77.

³² Zieli ski (1929) pp. 212-215.

³³ Israel (2001) p. 461; Hunter (1981) pp. 78-112; Jacob (1976) pp. 15-21, (2006) pp. 268-271; Cragg (1960) pp. 65-80.

he so judges fit to be accomplished: And consequently it is impossible but he must actually direct and appoint every particular thing and circumstance that is in the World or ever shall be, excepting only what by his own good pleasure he puts under the Power and Choice of subordinate Free Agents³⁴ In support of this theory Clarke referred the reader to a passage in the second book of *De Natura Deorum* in which Cicero, as Balbus, articulates the Stoic argument for divine providence.³⁵ Clarke does not even attempt to clarify the difference between Cicero and Balbus, but quotes the passage as if directly from Cicero.

iii. Without the establishment: Freethinkers and Cicero

While those who wrote in defence of orthodox Anglicanism saw in Cicero's natural religion a tool for their own faith, Cicero also became an important figure for heterodox writers, in particular the Freethinkers, maintaining his significance in religious discourse.³⁶ Advocates of Freethought, most notably Anthony Collins, called for liberation from authority and tradition so that men may exercise their own logic and reason in the acquisition of knowledge and belief. These Freethinkers also fundamentally advocated a natural religion, accessible to the reason of all, but their conception of the divine varied greatly from their orthodox counterparts.³⁷ Amongst the Freethinkers, natural laws were granted supremacy; they governed the universe, and the divine did not control them, or create them, indeed he could not even change

³⁴ Clarke, *Discourse* pp. 18-19. See also Wilkins, *Principles* I.218, quoting *DND*.I.54.

³⁵ *DND*.II.75.

³⁶ Zieli ski (1929) pp. 210-232; Gawlick (1963) pp. 657-682.

³⁷ Herrick (1997) pp. 26-36; Lund (1995) pp. 1-32; Levine (1995) pp. 224-228; Jacob (1976) pp. 201-250; Cragg (1960) pp. 65-80; Israel (2001) pp. 360-363, 599-627.

or hinder them. As a result, they directed a great deal of scepticism against certain elements of orthodox Christianity in order to eliminate those features of that religion unacceptable to their natural religion and their commitment to Freethought.

The different use to which the Freethinkers put Cicero necessitated a different reading of his philosophy and religious works. Anthony Collins produced the most explicit account of how Cicero could be identified as a Freethinker, a conclusion which provoked Richard Bentley's reply in his *Remarks upon a late Discourse of Free-thinking*. Collins sees in Cicero a philosopher who followed the dictates of no philosophical school, but subjected all dogma to sceptical examination, thereby illustrating his ability to think freely.³⁸ As a result, he recommended a different approach to reading Cicero's philosophical dialogues: "the true method of discovering the Sentiments of CICERO, is to see what he says himself, or under the Person of an *Academick*...And if CICERO's Readers will follow this Rule of common Sense in understanding him, they will find him as great a *Free-Thinker* as he was a *Philosopher*, an *Orator*, a *Man of Virtue*, and a *Patriot*."³⁹ Collins rejected the approach of the Anglicans which identified Cicero's voice under his own name, arguing for the probable in any given debate, but instead located him wherever the voice of the Academic Sceptic was in evidence. For the Freethinkers, Cicero was defined by his scepticism, by this free thinking which allowed him to deconstruct dogmatic theology.⁴⁰ Fundamental to this reading was *De Divinatione*, which

³⁸ Collins, *Discourse* pp. 135-140.

³⁹ Collins, *Discourse* p. 139.

⁴⁰ On the previous influence of Cicero's scepticism see Long (1974) pp. 232-248, Popkin (2003) pp. 28-35 and Schmitt (1972). On its future influence on Hume see Fosl (1994) pp. 103-120.

recovered importance in the works of the Freethinkers.⁴¹ Cicero's demolition of Stoic doctrine, ostensibly under his own name, was crucial to the Freethinkers' characterisation of Cicero as fundamentally sceptical.

This approach provided the Freethinkers with a series of 'Ciceronian' arguments and strategies with which to counter the orthodox conception of the divine. The reading of Cicero recommended here meant that two of his works could be turned to a different purpose from that assigned by the Anglican rationalists: *two Treatises*, one of the *Nature of the Gods*, and the other *concerning Divination*: in the former of which, he has endeavoured to show the Weakness of all the Arguments of the *Stoicks* (who were the great *Theists* of Antiquity) for the Being of the Gods; and in the latter has destroyed the whole Revealed Religion of the *Greeks* and *Romans*, and showed the Imposture of all their Miracles, and Weakness of the Reasons on which it was pretended to be founded.⁴² For example, prominent Deist Charles Blount in his *Anima Mundi* was able to look to the third book of *De Natura Deorum* for arguments against divine providence, and to count Cicero among the ancient philosophers who denied the divine the role of creator.⁴³ Cicero provided the means by which arguments for the existence of a providential God, and hence revelation, might be confuted effectively, as long as he was correctly identified with the sceptical figure.

⁴¹ Pease (1963) pp. 29-37; Gawlick (1963) p. 663. Individual editions of *De Divinatione* were produced by Petrus Marsus, Paris 1542, Thomas Richard, Paris 1553, and John Davies, Cambridge 1721, otherwise access was through the complete editions.

⁴² Collins, *Discourse* pp. 135-136; cf. Matthew Tindal, *Christianity as old as the creation* p. iv.

⁴³ Blount, *Anima Mundi* pp. 10-11, 33.

The difficulties surrounding Cicero's personal philosophy and how that philosophy affected his theological works deeply influenced the way in which those works were read and used in the context of early modern religious discourse. Among Anglican clergymen he was an Academic whose moderation and eclecticism permitted him to adopt aspects of Epicurean and Stoic doctrine with the equivalent commitment of dogma, allowing him to assume a constructive presence in their theological writings. For the Freethinkers he was a sceptic above all else, and hence a free thinker himself, granting him essentially a destructive function, and identifying him as a source for their own destructive scepticism. When Toland decided to adopt Cicero as a tool within his own religious discourse, he too needed to determine how to approach this evidently difficult material.

II. Identifying *superstitio*

The prominent theme of the passage drawn from *De Divinatione* which was favoured by Toland is the pledge contained therein to eradicate superstition, and its declaration that *⁊sic superstitionis stirpes omnes eiiciendae*⁴⁴ In Toland's own discourse directed against the clergy this assurance, both its sentiment, and how such an uprooting might occur, prove influential. Superstition must be identified, and eliminated.

i. 'Cicero's' critique of superstition

Toland's identification of Cicero as an enemy of superstition necessitates a reading of *De Divinatione* which aligns with the approach of the Freethinkers. In a discussion of Cicero's voice in *Cicero Illustratus* Toland identified the closing

⁴⁴ *Div.*II.149.

passages of the second book of *De Divinatione*, including that passage which opened this chapter and which proved so significant to Toland, as a clear statement of Cicero's own views.⁴⁵ In this way Toland not only claimed this statement on the evils of superstition reflected Cicero's true views on the matter, but also that the scepticism concerning superstitious practices displayed by Cicero throughout the second book of *De Divinatione* was an expression of Cicero's philosophical stance and approach.⁴⁶ This reading of Cicero dictated the role his comments on superstition played in Toland's war against priestcraft.

According to Toland's reading of Cicero a particular understanding of what superstition was becomes apparent. In the second book of *De Natura Deorum*, Cicero – as Balbus – recounts the etymologies of the words *religio* and *superstitio*.⁴⁷ Balbus explains that the term *superstitio* emanated from the efforts of parents to use religious practices to ensure that they were outlived by their children, developing from *superstites* meaning survivors. This was a misuse of religion which allowed Cicero to draw the conclusion that –ita factum est in superstitioso et religioso alterum vitii nomen alterum laudis⁴⁸ In connection to this sense that a superstitious practice was the employment of religion for inappropriate ends was the use of *superstitio* to refer to a false belief, a misunderstanding about the gods and their roles in the

⁴⁵ *CI* p. 38.

⁴⁶ When referring to –Cicero in these passages, I will be referring to Cicero as Toland read him.

⁴⁷ *DND*.II.72.

⁴⁸ *DND*.II.72: –hence –superstitioso and –religioso came to be terms of censure and approval respectively (trans. Rackham).

universe.⁴⁹ It is in this sense that *superstitio* is most commonly used in *De Divinatione*, referring to the false Stoic beliefs about divination. In Cicero's use of the word, *superstitio* therefore comes to represent a baseless fear of the gods, which encourages people to misuse or misunderstand the purpose of religious practice.⁵⁰

At the end of *De Divinatione* when Cicero pledges to tear superstition up by the roots he provides an indication of what these roots might be: *nam, ut vere loquamur, superstitio, fusa per gentis, oppressit omnium fere animos atque hominum imbecillitatem occupavit*⁵¹ The principle that superstition originates in the weaknesses of men's minds, their irrationality and fear, was of the utmost importance to Cicero's handling of *superstitio*. In *De Divinatione* Cicero often refers to the weakness of the minds of men as the target of divinatory practices: *quid mirum igitur, si in auspiciis et in omni divinatione imbecilli animi superstitiosa ista concipiant, verum dispicere non possint?*⁵² The fear of the gods which drove men to adopt superstitious practices was based in the credulity of a feeble mind. Cicero extends this argument to apportion blame on those who deliberately exploit such irrationality with the invention of practices like divination, designed to not only

⁴⁹ *DND*.I.77, II.63, 70, III.52, 92; *Clu*.194; *Div*.II.19, 76, 118, 136; *Leg*.I.32, II.45; *Tusc*.III.72. See Martin (2004) pp. 127-128.

⁵⁰ Toland would also have found such an understanding of superstition in Plutarch's *On Superstition*, cf. Martin (2004) pp. 94-98. Amongst Toland's papers (BL Add 4295 f. 72) was a proposal for a work, entitled *Superstition Unmask'd*, which was to include Plutarch's essay on superstition with notes.

⁵¹ *Div*.II.148.

⁵² *Div*.II.81: *what wonder, then, if in auspices and in every kind of divination weak minds should adopt the superstitious practices which you have mentioned and should be unable to discern the truth?* (trans. Falconer); cf. *Div*.II.19, 83, 85, 86, 100, 125, 129.

exploit man's weakness, but to perpetuate it by maintaining the irrational fear of the gods which is its basis.⁵³ The roots of superstition are buried deep in the irrationality of men, and those who seek to encourage and exploit that irrationality for their own purposes.

This is an understanding of superstition which suits Toland's own purposes absolutely. Following the recitation of Cicero's condemnation of superstition at the end of *De Divinatione* in *Pantheisticon* Toland's imagined congregation makes the following response: "Non vigilat SUPERSTITIOSUS, Non dormitat tranquillus; Neque beatè vivit, Neque securè moritur: Vivus et mortuus, Factus SACRIFICULORUM praeda"⁵⁴ The man who engages in superstition does so because he is prey to irrational fears and disturbances. This is further evident in Toland's third *Letter to Serena*, in which he considered the origins of idolatry: "the fluctuating of mens Minds between Hope and Fear, is one of the chief Causes of Superstition: for being no way able to foresee the Event of what greatly concerns them, they now hope the best, and next minute fear the worst, which easily leads them not only to take any thing for a good or bad Omen, which happen'd to them in any former good luck or misfortune; but also to lay hold of any Advice, to consult Diviners and Astrologers"⁵⁵ The uncertainty of life, the fears and troubles which that introduces, allowed men to become targets of superstitious practices. Toland's

⁵³ *Div.* II.83-85.

⁵⁴ Toland, *Pantheisticon* p. 70: "the superstitious man, asleep or awake, enjoys no repose: he lives not happily, nor dies securely, who, living and dying, is a prey to silly priests"

⁵⁵ Toland, *Letters to Serena* III.78; cf. *Clito* p. 18, "Celtic religion" in *Collection* I.8-9, "History of the Druids" in *Collection* I.140, 142-143, *Amyntor* p. 38, *Christianity not Mysterious* p. 44, *Appeal* p. 16, *Art of Reforming* p. 29.

reading of Cicero therefore provides an understanding of the origins of the affliction of superstition useful to his own strategies.

ii. The origins of superstition

The identification of superstition with irrationality is used by Toland extensively in his *Letters to Serena*. In the preface to this work Toland relates that a particular passage from Cicero's *De Legibus* inspired the first letter in the collection: "sensus nostros non Parens, non Nutrix, non Magister, non Poeta, non Scena depravat, non multitudinis Consensus abducit: at vero Animis omnes tenduntur Insidiae"⁵⁶ It is a passage in which Cicero sought to demonstrate that disagreements concerning justice emanate not from any flaw in reason or natural law, but in a failure among men to understand reason appropriately. Toland explains that from this passage developed the subject of his first letter, on the origin of prejudices, "*showing the successive Growth and Increase of Prejudices thro every step of our lives, and proving that all the Men in the World are join'd in the same Conspiracy to deprave the Reason of every individual Person*"⁵⁷ Toland therefore built on Cicero's account of the deprivation of reason to develop an argument that prejudices pervade society because numerous forces converge to increase and perpetuate man's irrationality. In Toland's view, no group contributes more to this process than priests: "the strange things and amazing storys we have read or heard (if of any Concern to a particular Religion) are daily confirm'd to us by the Preacher from the Pulpit, where all he says

⁵⁶ Toland, *Letters to Serena* preface, quoting *Leg. I.47*: "neither Parents or Nurse or Schoolmaster, or Poet, or Playhouse depraves our Senses, nor can the Consent of the Multitude mislead them: but all sorts of Traps are laid to seduce our Understandings" (trans. Zetzel).

⁵⁷ Toland, *Letters to Serena, The Preface* b5; cf. "History of the Druids" *Collection I.140*.

is taken for Truth by the greatest part of the Auditory, no body having the liberty to contradict him, and he giving out his own Conceits for the very Oracles of God⁵⁸ Toland's use of this passage from *De Legibus* links Ciceronian *superstitio* to his own war on priestcraft: it is the clergy who do most to maintain the irrationality among men from which superstition grows.

In order to understand the benefits accrued to the clergy by this continuation of irrationality, Toland directs the readers to the origins of idolatry, or superstitious practices, examined in the third of the *Letters to Serena*. Here Toland provides an extensive account of the origins of priestly power in their exploitation of man's irrationality, which he identified with the original imposture.⁵⁹ According to Toland's account of the history of idolatry, it was the wish of priests to profit from man's irrational fears, most prominently the fear of death, that introduced superstitious practices: "it seems evident from the remotest Monuments of Learning, that all Superstition originally related to the Worship of the Dead, being principally deriv'd from Funeral Rites, tho the first occasion might be very innocent or laudable...but the Flatterers of great Men in the Persons of their Predecessors, the excessive Affection of Friends or Relations, and the Advantage which the Heathen Priests drew from the Credulity of the simple, carry'd this matter a great deal further⁶⁰ The deification of men, aspects of nature and qualities of mankind such as clemency extended religious devotion to all manner of objects beyond what was

⁵⁸ Toland, *Letters to Serena* I.8.

⁵⁹ On the tradition of the theory of imposture see Harrison (1990) pp. 14-18, 73-77 and Champion (1996) pp. 333-356.

⁶⁰ Toland, *Letters to Serena* III.72-73; cf. *Milton* pp. 91-92 and *Memorial* p. 6.

naturally instinctive to mankind. Toland draws extensively on Cicero to provide examples of the irrational origins of many superstitious beliefs. His argument that superstitions originated with the rituals of the dead is supported repeatedly with material from the *Tusculan Disputations*.⁶¹ The extension of this argument to encompass the deification of inappropriate objects as important in the progression towards idolatry primarily uses *De Natura Deorum*, particularly the descriptions of the efforts of the Stoics to expand the fear of the gods among the people through such means as the deification of dead men.⁶² According to Toland's account, priests and others who sought power for themselves built on the fears and irrationalities of men through the introduction of rituals and false religious practices. This original imposture by priests drew on the irrationality of men; the basis of priestly power in irrationality revealed that the origins of their influence lay in superstition rather than faith.

This historical account of the original imposture, employing not only Ciceronian evidence but the Ciceronian association between superstition and irrationality, could be directed against the conduct of the clergy contemporary to Toland.⁶³ The clergy may not have initiated imposture, but they perpetuated and adapted it: having given this summary Account, SERENA, of ancient and modern Heathenism, we may remark that almost every Point of those superstitious and idolatrous Religions are in

⁶¹ Toland, *Letters to Serena* II.28 (*Tusc.I.38*), II.44-46 (*Tusc.I.36*), III.81-84 (*Tusc.I.37*), III.84-87 (*Tusc.I.28-29*).

⁶² Toland, *Letters to Serena* III.72-74 (*DND.II.62*), III.77-80 (*Div.II.4*), III.87-90 (*DND.II.60-61*), III.90-93 (*DND.I.101*), III.119-123 (*DND.II.63*).

⁶³ Harrison (1990) pp. 77-85; Cameron (2010) p. 309; cf. Goldie (1993) pp. 220-221 on the efforts of Robert Howard to this end.

these or grosser Circumstances revivød by many Christians in our Western Parts of the Word, and by all the Oriental Sects: as Sacrifices, Incense, Lights, Images, Lustrations, Feasts, Musick, Altars, Pilgrimages, Fastings, religious Celibacy and Habits, Consecrations, Divinations, Sorcerys, Omens, Presages, Charms, the Worship of dead Men and Women, a continual Canonization of more, Mediators between God and Men...ø⁶⁴ Tolandø catalogue of priestly superstitions continues extensively, and is mimicked in later works which reiterate the accusation that priestly powers amount to superstitions invented and maintained to permit their control over the laity. In *An Appeal to Honest People against Wicked Priests*, Toland attacks the sacrament of the Eucharist, one of the two sacraments maintained in the Protestant faith, on this basis.⁶⁵ In the *Defence* written in 1697 following the attacks on *Christianity not Mysteious* Toland condemned the clergyø maintenance of the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation as Mysteries preached to inhibit the laityø reason. The practices and rituals may have changed, but they continued to be based on an irrational fear of God, which as Ciceroø approach demonstrated, made them superstitions.

Tolandø account of the history of superstition, its invention and persistence, grants a leading role to priests. Toland argued that the priests had invented practices designed to enhance their own power by exploiting the irrational fear of the gods possessed by men, making those priestly practices essentially superstitions. Cicero proves vital to the construction of this argument, providing not only the

⁶⁴ Toland, *Letters to Serena* III.127-128. The catalogue Toland presents here has some resemblance to Hobbesø description of pagan religious practices in *Leviathan* XII.18-19.

⁶⁵ Toland, *Appeal* p. 37.

understanding of superstition which underpins it, but also the historical evidence arranged in its support.

iii. The irrationality of sacerdotal authority

In addition to an historical account of priestcraft which associated priestly power with superstition and the depravation of reason necessary to perpetuate that superstition, Toland further identified priests with irrationality by deploying rational arguments against the core elements of their power, most notably sacerdotal authority. It is in this aspect of Toland's war against priestcraft that Cicero's sceptical assault on Stoic belief in divination in the second book of *De Divinatione* proves most useful. Cicero is quite explicit that in opposition to the numerous examples provided by Quintus as evidence for divination, he will counter with *ratio*: *argumentis et rationibus oportet, quare quidque ita sit, docere, non eventis, eis praesertim quibus mihi liceat non credere*⁶⁶ Cicero therefore directs *ratio* against the arguments for divination, including the concept that certain people are specially enabled as vessels for messages from the divine, and interpretation of those messages. For example, when refuting the divinatory power of dreams Cicero focuses the majority of his attack on the concept that dreams are messages sent by the gods.⁶⁷ The use made by Cicero of reason to expose the claim that the divine communicated directly to men is adopted directly by Toland in his own works, where *De Divinatione* features consistently.

⁶⁶ *Div.*II.27: *you ought to have employed arguments and reason to show that all your propositions were true and you ought not to have resorted to so-called occurrences ó certainly not to such occurrences as are unworthy of belief* (trans. Falconer); cf. II.86. See Krostenko (2000) pp. 370-373 on the rhetorical significance of this *ratio* vs. *exempla* approach.

⁶⁷ *Div.*II.124-142.

In the *Two Essays*, when rejecting the stories he claims were invented by Christian monks, Toland employs Cicero's dismissal of prophecy as irrational ravings: *quid verò habet Auctoritas furor iste, quam divinum vocamus, ut, quæ sapiens non videat, ea videat insanus, et Is, qui humanos sensus amiserit, divinos assecutus sit?*⁶⁸ Toland's most controversial use of this material is in his *Origines Judiciae*, when he directs Ciceronian arguments against the divinatory power of dreams against the tradition that Moses was a vessel of divine knowledge. Dreams do not reflect reality, merely a perception of that reality: *suntque inter doctorum doctiores qui omnes Dei Apparitiones, in Pentateucho et alibi relatas, ad Somnia et Extases constanter referunt: unde non nemo aiebat esse convertibilia, sive dixeris Abrahamo loquutum esse Deum in somnio, sive Abrahamum somniasse sibi loquutum esse Deum; sicuti de quodam Alexandri somnio scribens Cicero, non audivit (inquit) ille Draconem loquentem, sed est visus audire*⁶⁹ Toland also used Cicero to demonstrate the extent to which such claims to divine interpretation could be exploited for the acquisition of secular power, using Cicero's quotation from Demosthenes describing the manipulation of an oracle by Philip: *ita Demosthenes (referente Cicerone) Pythiam Phillipizare dicebat, id est, quasi cum Philippo facere. Hoc autem eo*

⁶⁸ Toland, *Two Essays* II.31-32, quoting *Div.* II.110: *but what weight is to be given to that frenzy of yours, which you term divine and which enables the crazy man who has lost human intelligence of gods?* (trans. Falconer).

⁶⁹ Toland, *Origines Judiciae* pp. 167-168 (*Div.* II.141): *and there are those among the more learned of learned men who having related every Apparition of God, in the Pentateuch and similar, constantly refer to Dreams and Ecstasies: from which some were saying that it was changeable, either you may have said that God spoke to Abraham in a dream, or that God spoke to him as he was daydreaming; just as Cicero wrote about a certain dream of Alexander, he did not hear the serpent speak, but thought he heard it*. See Thomas (1971) pp. 128-146 on the role of dreams in the early Church. Toland was preceded in this rejection of dreams by Hobbes, *Leviathan* II.7-9 and Spinoza, *Theological-Political Treatise* VI; cf. Israel (2001) pp. 218-229.

*spectabat (addit ille) ut eam a Philippo corruptam diceret*⁷⁰ The efforts by Cicero in *De Divinatione* to direct rational argument against the possibility of direct communications from the divine found a great deal of favour with Toland.

The appeal of these arguments in *De Divinatione* may be elucidated further when related to one of Toland's foremost strategies in his war on priestcraft: exposure of sacerdotal authority as contrary to reason. Toland was concerned to demonstrate that the idea that certain men were granted particular access to divine intelligence was irrational and hence a superstition. Sacerdotal authority essentially amounted to the claim that divine power could be interpreted by, even delegated into, the clergy. It was this authority, cited as *de iure divino*, that allowed priests to perform sacraments and liturgy, interpret the Bible, guide the laity, and which underwrote the apostolic succession.⁷¹ Toland targeted sacerdotal authority as the means by which the clergy authorised their right to think for the laity, and established their tyranny.⁷² This is the sentiment expressed by Toland in his poem *Clito* when he declares 'RELIGION safe, with PRIESTCRAFT is the War, All Friends to Priestcraft, Foes of Mankind are. Their impious Fanes and Altars I'll overthrow, And the whole Farce of their feign'd Saintship show'⁷³ Toland's doubts concerning the sacerdotal

⁷⁰ Toland, *Origines Judiciae* p. 171 (*Div.II.118*): 'in this way Demosthenes (as was quoted by Cicero) said that the Pythian priestess 'philippized', in other words, that she was Philip's ally. By this he meant (he adds) that she had been bribed by Philip'

⁷¹ Thomas (1971) pp. 25-77 on the changing role of 'magic' in the Church. See also Harrison (1990) pp. 19-28; Goldie (1987) pp. 212-218; Champion (2000a) pp. 550-551. See Cameron (2010) pp. 304-305 on sacerdotal authority as superstition in the broader tradition.

⁷² Toland, *Appeal* p. 14; 'History of the Druids' in the *Collection* I.142-143.

⁷³ Toland, *Clito* p. 16.

authority of the clergy are even more explicitly stated in his *Christianity not Mysterious*: “the Priests, but very rarely, and then obscurely, taught in publick, pretending the Injunctions of their Divinities to the contrary, lest their Secrets, forsooth, should be exposèd to the Profanation of the Ignorant, or Violation of the Impious...and it was inexpiable Sacrilege for any to enter these but such as had a special Mark and Privilege, or as much as to ask Questions about what passed in them. All the Excluded were for that Reason stilèd *the Profane*, as those not in Orders with us *the Laity*”⁷⁴ Cicero’s identification of belief in divine interaction with men as irrational and therefore a superstition would clearly appeal to Toland in his attempts to discredit sacerdotal authority as contrary to reason.

Toland’s account of the history of priestcraft, and the basis of clerical authority, was designed to demonstrate the extent to which they were dependent on superstition for both the creation and the continuation of their influence over the laity. The Ciceronian identification of the origins of superstition in irrationality, as adopted by Toland, together with Cicero’s use of rational argument as the primary means of demolishing superstition, demonstrated that superstition fundamentally contradicted reason. Toland’s war on priestcraft was thus constructed around an exposure of the clergy as contrary to reason.

III. Identifying *religio*

The significance of this association between priestcraft, superstition, and irrationality is made clear when another feature of Toland’s favoured *De Divinatione* passage is considered: “nec vero ó id enim diligenter intellegi volo ó superstitione tollenda

⁷⁴ Toland, *Christianity not Mysterious* p. 69; cf. pp. 155-156, 164 and “Primitive Constitution” in the *Collection* II.121-123.

religio tollitur⁷⁵ *Religio* will be respected, only *superstitio* will be eliminated, thereby allowing the formation of a religion free of all irrational elements. True religion would therefore need to be free of priestcraft.

i. True *religio* is rational

When attempting to identify the parameters of Cicero's true, superstition free, *religio* Toland's location of Cicero's voice is again significant. His reading of *De Divinatione* had already identified Cicero with the character of the Academic Sceptic, and Toland maintains this association in his reading of *De Natura Deorum* by identifying Cicero with Cotta.⁷⁶ It is for this reason that Toland feels able to condemn the practice of those, such as the Anglican clergymen, who cite the Epicurean and Stoic stances presented in the work as Cicero's own: "unde idcirco in citationibus inde pro ideis innatis, causis finalibus, consensu universali, et talibus rebus, desumtis; non Cicero, qui haec aspernatur, citari debuit, sed Velleius Epicureus apud Ciceronem, Balbus Stoicus apud Ciceronem, et sic de aliis"⁷⁷ In Toland's view, the conclusion of *De Natura Deorum* is irrelevant. Cicero spoke his true views at the conclusion of *De Divinatione*, and thus must be identified as the character Cotta, directing Academic arguments against those beliefs in the divine which encourage irrational superstition and inhibit a rational religion.

⁷⁵ *Div.*II.148; cf. *DND.*I.117, II.71.

⁷⁶ *CI* p. 37.

⁷⁷ *CI* p. 37: "consequently in citations taken from there in favour of innate ideas, final causes, universal agreement, and such matters; Cicero, who rejected these things, ought not to be cited, but Velleius the Epicurean in Cicero, Balbus the Stoic in Cicero, and in the same way about other things"

The equation of *religio* with *ratio* is one which Toland makes in his own works. As already noted, Toland repeatedly employs the distinction between *superstitio* and *religio* from Cicero's *De Divinatione*, integrating it into his works, and using it to adorn frontispieces. In addition, his private papers contain several drafts of frontispieces for proposed works which reiterate the distinction, including "Priesthood without Priestcraft: or, Superstition distinguished from Religion, Dominion from Order, and Biggotry from Reason"⁷⁸ In *Pantheisticon*, Toland's most extensive treatment of his own personal religion, he declares that "RATIO est vera et prima lex; Lux, lumenque vitae"⁷⁹ The members of this Pantheistic society are encouraged not to allow themselves to be deceived by anything which contradicts their reason, as it will be a superstition, and not consistent with the true religion. Toland's conviction that religion should be rational cannot be doubted.

In order to alleviate any uncertainty about the extent to which he drew upon Cicero for these philosophical strategies, the definition Toland offers for *ratio* is Ciceronian. Obtained from the sixth book of Lactantius's *Divine Institutes*, Toland quotes in full the definition of law, or right reason, expounded by Laelius in the third book of *De Republica*, as he defends justice against the attack by Philus.⁸⁰ This is also the definition of reason Toland chose to employ in his *Nazarenus*, again quoting it in full, when arguing that reason was the moral law which bound men of all faiths together.⁸¹ There are two key qualities to right reason in this definition which make

⁷⁸ BL Add 4295 f. 67.

⁷⁹ Toland, *Pantheisticon* p. 57: "REASON is the true and first Law, The Light and Splendor of Life"

⁸⁰ *Rep.* III.33; preserved in Lactantius, *Inst.* 6.8.6-9.

⁸¹ Toland, *Nazarenus* I.179-180.

it particularly useful in the religious context Toland envisages: it is consonant with nature, and it is universal, existing within all men. As seen in the *Two Essays*, these are the two tests Toland finds to be most apposite in identifying superstition: “I will confine myself, in this short Essay, to a plain Examination of matter of Fact, as it stands in Nature, and as it appears to our Senses”⁸² The concluding comment from Toland following the quotation of the passage in *Pantheisticon* leaves little doubt: “Hac Lege institui regique volumus: Haudquaquam mendacibus, Et superstitiosis hominum commentis”⁸³ *Ratio* is placed in direct opposition to *superstitio*, and provides the parameters by which to test belief and the true *religio*.

ii. A natural religion

As defined by Ciceronian *ratio*, the true *religio* must conform with the laws of nature: “est quidem VERA LEX RECTA RATIO, naturae congruens, diffusa in omnes, constans, sempiterna”⁸⁴ This is also in evidence in the conclusion of *De Divinatione*, when Cicero declares that the beauty of the universe may be taken as evidence of a divine being, and goes on to provide this description of *religio*: “quam ob rem, ut religio propaganda etiam est, quae est iuncta cum cognitione naturae, sic superstitionis stirpes omnes eiiciendae”⁸⁵ This is an understanding of natural religion which proved intensely appealing to Toland, as the core belief of his natural

⁸² Toland, *Two Essays* p. 2.

⁸³ Toland, *Pantheisticon* p. 68: “we are willing to be brought up, and governed by this Law, Not by the lying, and superstitious fictions of men”

⁸⁴ Toland, *Pantheisticon* pp. 67-68 (*Rep.*III.33): “true law is right reason, consonant with nature, spread through all people”

⁸⁵ *Div.*II.148-149

philosophy Pantheism was the conflation of god and nature as one entity.⁸⁶ Toland draws on Cicero in order to illustrate this conception of the divine: “MOD. Carmen accinamus De natura UNIVERSI. MOD & RESPONDI. “Quicquid est Hoc, omnia animat, Format, alit, auget, creat; Sepelit, recipitque in sese omnia: Omniumque idem est Pater; Indidemque omnia, quae oriuntur, De integro atque eodem occidunt”⁸⁷ The fact that Toland employs Cicero in a quasi-priestly role in his main exposition of Pantheism, *Pantheisticon*, immediately intimates the extent to which he utilised Cicero as a source for that natural religion.

Within the liturgy recorded in *Pantheisticon*, Toland quoted in full the account of Academic physics provided by Cicero in the *Academics*.⁸⁸ This account demonstrated the extent to which Academic physics, or more specifically Antiochean physics, drew on Stoic materialism. According to this theory nature and the universe are formed by matter, and a force animating that matter; this force and matter must coexist for anything else to exist. For the Stoics, the divine is the force which animates matter, and hence the universe and everything within it; they call this force alternately *pneuma*, providence, reason or necessity.⁸⁹ The *Academics*,

⁸⁶ On Toland’s Pantheism see Wigelsworth (2009) pp. 143-147; Hudson (2009) pp. 92-94; Israel (2001) pp. 610-613; Champion (1995) pp. 259-280; Jacob (1981) pp. 60-62. On Pantheism in this period see Hunter (1981) pp. 162-187; Jacob (2006) p. 271; Cragg (1960) pp. 37-49; Champion (1995) pp. 278-279; Levine (1994) pp. 47-70.

⁸⁷ Toland, *Pantheisticon* p. 55, quoting *Div.I.131*: “MOD. Let us sing a hymn, on the nature of the universe. MOD & RESP. “Whatever the power may be, it animates, Creates, gives form, increase, and nourishment To everything: of everything the sire, It takes all things unto itself and hides Within its breast; and as from it all things Arise, likewise to it all things return”

⁸⁸ *Ac.I.24-29*, quoted in *Pantheisticon* pp. 58-61.

⁸⁹ *DND.II.45-72*; cf. Lintott (2008) pp. 350-358.

including Cotta, are satisfied by this physical account of the universe, in which nature and the divine are one. Toland was evidently also satisfied by this explanation, concluding the passage with an exclamation of its effective summation of the situation: *de natura EFFICIENTIS plus quàm EFFECTI, Non est cur imposterùm dubitemus*⁹⁰ The Stoic and Academic physical philosophy portrayed here in large part cohered with the materialist philosophy Toland had presented in his works, most extensively in the fourth and fifth of his *Letters to Serena*, and in the *Discourse* which prefixed his *Pantheisticon*. This philosophy established that the force animating the matter which constituted the universe was God.

Integral to Toland's Pantheism is the rejection of the idea that the divine could act outside the laws of nature, as it was one with nature; God cannot be viewed as distinct from the universe, and is hence governed by its laws.⁹¹ It is in this aspect of Pantheism that the character of Cotta in *De Natura Deorum* proves useful, as he provides the sceptical arguments directed against the Stoic belief in providence which transgresses Toland's Pantheism. Balbus in *De Natura Deorum* articulates the Stoic case for divine providence: *nihil est autem praestantius deo; ab eo igitur mundum necesse est regi; nulli igitur est naturae oboediens aut subiectus deus, omnem ergo regit ipse naturam*⁹² The arguments made by Cotta to challenge this Stoic conception of the divine are all directed against the elevation of the divine

⁹⁰ Toland, *Pantheisticon* p. 61: *the nature of the efficient, no more than that of the effect, leaves us no room for doubt*

⁹¹ Wigelsworth (2009) pp. 146-147; Levine (1994) pp. 93-112.

⁹² *DND.II.77*: *but as a matter of fact nothing exists that is superior to god; it follows therefore that the world is ruled by him; therefore god is not obedient or subject to any form of nature, and therefore he himself rules all nature*(trans. Rackham).

above nature.⁹³ Cotta attempted to liberate nature from Stoic divine reason, arguing that reason and the patterns of nature belonged to nature itself, rather than some guiding force: *naturae ista sunt, Balbe, naturae non artificiose ambulantis ut ait Zeno, quod quidem quale sit, iam videbimus, sed omnia cientis et agitantis motibus et mutationibus suis*⁹⁴ Cotta goes on to further clarify his stance: *illud non probabam, quod negabas id accidere potuisse nisi ea uno divino spiritu contineretur. Illa vero cohaeret et permanet naturae viribus, non deorum*⁹⁵ While the greater portion of Cotta's refutation of divine providence was lost, or destroyed, sufficient material remains to confirm his rejection of the belief that a divine force could surpass the laws of nature.

Toland was therefore able to construct from his reading of Cicero support for both his materialist philosophy and for his rejection of any supernatural aspects of religion, making Cicero a vital resource for his natural religion.

iii. A universal religion

In addition to cohering with the laws of nature, for a religion to be rational it must be accessible to the reason of all men: *neque est quaerendus Explanator, aut Interpretus ejus alius; nec erit alia Lex Romae, alia Athenis, alia nunc, alia posthac: sed et*

⁹³ Fott (2012) pp. 163-168.

⁹⁴ *DND.III.27*: *these faculties, Balbus, are the gifts of nature ó not nature walking in craftsmanlike manner as Zeno says (and what this means we will consider in a moment), but nature by its own motions and mutations imparting motion and activity to all things*(trans. Rackham).

⁹⁵ *DND.III.28*: *but I could not accept your assertion that this could not have come about were it not held together by a single divine breath. On the contrary, the system's coherence and persistence is due to nature's forces and not to divine power*(trans. Rackham).

omnes gentes, et omni tempore, una Lex, et sempiterna et immortalis, continebit⁹⁶

Those elements of religion which contravene this can therefore be considered superstitions rather than truly religious. This is fundamental to Toland's argument against revelation and sacerdotal authority, as a reasonable religion should be accessible to the reason of all men, not solely to a select few.

Integral to this is the argument that religious knowledge existed in the state of nature, prior to the intervention of established religion and priests.⁹⁷ This was a prominent idea in the Deist tradition, associated with the five common notions of all religions identified by Herbert of Cherbury and perpetuated by Charles Blount.⁹⁸ It was also an historical argument used regularly by Toland to challenge Christian orthodox history.⁹⁹ This argument for the existence of religion in the state of nature features in the second of the *Letters to Serena*, dealing with the immortality of the soul, and the earlier parts of the third letter, dealing with the origins of idolatry. In these sections Toland proves, by appealing to historical evidence including that provided by Cicero, that the Egyptians were able to acquire awareness of the immortality of the soul entirely without the aid of revelation or priestly knowledge.¹⁰⁰ In the absence of depravers of reason, the Egyptians were able to

⁹⁶ *Rep.* III.33, quoted in *Pantheisticon* p. 68: "there will not be one law at Rome and another at Athens, one now and another later; but all nations at all times will be bound by this one eternal and unchangeable law"

⁹⁷ On the significance of this original primitive religion for the Deists and Freethinkers see Herrick (1997) pp. 30-31 and Champion (1992) pp. 133-137.

⁹⁸ Harrison (1990) pp. 61-73; Levine (1995) pp. 224-226; Champion (1992) pp. 140-160.

⁹⁹ See Toland, *Nazarenus*, and "Primitive religion" and "History of the Druids" in the *Collection*.

¹⁰⁰ Toland, *Letters to Serena* II.28 (*Tusc.* I.38); II.46 (*Tusc.* I.36); III.77-80 (*Div.* II.4).

develop a simplistic form of religion in no way reliant on rites, images, or any other practices associated with priestcraft. It was the corruption of this practice which introduced superstition to the world: 'I shall only endeavour to show by what means the Reason of men became so deprav'd, as to think of subordinate Deitys, how the Worship of many Gods was first introduc'd into the world, and what induc'd Men to pay Divine Honors to their Fellow-Creatures, whether on Earth or in the Heavens'¹⁰¹ The existence of religious knowledge amongst the pagans prior to the institutions of religion is wielded as proof of the rational nature of religion.

Toland also directed the argument that a rational religion should be accessible to the reason of all against the place of fables, myths and mysteries in religion.¹⁰² Toland's most notable works on this subject were *Christianity not Mysterious*, and the subsequent *Defence* of that work, in which the rejection of mysteries on the basis that religion should be accessible to all men's reason is made with vigour.¹⁰³ Such inventions are accused of being a way of obscuring religion from man's reason, and therefore cannot count as true religion. Toland draws extensively in his essay *Clidophorus* (1720) on Cotta's arguments intended to disprove Stoic fables to demonstrate this: 'they were too sagacious to admit the truth of such things in the literal sense, and too prudent to reject them all as nonsense: which led them of course, by the principle of self-preservation, to impose upon them a tolerable sense of their own; that they might not be deem'd wholly to deny the Religion in vogue,

¹⁰¹ Toland, *Letters to Serena* II.69-70.

¹⁰² Toland, *Two Essays* pp. 29-31; 'Clidophorus' in *Tetradymus* pp. 79-80, 87; 'History of the Druids' in *Collection* I.40. See Harrison (1990) pp. 14-18.

¹⁰³ Champion (2003) p. 83.

but to differ onely from others about the design and interpretation of it¹⁰⁴ Toland then quotes Cotta's accusation that such fables are perpetuated by the Stoics who attempt to develop these fables as divine explanations for natural occurrences, thereby inhibiting the access of men's reason.¹⁰⁵ Toland concludes that "the same CICERO does often elsewhere express his aversion to Fables; as being, if not the parents, yet certainly the fosterers of Superstition"¹⁰⁶ Toland draws on Ciceronian material to make the case that there is no need in a true religion for anything which obscures that religion from man's own reason, as it should be fully accessible to a rational man.

Toland's descriptions of his Pantheistic religion demonstrate the extent to which it was designed to be accessible to man's natural reason. First, he states through the "liturgy" in *Pantheisticon* his rejection of the inventions of men: "MOD.: Non clarae sunt fictae Leges, nec universales, Non semper eadem, nec efficaces unquam: RESP.: Paucis ergò, aut oppidò nullis sunt utiles, Solis exceptis INTERPRETIBUS"¹⁰⁷ He then describes the nature of this Pantheistic religion: "religionem eorum animadvertas simplicem, claram, facilem, intemeratam, et gratuitam; non fucata, implicitam, operosam, incomprehensibilem, aut

¹⁰⁴ Toland, "Clidophorus" *Tetradymus* pp. 91-92.

¹⁰⁵ *DND*.III.63.

¹⁰⁶ Toland, "Clidophorus" *Tetradymus* pp. 91-92.

¹⁰⁷ *Pantheisticon* p. 69: "PRES.: laws framed by Men, are neither clear, nor universal; nor always the same, nor ever efficacious. RESP.: They are therefore useful to few, or wholly to none. Interpreters alone excepted"

mercenariam¹⁰⁸ As any true, rational religion should be, Pantheism is fully accessible to all men. Toland has therefore successfully constructed his Pantheistic society as an expression of the true rational *religio* as identified by his reading of Cicero.

IV. Civil religion

The treatment of superstition and religion Toland constructed from his reading of Cicero's works served his war on priestcraft well: a true religion was a rational religion, priestcraft drew its power from irrationality, and was therefore a superstition to be eliminated from true religion. There is one last aspect of Cicero's statement in *De Divinatione* which proves important to Toland: "multum enim et nobismet ipsis et nostris profuturi videbamus, si eam funditus sustulissemus"¹⁰⁹ The eradication of superstition becomes then not only a philosophical act, intended to purify religion, but a practical act, intended to contribute to the *res publica*. Toland's war on priestcraft was a constituent of his broader republican project, suggesting that he too conceived of this attack on the clergy as not only philosophical but practical, intended to serve the Commonwealth. It is precisely how Toland believes a rational religion, stripped of priestcraft, will serve the Commonwealth which remains to be examined, and the extent to which the parallel aims evident in Cicero's works influenced Toland's approach.

¹⁰⁸ Toland, *Pantheisticon* p. 76: "you may perceive that their religion is simple, clear, easy, without blemish, and freely bestowed; not painted over, nor intricate, embarrassed, incomprehensible, or mercenary"

¹⁰⁹ *Div.*II.148.

i. Engaging with the established religion

At the conclusion of *De Divinatione* Cicero makes a statement which seemingly contradicts everything that the character Marcus has just argued: *nam et maiorum insituta tueri sacris caeremoniisque retinendis sapientis est*¹¹⁰ The discrepancy between this statement and the arguments put forward attacking forms of divination which feature prominently in the traditional Roman religion is significant.¹¹¹ In the second book of *De Divinatione*, Cicero responds to the inconsistency between the arguments he was making against divination, and his own public displays of support for those practices. Quintus had reminded Cicero of his displays of belief in divination, particularly within the poems Cicero composed on his own consulship, and of the fact that he was himself an augur. Cicero responds, however, that such statements need not preclude his private belief in the impossibility of divination.¹¹² Certainly Cicero had represented himself as a champion of the traditional religion in his more public works. In his speeches he regularly invoked the responsibility of Rome's political leaders to defend religion, and called upon the traditional Roman practices to authorise his arguments.¹¹³ Considered in the context of Cicero's statements in *De Divinatione*, it would appear Cicero was claiming for himself the right to possess both public beliefs and private beliefs. While his public beliefs reflected his support for traditional religious practices, this did not prevent him from

¹¹⁰ *Div.*II.148.

¹¹¹ Beard (1986) pp. 33-34. Schofield (1986) pp. 57-58 diminishes the importance of Cicero's rejection of superstition by calling *Div.*II.148-149 a 'rhetorical flourish'

¹¹² *Div.*II.45-46, 54, 70, 140.

¹¹³ *Sest.*98; *Dom.*7; *Flac.*67; *Font.*47; *Har.*18-19.

doubting the truth of certain practices associated with that traditional religion in his own private philosophy.

This understanding of the need for private and public religions working in tandem is one which appealed greatly to Toland.¹¹⁴ Toland describes the conduct of his Pantheistic society in these terms, claiming that their beliefs necessitated what he identified as a two-fold philosophy: *sed vitio forsā vertetur PANTHEISTIS, quod duplicem habeant doctrinam, Externam scilicet vel popularem, vulgi praejudiciis, aut dogmatibus publice pro veris sancitis, utcunque accomodatam; et Internam vel Philosophicam, rerum naturae, ac ipsi adeo Veritati, penitus conformem*¹¹⁵ While perfect and true philosophy might be achieved in privacy, public discourse had to respond to the imperfect reason of much of its audience. Toland identified Cicero and the Academics as precursors to this two-fold philosophy in his essay on the subject, entitled *Clidophorus*.¹¹⁶ In this work, Toland quotes Cicero's description of esoteric and exoteric philosophies from *De Finibus* in order to describe the approach of Academic philosophers: *there are two sorts of books, says he; the one popularly*

¹¹⁴ Toland's public statements of his Christianity have been dismissed by some as attempts to obscure his heterodox beliefs; see Berman (1988) pp. 75-76, (1992) pp. 255-272 and Jacob (1981) pp. 152-154.

¹¹⁵ Toland, *Pantheisticon* p. 78: *but perhaps it may be imputed as a fault to the Pantheists for embracing two doctrines, the one External or popular, adjusted in some measure to the prejudices of the people, or to doctrines publicly authorised for true; the other Internal or philosophical, altogether conformable to the nature of things, and therefore to truth itself* cf. *Clidophorus* in *Tetradymus* p. 94. See Harrison (1990) pp. 85-92; Daniel (1991) pp. 1-12; Cherchi (1994) pp. 61-69.

¹¹⁶ Champion (1995) pp. 274-275. See Gay (1966) pp. 150-159 on this approach amongst Enlightenment *philosophes*, and Wilkinson (1982) pp. 82-92 on this reading by Augustine. Toland also recognised the distinction made by Varro between mythical, natural and civil theology in his *Theologia Tripartita*, as preserved by Augustine; cf. *City of God* VI.v-vii, Champion (1995) p. 175.

written, which they call'd Exoteric; the other more perfectly written, namely the Esoteric, which they left in their commentaries, or finished Pieces¹¹⁷ It was for this reason that Academics often had to obscure their true beliefs in their works, as Cicero had done at the conclusion of *De Natura Deorum*. According to this understanding of both his own and Cicero's works, statements in support of the established religion were not insincere attempts to counter the radicalism of their true views, but necessary adaptations of their discourse for public consumption.¹¹⁸ Toland did not have to abandon in his public works the radical and sceptical Cicero so important to his own philosophy; the two-fold approach merely meant that there was room for a practical approach to religious discourse as well as a sceptical approach.

This two-fold philosophy of private and public belief is justified by Cicero on account of the vital role public religion plays in the republic. There are repeated references in the second book of *De Divinatione* to the need for a state religion.¹¹⁹ Cicero does not attempt to obscure his recognition of the political necessity of certain divinatory practices: *ut ordiar ab haruspicina, quam ego rei publicae causa communisque religionis colendam censeo*¹²⁰ This sentiment is repeated concerning

¹¹⁷ Toland, *Æclidophorus* in *Tetradymus* p. 77, quoting *Fin.V.12*; cf. *Pantheisticon* p. 97.

¹¹⁸ On the argument that Cicero's conclusion to *De Natura Deorum* was intended to obscure his own commitment to Cotta's scepticism see Pease (1955-58) pp. 33-36, and the Fathers Augustine *City of God* 5.9 and Lactantius, *Inst.* 1.15, 16-27.

¹¹⁹ Fott (2012) pp. 168-174; Goar (1972) pp. 29-33; Krostenko (2000) pp. 353-355.

¹²⁰ *Div.II.28*: *Æ* shall begin with soothsaying, which, according to my deliberate judgement, should be cultivated from reasons of political expediency and in order that we may have a state religion (trans. Falconer).

the maintenance of augural practices and the role of the haruspices, where this political expediency is identified with the power of religion to influence the masses.¹²¹ This reflects a statement in *De Legibus* that the art of the augurs had declined, but its maintenance was required due to the important role augury played in the Commonwealth.¹²² This evident belief in the need for a state religion undermines the reading of *De Divinatione* as a thoroughly sceptical, negative rejection of all popular superstition and its exploitation by politicians.¹²³ Cicero recognised the importance of piety for social order, due to the influence of religion on the masses, and as a result demonstrates respect for traditional Roman institutions not just in *De Divinatione*, but as Cotta in *De Natura Deorum*: *harum ego religionum nullam umquam contemnendam putavi, mihique ita persuasi, Romulum auspiciis Numam sacris constitutis fundamenta iecisse nostrae civitatis, quae numquam profecto sine summa placatione decrum immortalium tanta esse potuisset*¹²⁴ The implication of these statements is that the service to the state being rendered by the rationalisation of religion in *De Divinatione* is the solidification of state control over the public religion, so that its ability to influence the masses is directed appropriately.

¹²¹ *Div.*II.70, 75.

¹²² *Leg.*II.31-33.

¹²³ This reading can be found in Pease (1963) pp. 12-13 and Momigliano (1984) p. 209.

¹²⁴ *DND.*III.5: *well, I have always thought that none of these departments of religion was to be despised, and I have held the conviction that Romulus by his auspices and Numa by his establishment of our ritual laid the foundations of our state, which assuredly could never have been as great as it is had not the fullest measure of divine favour been obtained for it*(trans. Rackham); cf. Goar (1972) pp. 114-120.

This is certainly how Toland reads Cicero's statements concerning popular religion. In the opening passages of Toland's *Origines Judiciae*, the work in which Toland seeks to politicise Moses and thus the origins of Christianity, Toland draws extensively on Cicero to make the case that religion was necessary to the state, on account of its ability to influence the masses: *Æfateris (Auguste dulcissime) me recte omnino affirmare, in Adeisidaemone meo, nobiliores fere omnes et doctiores Romanos, Cultum sacrum, a Numa Pompilio traditum, vel tradi creditum, pro Politico habuisse Commento; et, ut cum Cicerone loquar, eos persuasos fuisse totam de Diis immortalibus opinionem, fictam esse ab hominibus sapientibus Reipublicae causa: UT QUOS RATIO NON POSSET, EOS AD OFFICIUM RELIGIO DUCERET*¹²⁵ Toland then quotes in full a passage from the second book of *De Divinatione* which reiterates the point that religion served the state by means of influencing the masses, and that as a result the practice of augury should be maintained, provoking an exclamation from Toland regarding the fact that this was being acknowledged by someone who was an augur himself.¹²⁶ As a final confirmation, Toland once more quotes the relevant section of the favoured passage from the end of *De Divinatione*, in which Cicero explicitly states that the rationalisation of religion will serve the state. Toland concludes that *hoc et de me quoque diligentissime intelligi volo, cum impugnando Superstitionem, Religionem*

¹²⁵ Toland, *Origines Judiciae* pp. 101-102 (quoting *DND.I.118*): *you acknowledge (sweetest August) that I altogether rightly confirmed, in my Adeisidaemon, that all the more noble and more learned Romans held that the sacred Cult, handed down, or believed to have been handed down, by Numa Pompilius, was a political invention; and, as I say with Cicero, they had been persuaded that the entire nation of immortal gods is a fiction invented by wise men in the interest of the state, to the end that those whom reason was powerless to control might be led in the path of duty by religion, cf. Champion (1992) pp. 173-179, 186-195, (1996) pp. 333-334.*

¹²⁶ *Div.II.70* in *Origines Judiciae* pp. 101-103.

propugnare sit unicum mihi¹²⁷ Toland uses Cicero to make the case that a popular religion was necessary to the state, provided that it was politically controlled.

ii. A rational religion and the commonwealth

The influence of the Ciceronian state religion on Toland's conception of popular religion extends beyond the explicit link made in *Origines Judiciae*. Toland consistently demonstrates his belief in the necessity of a popular religion which coheres with Cicero's state religion.¹²⁸ In *Anglia Libera* in particular Toland grants a great deal of space to celebrating the Act of Settlement's protection of the Protestant religion, and to praising William III for ensuring that the Act succeeded on this basis.¹²⁹ Also signified in *Anglia Libera* is Toland's belief that this religion should be administered by the state: "Religion it self is not more natural to Man, than it is for every Government to have a *national Religion*, or som public and orderly Way of worshipping God, under the Allowance, Involvement, and Inspection of the civil Magistrat¹³⁰ Toland continuously advocates the existence of a national Church, provided it is under the supervision and rule of the civil government.¹³¹ Later, in his *State-Anatomy*, Toland describes with pride the role of the Protestant religion in

¹²⁷ Toland, *Origines Judiciae* p. 103: "and I want this also to be understood about me most carefully, since Superstition must be attacked, Religion alone shall be defended by me"

¹²⁸ Champion (1992) p. 193. Toland is here part of a tradition which can be traced through Machiavelli, Hobbes and Harrington; cf. Goldie (1987) pp. 197-222, Tuck (1993b) pp. 120-138, Klein (1993) p. 287, Champion (1992) pp. 133-137, 196-198, Beiner (2011) pp. 17-72, Pocock (1980) pp. 96-99.

¹²⁹ Toland, *Anglia Libera* pp. 33-47, 94-106; cf. *Art of Governing* pp. 11-31.

¹³⁰ Toland, *Anglia Libera* pp. 95-96.

¹³¹ Champion (1992) pp. 179-186, (2003) pp. 141-142.

society, indicating clearly the dominant role of the state: ~~but~~ we *Britons* being firmly persuaded, that the Protestant Religion is preferable to all others in spiritual as well as temporal regards, the most conformable to Scripture, and the most agreeable to Reason, have made it an essential part of our Constitution, adding the sanction of the laws to the convictions of our minds¹³² The *State-Anatomy* is further significant for its recommendations for annexing power from the Church as an independent establishment to the state, most notably by recommending the suspension of the House of Convocation, a measure which was in fact instituted following the Bangorian controversy in 1720.¹³³

Toland's concern for the state control of religion is in large part a response to the perceived threat posed to the constitution of the Commonwealth by elements of the Church.¹³⁴ This was a threat particularly associated with the High Church Anglicans, referring to the conservative elements of the Church, who continued to advocate the authority of the ecclesiastical establishment in the civil sphere, thereby challenging the authority of the civil government.¹³⁵ Toland provided a lengthy definition of High Churchmen in his *State-Anatomy*, describing their commitment to the independence of the ecclesiastical institution, and to the divinity of the episcopacy, concluding that ~~the~~ High Churchmen have been generally for the uncontrollable Power of the Prince in temporal affairs, as most agreeable to the

¹³² Toland, *State-Anatomy* p. 20.

¹³³ Kenyon (1977) pp. 195-196; Champion (2000b) pp. 42-66.

¹³⁴ Champion (1992) pp. 1-24.

¹³⁵ Goldie (1993) pp. 211-213; Cragg (1960) pp. 50-64; Clark (2006) pp. 56-64; Champion (1992) pp. 7-10; Klein (1993) pp. 291-293.

Jurisdiction they claim to themselves in Ecclesiasticks¹³⁶ This was manifested by the clergy's efforts to preserve their own interests in the civic sphere by offering their support to the Tory Party, and utilising the House of Convocation to influence political matters. The trial of Sacheverell brought matters to a crisis, as his sermons and their claims for the political influence of the clergy provoked the Whigs, but concluded with a return to power for the Tory Party.¹³⁷ In the years between 1710 and 1714 Toland produced at least three works challenging the claim that the clergy might involve itself in politics from the pulpit: *High Church Display'd* (1711), an account of the trial, *The Jacobitism, Perjury, and Popery of High-Church Priests* (1710), and *An Appeal to honest People against wicked Priests* (1713). In these works Toland reiterated his condemnation of the preaching of divine right and passive obedience by the clergy in return for influence in the civil sphere.¹³⁸ He accused the clergy of using their power to undermine the authority of the British constitution, as absolutist government served their purposes better.

It is this desire to safeguard state control of the national religion that in large part motivated Toland's rationalisation of religion. If the claims of the clergy to authority could be eradicated, if their superfluity to true religion could be proved, then the Church could be entirely subsumed into the state. By eradicating priestcraft from true religion, Toland was able to challenge the claim made to an independence from the authority of the state by the ecclesiastical establishment on the basis of their special status in relation to the divine. This is one of his targets in *An Appeal to*

¹³⁶ Toland, *State-Anatomy* p. 25.

¹³⁷ On the trial of Sacheverell see Holmes (1973); Kenyon (1977) pp. 128-145.

¹³⁸ Toland, *Appeal* pp. 45-48; cf. *Art of Governing* pp. 14-15 and *Anglia Libera* pp. 177-190.

Honest People: first, I mean those who sawcily strike at the Queen's Supremacy, by asserting the Independency of the Church upon the State, calling their own Decrees thundering Anathemas, Sentences ratify'd in Heaven, and which they defy any Power on Earth to reverse¹³⁹ Such a claim to authority simply cannot coexist with the Commonwealth constitution. On this basis, Toland's pledge to free religion from priestcraft can indeed be interpreted as a public service, as it allowed religion to become the preserve of the state alone.

iii. A rational religion and civil society

It was not only the perceived threat to the constitution from an independent religious establishment which drove Toland to seek a state-controlled religion. He understood, as Cicero did, the immense influence over the people permitted by religious control. For Toland, this influence would be best exerted leading people towards the reason and virtue which would allow them to become the best civil community for the commonwealth.¹⁴⁰ Toland's authorisation of the Protestant religion reflects his concern on this front: but I shall here consider Protestantism and Popery barely as they regard our *British* Empire, wherein as the Protestant is the National religion, so it is beyond comparison the best adapted to the happy and flourishing condition of the inhabitants¹⁴¹ In large part, the Protestant religion manages this because it is a religion well suited to the purpose of leading men to virtue, whereas under the authority of the priests there had been attempts to compel

¹³⁹ Toland, *Appeal* pp. 36-37.

¹⁴⁰ On this tradition in republican discourse see Pagden (1987) pp. 6-11.

¹⁴¹ Toland, *State-Anatomy* p. 19.

men to orthodoxy.¹⁴² True virtue could only be achieved by the exercise of reason, therefore it could never be achieved under the authority of the clergy. If the people were unable to attain virtue, this would damage the civil community of the commonwealth.¹⁴³ For Toland, true worship could only exist in the exercise of reason and virtue: “according to this model, the Christian Worship does not consist (it seems) in stately Edifices, sumptuous Altars, numerous Attendants, gorgeous Habits, exquisite Musick, or a curiously contriv’d, expensive, and ceremonious service, supported by ample revenues and possessions...a man’s behaviour, and not the cant of a party, not the particular garbs or customs of any place, but the goodness and sincerity of his actions, wou’d be the real test of his Religion¹⁴⁴

In a Church administered by the state, the priests would no longer be able to claim the right to speak for God in moral education.¹⁴⁵ Instead, “all they can claim is a capacity of being Teachers, when any society pleases to authorize æm¹⁴⁶ This is a point Toland makes by drawing on Cicero once more in the *State-Anatomy*: “Cicero, I say, telling those Priests to their faces, that, if they wou’d go about to defend those things by Divine Religion, which were condemn’d by Human Equity, what wou’d be the consequence, thus accosts them; if you shou’d do this *we must look out for other Ceremonies, for other Priests of the immortal Gods, for other Expounders of*

¹⁴² Toland, *State-Anatomy* p. 28.

¹⁴³ Toland, “History of the Druids” in *Collection* I.8-9

¹⁴⁴ Toland, “The Primitive Constitution of the Christian Church” in *Collection* II.145-146; cf. *Clito* p. 17. See Champion (1992) pp. 170-173, Jacob (2006) pp. 268-271 and Webb (1992) pp. 161-162.

¹⁴⁵ Harrison (1990) pp. 19-28; Israel (2001) p. 471; Lund (1995) pp. 1-32; Scott (2004a) pp. 41-44.

¹⁴⁶ Toland, “Primitive Constitution” in *Collection* II.196-197.

Religions. This is in our stile, we must look out for another Liturgy, for others Bishops, and for other Preachers'.¹⁴⁷ Toland's concern over the clergy's exploitation of the pulpits in this way was another theme of his works in response to the trial of Sacheverell, whose sermons argued for the right of the clergy to punish those who transgressed orthodoxy.¹⁴⁸ In a rational religion, subsumed within the state, that state had the authority to make this challenge to the clergy, when they used their pulpits to preach concepts damaging to the civil community.

Toland was particularly hostile to the associated belief that the clergy could define orthodox belief, and condemn those who strayed from it. In *The Memorial of the State of England* Toland recruited Cicero once more to make this point, quoting the law detailed in *De Legibus* that only God can avenge those who worship him incorrectly: 'but these *Pagans* thought God to be potent enough to vindicate profane Addresses, or clement enough to forgive devout Ignorance; but we *Christians* must come to the help of the Lord against the mighty, and be readier to exercise his Justice, than to exercise his mercy'¹⁴⁹ Toland's arguments against the moral authority of the clergy, and for the existence of true worship in the acquisition of virtue, are vital for the campaign for toleration which permeates his works.¹⁵⁰ The clergy's unwillingness to tolerate other faiths had led to such measures as the Occasional Conformity Act (1711), the Schism Act (1714), and the Sacramental Test (1673), all of which were rejected by Toland in his *State-Anatomy* and repealed by

¹⁴⁷ Toland, *State-Anatomy* pp. 80-81 (*Dom.*2).

¹⁴⁸ Champion (2000b) pp. 42-66, (2003) pp. 141-142.

¹⁴⁹ Toland, *Memorial* pp. 47-48, referring to *Leg.*II.19.

¹⁵⁰ Toland, *Memorial* p. 101; *State-Anatomy* pp. 23, 26-32.

the Whig government, led by Stanhope and Sunderland between 1717 and 1721. Toland argues that provided religious practice does not contradict reason and virtue, as was the case with Catholicism, there is no reason why it should be banned: "and least of all will I grant, that either Princes or Priests may justly damnify any person in his reputation, property, liberty, or life, on the account of his religious profession; nor lay him under any incapacities for not conforming to the national manner of Worship, provided he neither professes nor practices anything repugnant to human Society, or the civil Government where he lives"¹⁵¹ Toland drew on Cicero's *Pro Balbo* several times to further make the case for toleration, as a work in which Cicero made the case for the acceptance of an "external" figure into a society.¹⁵² In a rational religion, no man would be excluded for the means by which he chose to worship, provided he did not threaten the civil community.

Toland constructed his understanding of Cicero's religious discourse so that he was able to identify the coexistence of both a sceptical, private discourse which served his efforts to deconstruct the authority of the clergy, and a practical, public discourse which served the Commonwealth. Toland drew upon Cicero's "public" discourse to construct his own understanding of how a public religion must function: it must be controlled by the state, and serve to lead the people to reason and therefore virtue. In the context of early eighteenth century England, a rational religion, in no way dependent on the clergy, was the optimum means of constructing this civil religion.

¹⁵¹ Toland, "Primitive Constitution" in *Collection* II.123.

¹⁵² Toland, *Reasons for naturalizing the Jews* frontispiece (*Balb.*51), p. 45 (*Balb.*26); *State-Anatomy* p. 58.

V. Conclusion

When Toland recruited Cicero for his war on priestcraft, he constructed from the evidence a rational and sceptical Cicero. The ambiguities in Cicero's works meant that in using it, scholars had to lay claim to a particular method of reading him. Toland, largely adhering to the precedent of the Freethinkers, read Cicero as a committed Academic Sceptic, identifying him consistently with this philosophical position in the dialogues. This approach allowed him to construct from the Ciceronian evidence an account of superstition and religion which indicted the clergy as dependent on superstition, and therefore entirely superfluous to true religion. This philosophical argument was a prominent feature of Toland's war on priestcraft, but it was not the only facet of that campaign.

Toland, unlike his Freethinking contemporaries, saw in Cicero not only a sceptical approach to religion, but also a practical approach. Religion offered too much in service of the state to be eliminated entirely, rather public belief should be controlled by the state, and used by that state to enforce its own interests. Toland located in Cicero's understanding of the role of a popular religion a precedent for his own efforts to advocate a civil religion, which would place the Church and the clergy under the control of the civil government.

CONCLUSION TO SECTION TWO

The Ciceronian tradition therefore constituted a forceful presence in Toland's radical discourse. When attempting to adapt the republican tradition into a compelling political ideology appropriate to a constitution overseen by a limited monarchy, it was Cicero to whom Toland turned for the theory of government which would underpin his own approach. Toland co-opted the Ciceronian tradition to serve his radical political aims, to imbue his arguments for a constitution based on the protection of the common good and the nurturing of civic virtue instead of the traditional divine right authority of monarchy with the authority of that tradition. When conducting a war on priestcraft and seeking the philosophical arguments which would legitimate a rational religion freed from the false authority of the clergy so that it might more ably serve the state through the encouragement of virtuous citizens, Toland once more drew upon Ciceronian strategies. In each case, Toland is revealed as actively adapting Cicero for radical purposes; first, the traditional Cicero for a modified republican system, then, a rational Cicero for a controversial religious discourse. Toland did not simply refer to Cicero as an authoritative source; he purposefully constructed Cicero into a valuable weapon in his radical philosophy.

Toland's efforts in the political and religious sphere have already confirmed him as an important radical figure, and as a force in the development of the early Enlightenment. He has been identified with the Radical Enlightenment by its foremost proponents, an identification seemingly justified by his commitment to challenging those bastions of traditional authority, the Church and the Crown. Yet, Toland's relationship with Cicero as expounded here presents a major problem for

the now dominant conception of the Radical Enlightenment. The portrayal of that Enlightenment as the rejection of all forms of authority and tradition in favour of philosophical reason is undermined by a figure considered to be a primary example of that process. Toland's use of Cicero reveals him not rejecting the past, and tradition, and authority, but instead adapting them for the construction of rational ideologies. The idea that tradition and reason were oppositional in the early Enlightenment is therefore revealed as flawed; Toland's adaptation of Cicero for his radical discourse shows that tradition and reason could function together in the formation of a new world.

CONCLUSION

In the first section of this thesis, in which the purpose of *Cicero Illustratus* itself was examined, Toland's exploitation of erudition to achieve his own ends was revealed. Toland presented a series of scholarly arguments intended to legitimise his often controversial approaches to editing, which focussed on limiting the role of the editor and scholar so that the author might be liberated from their dominion, allowing that author to recover his former cultural importance. While apparently limiting the ability of the editor to interfere with his subject, Toland's arguments simultaneously elevated the importance of the editor's knowledge of his subject, so that the subject would be presented accurately to the reader. The editorial identity Toland creates for himself is therefore defined by both his respect for the real Cicero, and his ability to identify, interpret and portray that real Cicero for the reader. The purpose of *Cicero Illustratus* was therefore not only to restore Cicero's cultural influence, but to empower Toland's interpretation of that cultural influence.

In the second section of this thesis, Toland's reasons for constructing this authority for his interpretation of Cicero were determined by evaluating the role Cicero played in Toland's radical discourse. Throughout that discourse Toland was actively adapting the existing Ciceronian tradition to serve new, and often controversial, purposes. In that context, the motives behind the efforts in *Cicero Illustratus* to sanction his understanding of Cicero, and to rehabilitate the influence of Cicero himself, become evident; Toland's modification of Cicero into a champion of republican and rational discourse was made more viable by *Cicero Illustratus*. This

presents a challenge to the traditional narratives of the Ciceronian tradition. Rather than a narrative of decline as modern thought made such classical works with a prominent use of rhetoric redundant, *Cicero Illustratus* and its function in Toland's thought represent a narrative of renewal and adaptation, as Cicero was constructed into a powerful weapon in radical philosophy, into a champion of reason and civic virtue. It is worth noting that other proposals for editions of Cicero's works were being developed by Anthony Collins and Thomas Hearne at the same time as *Cicero Illustratus*, which may provide further evidence for the way in which editing Cicero was being used to recruit him to particular intellectual discourses.

The function of *Cicero Illustratus*, and what it reveals about the importance of Cicero for Toland's radical discourse, sorely tests the trope that the Enlightenment embodied reason and a complete break with tradition. The fact that this work represents the efforts of a prominent Enlightenment figure to adapt the classical tradition for the radical philosophy so strongly associated with the subsequent development of the Enlightenment undermines this simplistic understanding of a vital period of intellectual history. The means by which tradition was adapted in *Cicero Illustratus* further negate this narrative. In this work Toland uses humanist scholarship to re-establish the authority of a classical author, identifying him firmly with the humanists. Not only does this demonstrate that humanism continued to be an active force into the eighteenth century, but it also reveals humanism contributing to the formation of modern thought.¹ By using humanist scholarship to adapt the

¹ See Trevor-Roper (1967) pp. 179-218 and Pocock (2004) pp. 8-9, (2010) pp. 12-18 on the influence of humanism and the Erasmian tradition on the formation of the religious radicalism which they identify with the roots of the Enlightenment.

Ciceronian tradition for his radical philosophy Toland demonstrated that humanism remained a powerful force.

Cicero Illustratus was a remarkable work, not necessarily for the standard of scholarship contained therein, but for the purposes that scholarship served. It constitutes an immensely valuable piece of evidence for the vital role Ciceronian scholarship was able to play in adapting the classical tradition of the Renaissance for the Enlightenment.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

MANUSCRIPTS

British Library, London

Add. MS. 4295: Toland Papers; collection of letters and papers of John Toland.

Add. MS. 4465: Toland Papers; collection of letters and papers of John Toland.

PRINTED SOURCES

Allen, W. (1954) 'Cicero's Conceit', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 85, pp. 121-144.

Ashcraft, R. (1995) 'Anticlericalism and authority in Lockean political thought' in Lund, R. D., ed. *The margins of orthodoxy: heterodox writing and cultural response, 1660-1750*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 73-96.

Atkins, E. M. (2000) 'Cicero' in Rowe, C. and Schofield, M., eds., *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Political Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 477-516.

Ayres, P. (1997) *Classical culture and the idea of Rome in eighteenth-century England*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bagnani, G. (1960) 'On fakes and forgeries', *Phoenix*, 14.4, pp. 228-244.

Balsdon, J. P. V. D. (1965) 'Cicero the man' in Dorey, T. A., ed. *Cicero*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, pp. 171-214.

- Barnett, S. J. (1999) *Idol Temples and Crafty Priests: the Origins of Enlightenment Anticlericalism*, Basingstoke: Macmillan Press.
- Baron, H. (1959) 'The Querelle of the Ancients and Moderns as a problem for Renaissance scholarship', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 20.1, pp. 3-22.
- (1966) *The crisis of the early Italian Renaissance: civic humanism and republican liberty in an age of classicism and tyranny*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- (1967) 'Leonardo Bruni: 'Professional Rhetorician' or 'Civic Humanist'?', *Past & Present*, 36, pp. 21-37.
- Beard, M. (1986) 'Cicero and Divination: The Formation of a Latin Discourse', *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 76, pp. 33-46.
- Beiner, R. (2011) *Civil Religion: a Dialogue in the History of Political Philosophy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bell, M. (2002) 'Mise-en-Page, Illustration, Expressive Form' in Barnard, J., McKenzie, D. F. and Bell, M., eds., *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 632-662.
- Bentley, J. H. (1978) 'Erasmus, Jean Le Clerc, and the principle of the harder reading', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 31.3, pp. 309-321.
- Berman, D. (1988) *A history of atheism in Britain: from Hobbes to Russell*, London: Croom Helm.

- (1992) 'Disclaimers as Offence Mechanisms in Charles Blount and John Toland' in Hunter, M. and Wootton, D., eds., *Atheism from the Reformation to the Enlightenment*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 255-271.
- (1997) 'The Irish Freethinker' in McGuinness, P., Harrison, A. and Kearney, R., eds., *John Toland's Christianity not Mysterious: text, associated works, and critical essays*, Dublin: The Lilliput Press, pp. 223-229.
- Berti, S., Charles-Daubert, F. and Popkin, R. H. (1996) *Heterodoxy, Spinozism, and free thought in early-eighteenth-century Europe: studies of the Traité des trois imposteurs*, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.
- Biddle, J. C. (1976) 'Locke's critique of innate principles and Toland's Deism', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 37.3, pp. 411-422.
- Bloch, E. (1965) 'Erasmus and the Froben Press: the Making of an Editor', *The Library Quarterly*, 55.2, pp. 109-120.
- Bolgar, R. R. (1954) *The Classical Heritage and its Beneficiaries*, London: Cambridge University Press.
- Braubach, M. (1963-1965) *Prinz Eugen von Savoyen: eine Biographie*, Wien: Verlag für Geschichte und Politik.
- Bravo, B. (2006) 'Critice in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries and the Rise of the Notion of Historical Criticism' in Ligota, C. R. and Quantin, J.-L., eds., *History of Scholarship: A Selection of Papers from the Seminar on the History of Scholarship Held Annually at the Warburg Institute*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 135-196.

- Brink, C. O. (1986) *English classical scholarship: historical reflections on Bentley, Porson and Housman*, Cambridge: Clarke.
- Brown, M. (2012) *A political biography of John Toland*, London: Pickering & Chatto.
- Browning, R. (1982) *Political and Constitutional Ideas of the Court Whigs*, Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- Brueggemann, L. W. (1795) *A view of the English editions, translations, and commentaries of Marcus Tullius Cicero, with remarks*, Stettin.
- Brunt, P. A. (1988) *The fall of the Roman Republic and related essays*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Brykman, G., ed. (1995) *John Toland (1670-1722) et la crise de la conscience europeenne*, Paris: Editions A. Michel.
- Burke, P. (1969a) 'Tacitism' in Dorey, T. A., ed. *Tacitus*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, pp. 149-171.
- (1969b) *The Renaissance sense of the past*, London: Edward Arnold.
- (1998) *Individuality and biography in the Renaissance*, Offprint from: *Die Renaissance und die Entdeckung des Individuums in der Kunst*.
- Burrow, J. (2007) *A History of Histories: Epics, Chronicles, Romances and Inquiries from Herodotus and Thucydides to the Twentieth Century*, London: Allen Lane.

- Burt, S. (1992) *Virtue Transformed: Political Argument in England, 1688-1740*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bury, J. B. (1920) *The idea of progress: an inquiry into its origin and growth*, London: Macmillan.
- Caine, B. (2010) *Biography and History*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cameron, E. (2010) *Enchanted Europe: superstition, reason, and religion, 1250-1750*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Carabelli, G. (1975) *Tolandiana: materiali bibliografici per lo studio dell'opera e della fortuna di John Toland (1670-1722)*, Firenze: La Nuova Italia.
- Cave, T. (1999) 'Ancients and Moderns: France' in Norton, G. P., ed. *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism III: The Renaissance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 417-425.
- Céard, J. (2012) 'Theory and practices of commentary in the Renaissance' in Henderson, J. R., ed. *The unfolding of words: commentary in the age of Erasmus*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, pp. 3-23.
- Champion, J. A. I. (1990) 'Toland and the *Traité des trois imposteurs* c1709-1718', *International Archives of the History of Ideas*, 148, pp. 333-356.
- (1992) *The pillars of priestcraft shaken: the Church of England and its enemies, 1660-1730*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (1995) 'John Toland: the Politics of Pantheism', *Revue de Synthèse*, 4.2-3, pp. 259-280.

- (1996) 'Legislators, impostors, and the politic origins of religion: English theories of imposture from Stubbe to Toland' in Berti, S., Charles-Daubert, F. and Popkin, R. H., eds., *Heterodoxy, Spinozism, and Free Thought in Early-Eighteenth-Century Europe: Studies on the Traité des Trois Imposteurs*, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 333-356.
- (1999a) 'Acceptable to inquisitive men!: some Simonian contexts for Newton's biblical criticism, 1680-1692' in Force, J. and Popkin, R. H., eds., *Newton and Religion: context, nature, and influence*, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 77-96.
- (1999b) *John Toland: Nazarenus*, Oxford: The Voltaire Foundation.
- (1999c) 'Manuscripts of Mine Abroad': John Toland and the Circulation of Ideas, c. 1700-1722', *Eighteenth-Century Ireland*, 14, pp. 9-36.
- (2000a) "'Religion's safe, with priestcraft is the war": Augustan anticlericalism and the legacy of the English Revolution, 1660-1720', *The European Legacy*, 5.4, pp. 547-561.
- (2000b) "'To govern is to make subjects believe": anticlericalism, politics and power, c 1680-1717' in Aston, N. and Cragoe, M., eds., *Anticlericalism in Britain: c. 1500-1914*, Stroud: Sutton, pp. 42-66.
- (2003) *Republican Learning: John Toland and the Crisis of Christian Culture, 1696-1722*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- (2006a) 'Directions for the Profitable Reading of the Holy Scriptures': Biblical Criticism, Clerical Learning and Lay Readers, c. 1650-1720' in

Hessayon, A. and Keene, N., eds., *Scripture and Scholarship in Early Modern England*, Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 208-230.

(2006b) 'Enlightened erudition and the politics of reading in John Toland's circle', *The Historical Journal*, 49.1, pp. 111-141.

(2012) "Socinianism Truly Stated': John Toland, Jean Leclerc and the Eighteenth-Century Reception of Grotius' *De Veritate*", *Grotiana*, 33, pp. 119-143.

Cherchi, G. L. (1994) 'Atheism, Dissimulation and Atomism in the Philosophy of John Toland' unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of London.

Claassen, J. (1992) 'Cicero's banishment: *tempora et mores*', *Acta Classica*, xxxv, pp. 19-47.

Clark, J. C. D. (2006) 'Great Britain and Ireland' in Tackett, T. and Brown, S. J., eds., *Cambridge History of Christianity VII: Enlightenment, Reawakening and Revolution 1660-1815*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 54-71.

Clarke, D. M. (1997) 'Toland on Faith and Reason' in McGuinness, P., Harrison, A. and Kearney, R., eds., *John Toland's Christianity not Mysterious: text, associated works, and critical essays*, Dublin: The Lilliput Press, pp. 293-302.

Clarke, M. L. (1965) "Non Hominis Nomen, Sed Eloquentiae" in Dorey, T. A., ed. *Cicero*, London: Routledge & K. Paul, pp. 81-107.

Clift, E. H. (1945) *Latin Pseudepigrapha: a study in literary attributions*, Baltimore: J. H. Furst company.

- Cooper, T. (2004) 'Davies, John (1679-1732)' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Copeland, R. (2011) 'The Ciceronian rhetorical tradition and Medieval literary theory' in Cox, V. and Ward, J. O., eds., *The rhetoric of Cicero in its Medieval and Early Renaissance commentary tradition*, Leiden: Brill, pp. 239-265.
- Corbett, E. P. J. (1971) 'The theory and practice of imitation in classical rhetoric', *College Composition and Communication*, 22.3, pp. 243-250.
- Cornish, M. L. (1978) 'Cicero's De Officiis and Machiavelli's Prince', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 9.4, pp. 80-93.
- Corns, T. N. (2008) 'The early lives of John Milton' in Sharpe, K. and Zwicker, S. N., eds., *Writing lives: biography and textuality, identity and representation in early modern England*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 75-89.
- Cox, V. and Ward, J. O., eds. (2011) *The Rhetoric of Cicero in Its Medieval and Early Renaissance Commentary Tradition*, Leiden: Brill.
- Cragg, G. R. (1950) *From Puritanism to the Age of Reason*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (1960) *The Church and the Age of Reason, 1648-1789*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- (1964) *Reason and Authority in the Eighteenth Century*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Craig, C. P. (1990) 'Cicero's Strategy of Embarrassment in the Speech for Plancius', *The American Journal of Philology*, 111.1, pp. 75-81.
- Daniel, S. H. (1984) *John Toland: his Methods, Manners, and Mind*, Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- (1991) 'The subversive philosophy of John Toland' in Hyland, P. and Sammells, N., eds., *Irish Writing: Exile and Subversion*, Basingstoke: Macmillan, pp. 1-12.
- (2004) 'Toland, John (1670-1722)' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Darnton, R. (1979) *The business of Enlightenment: a publishing history of the Encyclopedie, 1775-1800*, Cambridge: Belknap Press.
- Davidson, H. M. (1975) 'Fontenelle, Perrault, and the realignment of the arts' in Williams, C. G. S., ed. *Literature and history in the age of ideas: essays on the French Enlightenment presented to George R. Havens*, Columbus: Ohio State University Press, pp. 3-13.
- Davis, J. C. (1981) 'Pocock's Harrington: Grace, Nature and Art in the Classical Republicanism of James Harrington', *The Historical Journal*, 24.3, pp. 683-697.
- Dellaneva, J. (2007) *Ciceronian Controversies*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

- Des Maizeaux, P. (1726) 'Some Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Mr. John Toland' in *A Collection of several Pieces of Mr. John Toland*, London, pp. iii-xcii.
- Dickinson, H. T. (1977) *Liberty and property: political ideology in eighteenth-century Britain*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- (2002) 'The British Constitution' in Dickinson, H. T., ed. *A Companion to Eighteenth-Century Britain*, Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 3-18.
- Dillon, J. M. and Long, A. A. (1988) *The question of 'Eclecticism': studies in later Greek philosophy*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Douglas, D. C. (1939) *English Scholars*, London: Jonathan Cape.
- Downie, J. A. (1979) *Robert Harley and the press: propaganda and public opinion in the age of Swift and Defoe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dunlop, J. (1827) *History of Roman Literature from its earliest period to the Augustan age*, Philadelphia: E.Littell.
- Dyck, A. R. (2002) 'Text and commentary: the example of Cicero's *Philosophica*' in Gibson, R. K. and Kraus, C. S., eds., *The classical commentary: histories, practices, theory*, Leiden: Brill, pp. 319-329.
- Dzelzainis, M. (2002) 'Anti-monarchism in English Republicanism' in van Gelderen, M. and Skinner, Q., eds., *Republicanism: A Shared European Heritage. Volume I: Republicanism and Constitutionalism in Early Modern Europe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 27-41.

- Ebert, F. A. (1837) *A General Bibliographical Dictionary*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eisenstein, E. L. (1983) *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eliot, S. and Rose, J. (2007) 'Introduction' in Eliot, S. and Rose, J., eds., *A Companion to the History of the Book*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 1-6.
- Ernesti, I. A., ed. (1773) *Io. Alb. Fabricii Bibliotheca Latina nunc melius delecta rectius digesta et aucta diligentia Io. Aug. Ernesti*, Leipzig.
- Evans, R. R. (1991) *Pantheisticon: the career of John Toland*, New York: Peter Lang.
- Feld, M. D. (1978) 'The early evolution of the authoritative text', *Harvard Library Bulletin*, 26, pp. 81-111.
- Fink, Z. S. (1945) *The Classical Republicans: An Essay in the Recovery of a Pattern of Thought in Seventeenth-Century England*, Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Fosl, P. S. (1994) 'Doubt and Divinity: Cicero's Influence on Hume's Religious Skepticism', *Hume Studies*, xx.1, pp. 103-120.
- Fott, D. (2012) 'The politico-philosophical character of Cicero's verdict in *De Natura Deorum*' in Nicgorski, W., ed. *Cicero's Practical Philosophy*, Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, pp. 152-180.
- Fox, M. (2007) *Cicero's philosophy of history*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Freedman, J. S. (1986) 'Cicero in sixteenth and seventeenth century rhetoric instruction', *Rhetorica: a journal of the History of Rhetoric*, 4.3, pp. 227-254.
- Fryde, E. (1980) 'The beginnings of Italian humanist historiography: the 'New Cicero' of Leonardo Bruni', *The English Historical Review*, 95, pp. 533-552.
- Fukuda, A. (1997) *Sovereignty and the Sword: Harrington, Hobbes, and Mixed Government in the English Civil Wars*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fussner, F. S. (1962) *The historical revolution, English historical writing and thought, 1380-1640*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Gawlick, G. (1963) 'Cicero and the Enlightenment', *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century*, 25, pp. 657-682.
- Gay, P. (1966) *The Enlightenment: an interpretation. Vol. 1, The rise of modern paganism*, London: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Gentili, B. and Cerri, G. (1988) *History and biography in ancient thought*, Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben.
- Gilbert, F. (1965) *Machiavelli and Guicciardini: politics and history in sixteenth-century Florence*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Giuntini, C. (1979) *Panteismo e ideologia repubblicana: John Toland (1670-1722)*, Bologna: Il mulino.
- (1999) 'The classical roots of Toland's thought', *I castelli di yale: quaderni di filosofia*, 4, pp. 19-38.

- Glucker, J. (1988) 'Cicero's philosophical affiliations' in Dillon, J. M. and Long, A. A., eds., *The question of 'Eclecticism': studies in later Greek philosophy*, Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 34-69.
- Goar, R. J. (1972) *Cicero and the state religion*, Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert.
- Goldgar, A. (1995) *Impolite Learning: conduct and community in the Republic of Letters, 1680-1750*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Goldie, M. (1980) 'The roots of true Whiggism, 1688-1694', *History of Political Thought*, 1, pp. 195-236.
- (1987) 'The civil religion of James Harrington' in Pagden, A., ed. *The languages of political theory in early-modern Europe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 197-222.
- (1993) 'Priestcraft and the Birth of Whiggism' in Phillipson, N. and Skinner, Q., eds. *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 209-231.
- Goldsmith, M. M. (1994) 'Liberty, Virtue, and the Rule of Law, 1689-1770' in Wootton, D., ed. *Republicanism, liberty, and commercial society, 1649-1776*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp. 197-232.
- Görler, W. (1995) 'Silencing the Troublemaker: *De Legibus* I.39 and the Continuity of Cicero's Scepticism' in Powell, J. G. F., ed. *Cicero the philosopher: twelve papers*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 85-113.

- Grafton, A. (1975) 'Joseph Scaliger's edition of Catullus (1577) and the traditions of textual criticism in the Renaissance', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 38, pp. 155-181.
- (1983) *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship. I. Textual Criticism and Exegesis*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (1985) 'Renaissance readers and ancient texts: comments on some commentaries', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 38.4, pp. 615-649.
- (1990a) *Forgers and Critics: creativity and duplicity in Western scholarship*, London: Collins and Brown.
- (1990b) 'Petronius and Neo-Latin Satire: the Reception of the *Cena Trimalchionis*', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 53, pp. 237-249.
- (1991a) *Defenders of the text: the traditions of scholarship in an age of science, 1450-1800*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- (1991b) 'Humanism and Political Theory' in Burns, J. H. and Goldie, M., eds. *The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1450-1700*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 9-29.
- (1996) 'The new science and the traditions of humanism' in Kraye, J., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 203-223.
- (1997a) *Commerce with the Classics: Ancient Books and Renaissance Readers*, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

(1997b) *The Footnote: a curious history*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

(1999) *Cardano's Cosmos: The Worlds and Works of a Renaissance Astrologer*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

(2001) *Bring Out Your Dead: the past as revelation*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

(2007) *What was history? The art of history in early modern Europe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grafton, A. and Blair, A. (1992) 'Reassessing Humanism and Science', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 53.4, pp. 535-540.

Gray, H. H. (1963) 'Renaissance humanism: the pursuit of eloquence', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 24.4, pp. 497-514.

Greenblatt, S. (2005) *Renaissance self-fashioning: from More to Shakespeare*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Greetham, D. C. (1992) *Textual Scholarship: an Introduction*, New York: Garland.

Gregory, J. (1993) 'The eighteenth-century Reformation: the pastoral task of Anglican clergy after 1689' in Walsh, J., Haydon, C. and Taylor, S., eds., *The Church of England c.1689 - c.1833*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 67-85.

Griffin, D. (2010) *Swift and Pope: satirists in dialogue*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Griffiths, G. (1987) 'The new history' in Griffiths, G., Hankins, J. and Thompson, D., eds., *The humanism of Leonardo Bruni: selected texts*, Binghampton, NY: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies in conjunction with the Renaissance Society of America, pp. 175-196.
- Gudeman, A. (1894) 'Literary frauds among the Romans', *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 25, pp. 140-164.
- Hall, B. (1963) 'Biblical scholarship: editions and commentaries' in Greenslade, S. L., ed. *Cambridge History of the Bible III: The West from the Reformation to the present day*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 38-93.
- Halm, C. (1964) *Rhetores Latini Minores: ex codicibus maximam partem primum adhibititis emendabat Carolus Halm. Lipsiae, in aedibus B.G. Teubneri, 1863*, Frankfurt am Main: Minerva.
- Hamilton, A. (1996) 'Humanists and the Bible' in Kraye, J., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 100-117.
- Hankins, J. (1995) 'The 'Baron Thesis' after Forty Years and Some Recent Studies of Leonardo Bruni', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 56.2, pp. 309-338.
- Häring, N. M. (1982) 'Commentaries and Hermeneutics' in Benson, R. L. and Constable, G., eds., *Renaissance and renewal in the twelfth century*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 173-200.
- Harmsen, T. (2000) *Antiquarianism in the Augustan Age: Thomas Hearne 1678-1735*, Oxford: Peter Lang.

- Harrison, P. (1990) *'Religion' and the religions in the English Enlightenment*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haugen, K. L. (2011) *Richard Bentley: Poetry and Enlightenment*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Hayton, D. (1984) 'The 'Country' Interest and the Party System, 1689 - c.1720' in Jones, C., ed. *Party and Management in Parliament, 1660-1784*, Leicester: Leicester University Press, pp. 37-86.
- Hazard, P. (1953) *The European Mind 1680-1715*, London: Hollis and Carter.
- Heinemann, F. H. (1943) 'Prolegomena to a Toland bibliography', *Notes and Queries*, 185, pp. 182-186.
- (1944) 'John Toland and the Age of Enlightenment', *The Review of English Studies*, 20, pp. 125-146.
- Henderson, N. (1964) *Prince Eugen of Savoy: a biography*, London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Herrick, J. A. (1997) *The radical rhetoric of the English Deists: the discourse of Skepticism, 1680-1750*, Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
- Hill, B. (2002) 'Parliament, parties and elections (1688-1760)' in Dickinson, H. T., ed. *A Companion to Eighteenth-Century Britain*, Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 55-68.
- Holmes, G. (1967) *British Politics in the Age of Anne*, London: Macmillan.
- (1973) *The Trial of Doctor Sacheverell*, London: Eyre Methuen.

- Hoppit, J. (2000) *A Land of Liberty? England 1689-1727*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Housman, A. E. (2009) 'The application of thought to textual criticism' in Kelemen, E., ed. *Textual editing and criticism: an introduction*, New York: W. W. Norton, pp. 123-134.
- Hudson, W. (2009) *The English Deists: studies in early Enlightenment*, London: Pickering & Chatto.
- Hunt, T. J. (1998) *A textual history of Cicero's Academici Libri*, Leiden: Brill.
- Hunter, M. (1981) *Science and Society in Restoration England*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ianziti, G. (1998) 'Bruni on Writing History', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 51.2, pp. 367-391.
- (1999) 'The Plutarchan Option: Leonardo Bruni's Early Career in History, 1405-1414', *I Tatti Studies: Essays in the Renaissance*, 8, pp. 11-35.
- (2000) 'A Life in Politics: Leonardo Bruni's "Cicero"', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 61.1, pp. 39-58.
- (2002) 'Leonardo Bruni and biography: the "Vita Aristotelis"', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 55.3, pp. 805-832.
- Iiffe, R. (1995) 'Author Mongering: the 'editor' between producer and consumer' in Bermingham, A. and Brewer, J., eds., *The consumption of culture 1600-1800: image, object, text*, London: Routledge, pp. 166-192.

- (2006) 'Friendly criticism: Richard Simon, John Locke, Isaac Newton and the *Johannine comma*' in Hessayon, A. and Keene, N., eds., *Scripture and scholarship in early modern England*, Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 137-157.
- Iofrida, M. (1983) *Lo filosofia di John Toland: spinozismo, scienza e religione nella cultura europea fra '600 e '700*, Milano: F. Angeli.
- Israel, J. I. (2001) *Radical enlightenment: philosophy and the making of modernity, 1650-1750*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jackson Barlow, J. (1987) 'The Education of Statesmen in Cicero's 'De Republica'', *Polity*, 19.3, pp. 353-374.
- (2012) 'Cicero on property and the state' in Nicgorski, W., ed. *Cicero's Practical Philosophy*, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, pp. 212-241.
- Jacob, M. C. (1969) 'John Toland and the Newtonian Ideology', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, xxxii, pp. 307-331.
- (1976) *The Newtonians and the English Revolution, 1689-1720*, Hassocks: Harvester Press.
- (1981) *The Radical Enlightenment: Pantheists, Freemasons and Republicans*, London: George Allen & Unwin.
- (2006) 'The Enlightenment critique of Christianity' in Brown, S. J. a. Tackett, T., eds., *Cambridge History of Christianity VII: Enlightenment, reawakening, and revolution, 1660-1815*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 265-282.

- Jeanneret, M. (1999) 'Renaissance Exegesis' in Norton, G. P., ed. *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism III: The Renaissance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 36-43.
- Johns, A. (1998) *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Jones, R. F. (1936) *Ancients and moderns: a study of the background of the battle of the books*, St. Louis: Washington University Press.
- Kaster, R. A., ed. (2006) *Cicero: speech on behalf of Publius Sestius*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Kearney, R. (1997) 'John Toland: an Irish philosopher?' in McGuinness, P., Harrison, A. and Kearney, R., eds., *John Toland's Christianity not Mysterious: text, associated works, and critical essays*, Dublin: The Lilliput Press, pp. 207-220.
- Keene, N. (2004) *Critici Sacri: biblical criticism in England c.1650-1710*, unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of London.
- (2006) 'A two-edged sword': biblical criticism and the New Testament canon in early modern England' in Hessayon, A. and Keene, N., eds., *Scripture and scholarship in early modern England*, Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 94-115.
- Kelemen, E. (2009) *Textual editing and criticism: an introduction*, New York: W. Norton and Company.

- Kempshall, M. S. (2001) 'De Re Publica I.39 in Medieval and Renaissance Political Thought' in Powell, J. G. F. and North, J. A., eds., *Cicero's Republic*, London: Institute of Classical Studies, pp. 99-135.
- Kenney, E. J. (1974) *The Classical Text: aspects of editing in the age of the printed book*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kenyon, J. P. (1977) *Revolution principles: the politics of party 1689-1720*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kewes, P. (2005) 'History and its uses: introduction', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 68.1-2, pp. 1-31.
- Klein, L. E. (1993) 'Shaftesbury, Politeness and the Politics of Religion' in Phillipson, N. and Skinner, Q., eds., *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 283-301.
- Knights, M. (2011) *The devil in disguise: deception, delusion, and fanaticism in the early English Enlightenment*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Konstan, D. and Muecke, F. (1992-1993) 'Richard Bentley as a reader of Horace', *The Classical Journal*, 88.2, pp. 179-186.
- Kraus, C. S. (2002) 'Introduction: reading commentaries/commentaries as reading' in Gibson, R. K. and Kraus, C. S., eds., *The classical commentary: histories, practices, theory*, Leiden: Brill, pp. 1-27.
- (2007) 'Historiography and biography' in Harrison, S., ed. *A companion to Latin literature*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 241-256.

- Krostenko, B. A. (2000) 'Beyond (Dis)belief: Rhetorical Form and Religious Symbol in Cicero's *de Divinatione*', *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 130, pp. 353-391.
- Lamberton, R. (2001) *Plutarch*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Levine, J. M. (1991) *The battle of the books: history and literature in the Augustan Age*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- (1995) 'Deists and Anglicans: the ancient wisdom and the idea of progress' in Lund, R. D., ed. *The Margins of Orthodoxy: heterodox writing and cultural response, 1660-1750*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 219-239.
- (1997) 'Erasmus and the problem of the Johannine Comma', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 58.4, pp. 573-596.
- (1999) *The autonomy of history: truth and method from Erasmus to Gibbon*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Levine, M. P. (1994) *Pantheism: a non-theistic concept of deity*, London: Routledge.
- Lévy, C. (1992) *Cicero Academicus: Recherches sur les Académiques et sur la philosophie ciceronienne*, Rome: Ecole Française de Rome.
- Ligota, C. R. and Quantin, J.-L. (2006) *History of Scholarship: A Selection of Papers from the Seminar on the History of Scholarship Held Annually at the Warburg Institute*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lindenbaum, P. (1997) 'Rematerializing Milton', *Publishing History*, 41, pp. 5-22.

- Lintott, A. (1997) 'Cassius Dio and the history of the late Roman Republic', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*, 34.3, pp. 2497-2523.
- (1999) *The Constitution of the Roman Republic*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2008) *Cicero as evidence: a historian's companion*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lloyd, H. A. (1991) 'Constitutionalism' in Burns, J. H. and Goldie, M., eds., *The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1450-1700*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 254-297.
- Long, A. A. (1974) *Hellenistic philosophy: Stoics, Epicureans, Sceptics*, London: Duckworth.
- Love, H. (1993) *Scribal publication in seventeenth-century England*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Lowry, M. (1979) *The world of Aldus Manutius: business and scholarship in Renaissance Venice*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Lund, R. D. (1995) *The Margins of Orthodoxy: Heterodox Writing and Cultural Response 1660-1750*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mack, P. (2011) *A history of Renaissance rhetoric 1380-1620*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mandrou, R. (1979) *From humanism to science, 1480 – 1700*, trans. Pearce, B., Atlantic Highlands, N. J.: Humanities Press, 1979.

- Marshall, B. A. (1985) *A historical commentary on Asconius*, Columbia: University of Missouri Press.
- Martin, D. B. (2004) *Inventing superstition: from the Hippocratics to the Christians*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- May, J. M. (1988) *Trials of character: the eloquence of Ciceronian ethos*, Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press.
- May, J. M. and Wisse, J. eds. (2001) *Cicero: On the Ideal Orator*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mayer, R. (2010) 'Why discuss commentaries?', *MA Colloquium*, University of London.
- Mayer, T. F. and Woolf, D. R. (1995) *The rhetorics of life-writing in early modern Europe: forms of biography from Cassandra Fedele to Louis XIV*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Mayor, J. B., ed. (1885) *M. Tullii Ciceronis De natura deorum libri tres*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McGuinness, P. (1997) 'Christianity not Mysterious and the Enlightenment' in McGuinness, P., Harrison, A. and Kearney, R., eds., *John Toland's Christianity not Mysterious: text, associated works, and critical essays*, Dublin: The Lilliput Press, pp. 231-242.
- McInnes, A. (1970) *Robert Harley, Puritan Politician*, London: Victor Gollancz.
- McKay, D. (1977) *Prince Eugene of Savoy*, London: Thames and Hudson.

- McLaverly, J. (1984) 'The concept of authorial intention in textual criticism', *The Library*, VI.12, pp. 121-138.
- Metzger, B. M. and Ehrman, B. D. (2005) *The text of the New Testament: its transmission, corruption and restoration*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Millar, F. (1964) *A study of Cassius Dio*, Oxford: Clarendon.
- (2002) *The Roman Republic in political thought*, London: University Press of New England for Brandeis University Press and Historical Society of Israel.
- Miller, E. A. (1946) 'Some Arguments used by English Pamphleteers, 1697-1700, Concerning a Standing Army', *The Journal of Modern History*, 18.4, pp. 306-313.
- Miller, W. E. (1963) 'Double translation in English humanistic education', *Studies in the Renaissance*, 10, pp. 163-174.
- Moles, J. L. ed. (1988) *Plutarch: The Life of Cicero*, Warminster: Aris & Phillips.
- Momigliano, A. (1966) *Studies in Historiography*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- (1971) *The development of Greek biography*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- (1984) 'The Theological Efforts of the Roman Upper Classes in the First Century B.C.', *Classical Philology*, 79.3, pp. 199-211.

- Morstein-Marx, R. (2004) *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moss, A. (1982) *Ovid in Renaissance France: a survey of the Latin editions of Ovid and commentaries printed in France before 1600*, London: The Warburg Institute, University of London.
- (1999) 'Horace in the sixteenth century: commentators into critics' in Norton, G. P., ed. *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism III: The Renaissance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 66-76.
- Most, G. W. (2005) 'Classical Scholarship and Literary Criticism' in Nisbet, H. B. and Rawson, C., eds., *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism IV: The Eighteenth Century*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 742-757.
- Mulsow, M. (1996) 'Freethinking in early-eighteenth-century Protestant Germany: Peter Friedrich Arpe and the *Traité des trois imposteurs*' in Berti, S., Charles-Daubert, F. and Popkin, R. H., eds., *Heterodoxy, Spinozism, and Free Thought in Early-Eighteenth-Century Europe: studies on the Traité des Trois Imposteurs*, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 193-239.
- Murphy, J. J. (1992) *Peter Ramus' attack on Cicero: text and translation of Ramus' Brutinae Quaestiones*, Davis, Calif.: Hermagoras Press.
- Murrin, M. (1980) *The allegorical epic: essays in its rise and decline*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Nadel, G. H. (1964) 'Philosophy of History before Historicism', *History and Theory*, 3.3, pp. 291-315.

- Nelson, W. (1952) 'The teaching of English in Tudor grammar schools', *Studies in Philology*, 49.2, pp. 119-143.
- Norbrook, D. (1999) *Writing the English Republic: poetry, rhetoric, and politics, 1627-1660*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Novokhatko, A. A. ed. (2009) *The invectives of Sallust and Cicero: critical edition with introduction, translation, and commentary*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- O'Gorman, G. ed. (1990) *Cicero: Three books of duties, to Marcus his sonne*, trans. N. Grimalde, Washington: Folger.
- Ong, W. J. (1988) *Orality and literacy: the technologizing of the word*, London: Routledge.
- Orellius, I. C. and Baiterus, I. G., eds. (1836) *Onomasticon Tullianum, Part 1: continens Tullii Ciceronis vitam historiam litterariam*, Zurich.
- Osmond, P. J. and Ulery, R. W. (1995) 'Constantius Felicius Durantinus and the Renaissance origins of anti-Sallustian criticism', *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*, 1.3, pp. 29-56.
- Pade, M. (2007) *The reception of Plutarch's Lives in fifteenth century Italy*, Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, University of Copenhagen.
- Pagden, A. (1987) 'Introduction' in Pagden, A., ed. *The languages of political theory in early-modern Europe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-17.
- Parke, C. N. (2002) *Biography: writing lives*, London: Routledge Chapman & Hall.

- Paterson, J. (2004) 'Self-reference in Cicero's forensic speeches' in Powell, J. G. F. and Paterson, J., eds., *Cicero the Advocate*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 79-96.
- Patey, D. L. (2005) 'Ancients and Moderns' in Nisbet, H. B. and Rawson, C., eds., *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism IV: The Eighteenth Century*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 32-71.
- Pease, A. S., ed. (1955-1958) *Cicero: De Natura Deorum*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- (1963) *Cicero: De Divinatione*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Peltonen, M. (1995) *Classical Humanism and Republicanism in English Political Thought, 1570-1640*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pfeiffer, R. (1976) *History of Classical Scholarship: from 1300 to 1850*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Phillipson, N. (1993) 'Politeness and Politics in the Reigns of Anne and the Early Hanoverians' in Pocock, J. G. A., ed. *The Varieties of British Political Thought, 1500-1800*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 211-245.
- Pocock, J. G. A. (1965) 'Machiavelli, Harrington and English Political Ideologies in the eighteenth century', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 22.4, pp. 549-583.
- (1975) *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine political thought and the Atlantic republican tradition*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

(1980) 'Post-Puritan England and the Problem of the Enlightenment' in Zagorin, P., ed. *Culture and Politics: From Puritanism to the Enlightenment*, Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 91-111.

(1985) *Virtue, Commerce, and History: essays on political thought and history, chiefly in the eighteenth century*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

(1995) 'Within the margins: the definitions of orthodoxy' in Lund, R. D., ed. *The Margins of Heterodoxy: Heterodox Writing and Cultural Response, 1660-1750*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 33-53.

(2004) *Barbarism and Religion. Volume One. The Enlightenments of Edward Gibbon, 1737-1764*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

(2010) *Barbarism and Religion. Volume Five. Religion: The First Triumph*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pooley, R. (2006) 'Editing *The Pilgrim's Progress*: issues in presenting the early modern text' in Styler, R. and Pridmore, J., eds., *Textual variations: the impact of textual issues on literary studies*, Leicester: University of Leicester, pp. 65-76.

Popkin, R. H. (2003) *The history of scepticism: from Savonarola to Bayle*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Popkin, R. H. and Goldie, M. (2006) 'Scepticism, priestcraft, and toleration' in Goldie, M. and Wokler, R., eds., *The Cambridge History of Eighteenth-*

Century Political Thought, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 79-109.

Powell, J. G. F. (1994) 'The *Rector Rei Publicae* of Cicero's *De Republica*', *Scripta Classica Israelica*, pp. 19-29.

(1995) 'Introduction: Cicero's Philosophical Works and their Background' in Powell, J. G. F., ed. *Cicero the Philosopher: Twelve Papers*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 1-36.

(2012) 'Cicero's *De Re Publica* and the Virtues of the Statesman' in Nicgorski, W., ed. *Cicero's Practical Philosophy*, Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, pp. 14-42.

Powell, J. G. F. and North, J. A. (2001) *Cicero's Republic*, London: Institute of Classical Studies.

Preston, J. H. (1977) 'Was there an Historical Revolution?', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 38.2, pp. 353-364.

Preus, J. S. (2001) *Spinoza and the irrelevance of biblical authority*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Raab, F. (1964) *The English Face of Machiavelli: a Changing Interpretation 1500-1700*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Rawson, E. (1975) *Cicero: a portrait*, London: Allen Lane.

(1985) *Intellectual life in the late Roman Republic*, London: Duckworth.

- Reedy, G. (1977) 'Socinians, John Toland, and the Anglican Rationalists', *The Harvard Theological Review*, 70, pp. 285-304.
- Reeve, M. D. (1996) 'Classical scholarship' in Kraye, J., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 20-46.
- Reynolds, L. D. (1983) *Texts and transmission: a survey of the Latin classics*, Oxford: Clarendon.
- Reynolds, L. D. and Wilson, N. G. (1991) *Scribes and Scholars: a guide to the transmission of Greek and Latin literature*, Oxford: Clarendon.
- Robbins, C. (1968) *The Eighteenth-century Commonwealthman: studies in the transmission, development and circumstance of English Liberal thought from the restoration of Charles II until the war with the thirteen colonies*, New York: Atheneum.
- Robinson, A. (1994) 'Cicero's reference to his banishment', *The Classical World*, 87.6, pp. 475-480.
- Rubini, D. A. (1978) 'Party and the Augustan constitution, 1694-1716: politics and the power of the executive', *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 10.3, pp. 193-208.
- Russell, D. A. (1995) 'On reading Plutarch's *Lives*' in Scardigli, B., ed. *Essays on Plutarch's Lives*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 75-94.
- Sabetti, A. (1976) *John Toland: un irregolare della societa e della cultura inglese tra seicento e settecento*, Napoli: Liguori.

- Sabine, G. H. and Smith, S. B., eds. (1929) *Marcus Tullius Cicero: On the Commonwealth*, New York: The Liberal Arts Press.
- Sandys, J. E. (1908) *A history of classical scholarship, vol. 2: from the revival of learning to the end of the eighteenth century*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmitt, C. B. (1972) *Cicero Scepticus: a study of the influence of the *Academica* in the Renaissance*, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Schofield, M. (1986) 'Cicero for and against Divination', *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 76, pp. 47-65.
- (1995) 'Cicero's definition of *res publica*' in Powell, J. G. F., ed. *Cicero the philosopher: twelve papers*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 63-83.
- Schwoerer, L. G. (1974) *No standing armies!: the antiarmy ideology in seventeenth-century England*, Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- (1993) 'The right to resist: Whig resistance theory, 1688 to 1694' in Phillipson, N. and Skinner, Q., eds., *Political discourse in early modern Britain*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 232-252.
- Scodel, J. (1999) 'Seventeenth-century English literary criticism: classical values, English texts and contexts' in Norton, G. P., ed. *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism III: The Renaissance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 543-554.

- Scott, J. (1992) 'The English Republican Imagination' in Morrill, J., ed. *Revolution and Restoration: England in the 1650s*, London: Collins and Brown, pp. 35-54.
- (2004a) *Commonwealth principles: republican writing of the English revolution*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (2004b) 'What were Commonwealth Principles?', *The Historical Journal*, 47.3, pp. 591-613.
- Seigel, J. E. (1966) 'Civic Humanism' or Ciceronian Rhetoric? The culture of Petrarch and Bruni', *Past and Present*, 34, pp. 3-48.
- Seznec, J. (1981) *The survival of the pagan gods: the mythological tradition and its place in Renaissance humanism and art*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Shapin, S. (1994) *A social history of truth: civility and science in seventeenth-century England*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Sharpe, K. (2003) 'Reading Revelations: prophecy, hermeneutics and politics in early modern Britain' in Sharpe, K. and Zwicker, S. N., eds., *Reading, society and politics in early modern England*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 122-163.
- Sharpe, K. and Zwicker, S. N. (2003) 'Introduction: discovering the Renaissance reader' in Sharpe, K. and Zwicker, S. N., eds., *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-37.

(2008) *Writing lives: biography and textuality, identity and representation in early modern England*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Skinner, Q. (1972) 'Motives, Intentions and the Interpretation of Texts', *New Literary History*, 3.2, pp. 393-408.

(1978) *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought: Vol. 1, The Renaissance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

(1987) 'Sir Thomas More's *Utopia* and the language of Renaissance humanism' in Pagden, A., ed. *The languages of political theory in early-modern Europe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 123-157.

(1990) 'Machiavelli's *Discorsi* and the pre-humanist origins of republican ideas' in Bock, G., Skinner, Q. and Viroli, M., eds., *Machiavelli and Republicanism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 121-141.

(1996) *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

(1998) *Liberty before Liberalism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

(2002) *Visions of Politics. Volume 2: Renaissance Virtues*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

(2008) *Hobbes and Republican Liberty*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, N. (1996) 'The English Revolution and the End of Rhetoric: John Toland's Clito (1700) and the Republican Daemon' in Flint, K., ed. *Poetry and Politics*, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, pp. 1-18.

- Snobelen, S. D. (2006) 'To us there is but one God, the Father': Antitrinitarian textual criticism seventeenth and early eighteenth century England' in Hessayon, A. and Keene, N., eds., *Scripture and scholarship in early modern England*, Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 116-132.
- Solodow, J. B. (1978) *The Latin Participle 'Quidem'*, Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press.
- Spadafora, D. (1990) *The idea of progress in eighteenth-century Britain*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Speck, W. A. (1998) *Literature and Society in Eighteenth-Century England 1680-1820: Ideology, Politics and Culture*, Edinburgh: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.
- (2004) 'Harley, Robert, first earl of Oxford and Mortimer (1661-1724)' in *Oxford dictionary of national biography*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Spurr, J. (1988) "'Rational Religion" in Restoration England', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 49.4, pp. 563-585.
- Squires, S. ed. (1990) *Asconius: Commentaries on five speeches of Cicero*, Bristol: Bristol Classical Press.
- Starkman, M. K. (1950) *Swift's satire on learning in A Tale of a Tub*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Steel, C. (2005) *Reading Cicero*, London: Duckworth.
- Stephen, L. (1876) *History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century*, London: Smith, Elder, & co.

- Styler, R. and Pridmore, J. (2006) *Textual Variations: the Impact of Textual Issues on Literary Studies*, Leicester: University of Leicester Press.
- Sullivan, F. A. (1941) 'Cicero and *Gloria*', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 72, pp. 382-391.
- Sullivan, R. E. (1982) *John Toland and the Deist controversy: a study in adaptations*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Takada, Y. (2007) *Transcendental descent: essays in literature and philosophy*, Tokyo: UTCP.
- Tanselle, G. T. (1983) 'Classical, biblical, and medieval textual criticism and modern editing', *Studies in Bibliography*, 36, pp. 21-68.
- (1989) *A rationale of textual criticism*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Tarantino, G. (2007) *Lo scrittoio di Anthony Collins (1676-1729). I libri e i tempi di un libero pensatore*, Milan: FrancoAngeli.
- Thomas, K. (1971) *Religion and the decline of magic: studies in popular beliefs in sixteenth and seventeenth century England*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- (1983) *The perception of the past in early modern England: the Creighton Trust lecture in 1983, delivered before the University of London on Monday 21 November 1983*, London: University of London.
- Thorsrud, H. (2009) *Ancient Scepticism*, Stocksfield: Acumen.

- (2012) 'Radical and Mitigated Skepticism in Cicero's *Academica*' in Nicgorski, W., ed. *Cicero's Practical Philosophy*, Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, pp. 133-151.
- Timpanaro, S. (2005) *The genesis of Lachmann's method*, trans. G. W. Most, Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Tinkler, J. F. (1988) 'The splitting of humanism: Bentley, Swift, and the English Battle of the Books', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 49.3, pp. 453-472.
- Trevor-Roper, H. (1976) *The Crisis of the Seventeenth Century: Religion, the Reformation, and Social Change*, Indianapolis: Liberty Fund.
- (2010) *History and the Enlightenment*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Tuck, R. (1993a) *Philosophy and Government 1572-1651*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (1993b) 'The Civil Religion of Thomas Hobbes' in Phillipson, N. and Skinner, Q., eds., *Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 120-138.
- Tully, J. (1991) 'Locke' in Burns, J. H. and Goldie, M., eds., *The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1450-1700*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 616-652.
- Venturi, F. (1971) *Utopia and reform in the Enlightenment*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Viroli, M. (1990) 'Machiavelli and the republican idea of politics' in Bock, G., Skinner, Q. and Viroli, M., eds., *Machiavelli and Republicanism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 143-171.
- von Fritz, K. (1975) *The theory of the mixed constitution in antiquity*, New York: Arno Press.
- von Maltzahn, N. (1995) 'The Whig Milton, 1667-1700' in Armitage, D., Himy, A. and Skinner, Q., ed. *Milton and Republicanism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 229-253.
- von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. (1982) *History of Classical Scholarship*, ed. H. Lloyd-Jones, London: Duckworth.
- (1995) 'Plutarch as Biographer' in Scardigli, B., ed. *Essays on Plutarch's Lives*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 47-74.
- Walsh, M. (2009) 'Scholarly Editing: Patristics, Classical Literature and Shakespeare' in Suarez, M. F. and Turner, M., eds., *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain IV: 1695-1830*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 684-698.
- Webb, R. K. (1992) 'From toleration to religious liberty' in Jones, J. R., ed. *Liberty Secured? Britain before and after 1688*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp. 158-198.
- West, M. L. (1973) *Textual criticism and editorial technique applicable to Greek and Latin texts*, Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner.

- Wigelsworth, J. R. (2009) *Deism in Enlightenment England: Theology, politics, and Newtonian public science*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Wilkinson, L. P. (1982) 'Cicero and the relationship of oratory to literature' in Kenney, E. J. and Clausen, W. V., eds., *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature II: Latin Literature*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 56-93.
- Willis, J. (1972) *Latin Textual Criticism*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Wirszubski, C. (1968) *Libertas as a political idea at Rome during the Late Republic and Early Principate*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Witschi-Bernz, A. (1972) 'Main trends in historical-method literature: sixteenth to eighteenth centuries', *History and Theory*, 12, pp. 51-90.
- Wood, N. (1983) 'The Economic Dimension of Cicero's Political Thought: Property and the State', *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 16.4, pp. 739-756.
- Woolf, D. R. (1990) *The idea of history in early Stuart England: erudition, ideology, and 'the light of truth' from the accession of James I to the civil war*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Wootton, D. (1994) *Republicanism, liberty, and commercial society, 1649-1776*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Worden, B. (1991) 'English Republicanism' in Burns, J. H. and Goldie, M., ed. *The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450-1700*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 443-475.

(1994) 'Republicanism and the Restoration, 1660-1683' in Wootton, D., ed. *Republicanism, liberty, and commercial society, 1649-1776*, California: Stanford University Press, pp. 139-193.

(2001) *Roundhead reputations: the English Civil Wars and the persuasions of posterity*, London: Allen Lane.

(2002a) 'Republicanism, Regicide and Republic: the English Experience' in van Gelderen, M. a. S., Q., ed. *Republicanism: a Shared European Heritage. Volume I: Republicanism and Constitutionalism in Early Modern Europe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 307-328.

(2002b) 'Whig history and puritan politics: the *Memoirs* of Edmund Ludlow revisited', *Historical Research*, 75, pp. 209-237.

Young, B. (1998) *Religion and Enlightenment in Eighteenth-Century England: Theological Debate from Locke to Burke*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

(2012) 'Conyers Middleton: the historical consequences of heterodoxy' in Mortimer, S. and Robertson, J., eds., *The intellectual consequences of religious heterodoxy, c. 1600-1750*, Leiden: Brill, pp. 235-265.

Zetzel, J. E. G. ed. (1999) *Cicero: On the Commonwealth and On the Laws*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zieli ski, T. (1929) *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte*, Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.

Zwicker, S. N. (2008) 'Considering the ancients: Dryden and the uses of biography' in Sharpe, K. and Zwicker, S. N., eds., *Writing lives: biography and*

textuality, identity and representation in early modern England, Oxford:
Oxford University Press, pp. 105-126.

APPENDIX

TRANSLATION OF *CICERO ILLUSTRATUS*

This is a translation from the Latin original in the 1712 edition of *Cicero Illustratus*.
The original notes are maintained, and supplemented with modernised references to the relevant passages of Cicero and other ancient authors where necessary.

***CICERO ILLUSTRATUS, A PHILOLOGICAL-
CRITICAL DISSERTATION:***

OR, a plan for an edition of the whole of Cicero, with an altogether
different method than has ever been done before.

*He lives and will continue to live in the memory of the ages, and so long as this
universe shall endure – this universe which, whether created by chance, or by divine
providence, or by whatever cause, he, almost alone of all Romans, saw with the eye
of his mind, grasped with his intellect, illumined with his eloquence – so long shall it
be accompanied throughout the ages by the fame of Cicero.*

Vel. Paterc. lib. 2. cap. 66*

Written by JOHN TOLAND

LONDON: JOHN HUMFREYS in St Bartholomew's Street. 1712.

* Velleius Paterculus II.5 (trans. Shipley).

Chapter I:

To a man made famous
by his birth, character, and learning,
by his feats of arms,
D.D. Georg Wilhelm
The Baron of Hohendorf,
Colonel of the cavalry in the service of His Imperial Majesty
And Deputy-General and Adjutant,
To that Most Serene of Leaders
And Greatest of Commanders
EUGENE OF SAVOY,
JOHN TOLAND
sends many greetings.

A certain man, learned to the point of wonderment, often heard me saying "AS PLATO WAS FOR CICERO, SO CICERO WILL ALWAYS BE FOR ME" and when he had more than once read that sentiment in my writings (though no comparison was intended), he encouraged me earnestly [3] and continually to take it in hand to prepare a new edition of this incomparable Orator, the best of Citizens, the most wise of Magistrates, and an excellent Philosopher. For no one is accustomed to notice more sharply than our friend, those things which are in any way superfluous or lacking in any edition you care to name; whether because some editors have been too careless and yawned over their work, or because some have benefitted from fewer resources and less leisure: or whether, finally (as is certainly more common)

this has resulted out of the ridiculous affectation of very many Grammarians and Commentators, out of the conceited display of learning, out of the rhetorical exaggeration of petty matters, or ó the least tolerable of all ó out of arrogance. Therefore at the suggestion of this connoisseur of pleasanter studies, and roused by my ardent inclination towards Cicero, I formed, silently in my own mind at first, not just the model but also a plan for carrying out the creation of an edition more perfect in every way than ever before. I received no little strengthening of my purpose from men who were no less conspicuous for the eminence of their judgement than for the breadth of their learning: for, I acknowledge, I have revealed to a very few, whose authority counts more for me than the approval of the multitude, what my intentions were in this matter. And as for actually going on with the plan, one man above all was inspiring me to do so, a man who is able to judge a most useful undertaking of this kind according to its merits, and what is more, to promote it generously [4].

Chapter II:

But O good God! How high I raised my spirits, and how much I was roused and incited to these studies on that day on which (most eminent Baron) I was led for the first time by you to the most serene EUGENE OF SAVOY, a name most honoured by the whole world, and particularly revered by cultivators of literature, since he himself is the light and glory of all good arts! When (as I say) I was admitted to His Highness at the Hague, and the opportunity arose to gaze upon him in person, and what is more when it was permitted to ascertain his opinion concerning this edition of Cicero itself; I could no longer doubt nor hesitate, but that I should surrender me and mine at once into the protection and power of the conqueror. Previously it had

been known to me, alike with everyone whom the rising or setting Sun looks back on, that this man has surpassed in military excellence not only the glory of the men of the present, but also the memory of antiquity, and that he has left far behind him the whole record of the commanders of all nations: since none could be compared with his magnificent deeds, *not by greatness of conflicts, nor by number of battles, nor by variety of regions, nor by the swiftness with which they were brought to a conclusion.* For what kind of war is there in which Fortune did not challenge him, but his own virtues did not make him the victor? Should I recall the Turkish or the Hungarian, the German, the Italian, the Savoyard, the Belgian, the Gallic, [5] and other wars? In which his hand and indomitable spirit were not ever darkened by oblivion. To continue to describe him faithfully with the words of Tully, *he who has done battle more often with his country's enemies than any other man has quarrelled with his own, fought more campaigns than other men have read of, discharged more offices than other men have coveted; who, in his youth, learned the lessons of warfare not from the instructions of others but from the commands he held himself, not by reverses in war but by victories, not through campaigns but through triumphs?* It was impossible that these things should not be very well known to me. But can I acknowledge that it had certainly escaped me until that day that (which I understood after very well) Eugene was no less powerful in literature than in arms? That he had a talent for writing not only in the humanities, which are delightful to him, but also in the art of history: that not only had he been occupied in Roman and Greek antiquities, but that his most preeminent skill was his learning in the universal law of war and peace, which not only books taught him, but events themselves; since he is so strong in character and experience, as much as in reliability and authority.

Sharp-sighted and at the same time the most ethical of all mortal men he touched, not with Minerva unwilling, upon Philosophy, or the contemplation of the nature and doctrine of morality, than which there is no greater or better gift from God to man. It is incredible to narrate, what advances he has made in all its branches. Thus it happens that the approach of ordinary citizens to him is so easy, that [6] there is in him such great charm, elegance and refinement of conversation; finally that no one surpasses him in prudence, judgement, constancy, bravery, greatness of spirit, innocence, honesty, or any type of praiseworthy attribute: and he is of such a kind (by Hercules), that whatever is said about him, the same can be understood about no one else in the same way; he is the one man certainly, who completes all these tasks together as effectively as if they were separate. He is so great and magnificent to the cultivators of the liberal, indeed of the ingenious, arts (whom he would always receive with a kind countenance) that the kindness and courtesy of this man have now become proverbial. His learned and intelligent appraisal of art, of poetry, and of music, is no less than his enthusiasm for them. But a love of books, which he collects from everywhere with wonderful diligence and recruitment, has exceeded virtually all his other interests. Our own people last winter decided that this enthusiasm for endowing the richest of libraries should be honoured with every kind of public praise, since, being already an object of wonder on the Danube, Po, Rhine, and Meuse, he at last showed himself to our Ocean and the Thames as a still greater and more famous spectacle. For a long time now the British have envied the Dutch his presence. And would that this envy would stop here! *Whereas this man, as formerly they heard and now see with their eyes, is so moderate, so merciful, and so humane that those are accounted the most fortunate in whose midst his stay is most*

prolonged. There is a crowd of all good men, from the most remote islands, and from that furthest of lands Thule, among his guests [7] - they filled his ears with shouts, and their own eyes with the most welcome spectacle. Everywhere the streets were full, a narrow way through remained for him. Old men, young men, married women, young women, noble men, unknowns, eagerly rejoiced to see and to venerate him face to face; with the exception of a few entirely, among whom *reason, moderation, law, tradition, duty count for nothing – likewise the judgement and views of the citizen body and respect for the opinion of those who come after us.* Therefore not only his military actions were being celebrated by the Britons, as before; but also his knowledge of human and divine matters, prepared in camp (that is remarkable) and in the midst of war: for Eugene was the only one since the ancients to connect literature and weapons, things irreconcilable at this time. But in what direction am I tending? Certainly nobody has so great an abundance of speaking or writing ó I do not say to embellish, but merely to set out, much less equal - so many gifts of the mind, so many excellent deeds; but they deserve commemoration in the literature and tongues of all the peoples. Thus finally his praises have been extended far and wide, so that the home of his glory is limited by the very ends of the world, and the eternal esteem of History will accomplish the rest. Therefore while I breathe forth my breath, Hohendorf, I will never forget your kindness to me, you who introduced the acquaintance and favour of such a hero to me; nor will any day bring an end to the thanks owed by so great a service. How happy am I! To have you not only as the fairest appraiser of my studies, but as a sharp and capable exhorter. Since I will most readily [8] rely on your name for that reason, it is fair that I should discuss carefully and in detail with you my proposal for

editing Cicero; whence you will also learn my opinion about Cicero himself, and about a certain number of Aristarchuses with too much time on their hands. For the rest I rejoice infinitely, because I understand that I myself am esteemed and taken care of by you.

Chapter III:

Although I am convinced, in the first place, that the characters of all races and times are equal, as long as the circumstances are rightly considered: yet whether out of the most different methods of public instruction or private education, or out of the necessary employments or voluntary practice of most men, it has thus rightly come to pass; that whatever progress we make in eloquence and the study of political matters for the most part, we owe in full to Greek and Latin writers. Certainly their ghosts once handed down in their books (as if speaking from their tombs) to the world, and even now they provide excellent examples of more embellished conversations, and of carefully managing the Republic, polished manners and at the same time the most virtuous customs; all illustrated and supported with countless examples. It results from this, that the most elaborate idioms of today's languages, the most tried and tested customs and laws, and in the same way the most select proverbs, have been taken from there either by ourselves or by men in the course of reading: for many [9], who never applied toil to the literature of Greeks or Romans, but either more frequently read the works of more skilled men or copied them, gained from there the same advantages of taste, of clarity, and of order; to say nothing of the more concrete knowledge of facts, or about the excellent examples that can be adapted to any eventuality.

Chapter IV:

But truly of these ancients, it is not only on one single account that MARCUS TULLIUS CICERO has always been held most excellent; but also he could have supplied in a certain sort of way the lack of all others, if those that are still extant had been lost along with the rest. Since in delivering the history and instruction of Philosophers, the theory and practice of Politics, and (which I ought to have mentioned first) the origin, progression, and perfection of Eloquence, he immeasurably excelled all prominent Romans extant as well as lost, it is most true without doubt; if we give credence above all to those, whose testimony in this case it is not possible to refuse without absurdity, given that they are, next after him, to be considered leaders in these arts. As for those Greeks, whom he at first studied carefully as much as possible, and afterwards imitated with no less success, in the end he surpassed them by a long way, and for that reason the whole race of humans [10].

Chapter V:

Nevertheless I am safely able to assert, that this same Cicero is nearly unknown to not a few in this literary world; even if no man's name, doubtless, is heard more often on the lips of all and that most deservedly. Handled so ineptly by those pretended Grammarians (for the genuine grammarians I value very highly), I say, by ignoble artisans of words, and understood even now in so many perverse ways, so that many think that he was one of themselves; then it happens that after Philephus as many as labour under this most foul error, all shy away from him just as from a

trivial school teacher and petulant pedagogue. I say the same thing about Rhetoricians, in the bad sense in which the word is now understood to mean academic declaimers. Barristers, solicitors and attorneys pursue him closely either with flattery, or fear, or duties, or deceit, so that he declares himself elected into their College: and lying witnesses are not wanting, who maintain whatever is alleged; or pettifogging lawyers, who want to ensnare him with tricky arguments. This makes it the case among the ignorant, that he is held wordy, impudent, venal, and litigious, with the same offensive imputations, by which wrangling advocates and quibblers, most undeservingly abuse the most honourable condition in life of Advocates and Patrons. There is not any official of the smallest little town, whether he be Mayor (as they say in the vernacular) or Burgomaster [11]; nor proctor, nor alderman, nor bailiff, nor curator of public street or buildings, that does not believe himself Cicero, or Cicero altogether similar to himself: so appositely have recent Critics adapted the words to the facts! All these become Consuls, Praetors, Aediles, Quaestors (and whatever else?) for them, so they turn out, so they are named.

Chapter VI:

But you (Illustrious Man) who understand so well the appearance and administration of the Roman Republic, and what place our man held in it; you know that these things are so far away from the truth, that now not any Chief in Europe, or any magistrate, is able to equate his rank and dignity with Cicero, no more than to contrive his power and authority as equal to the Roman Empire. But, because it greatly increases the brightness of his reputation, from being a new man of the equestrian order, at Rome, then mistress of the whole world, he was elected in order

Quaestor, Aedile, Praetor, Consul, Augur, Proconsul with command, and hailed as Commander by the army in Cilicia. He was most skilled in knowledge of civil matters not only of his own time, but truly of all times; which the Speeches and Letters show very clearly. The importance of his eloquence equals command of the world; and once the enemy Julius Caesar (assuming that no one hostile to him was able to be a friend to the fatherland) [12] recognised Cicero as *winner of a greater laurel wreath than that of any triumph, inasmuch as it is a greater thing to have advanced so far the frontiers of the Roman genius than the frontiers of Rome's empire:** for this latter we have common with beasts; since while that former proceeds from Reason, in which we reflect God to a certain extent. He was the complete Orator in all classes, which the ancients admit never having known for themselves, but only fashioned and feigned in the mind; of such a kind that he himself (by Hercules) doubts has ever existed. Indeed his contemporaries and all others continuously to this day, shout with one voice that Cicero alone of mortals was endowed with all the qualities of the mind. By Jupiter! How admirable is he for the abundance, choice, placing of his words! How great the dignity, efficacy, pleasantness of his speeches! How exuberant the sources of his Invention, how ready to hand the Topics consisting in points to be selected or elaborated! How exquisite and neat the order! How clear and pure his perspective! What stunning elegance, and finest highlights adorn the whole of his works! How great an artist equally in rousing and delighting! Such (as I will say with a word) an uninterrupted succession of arguments, and how great a force of persuasion by no means to be

* **Plin. Hist, Nat. lib. 7. cap. 10.** [Pliny *Natural History* VII.117; trans. Rackham].

resisted! And yet everywhere he is easy and concise, most simple, most pleasing [13], most honest. This tribute, such as it is, is far too low for the sublimity of his efforts! For he was without a doubt the best of Roman citizens, indeed most loved of the fatherland before all (in which Cato alone left him not without a rival) and finally of his time, and not excepting that marvel of knowledge Varro, most erudite in every type of learning. For he did not only brood over fully exploring Orators, Politicians, and Philosophers; but also anything Poets, Grammarians, Geographers, Historians wrote, anything that Greek or Latin literature taught, he absorbed all this deeply and embraced with his mind. Lest this detailed narration of matters should escape anyone's notice, I am not afraid: for I observe that you (HOHENDORF) are not in the least unaware in any respect whatsoever of those things which I said now, or I am going to say again, since you surpass myself so greatly in reputation and authority. The lightest suspicion of that kind of stupidity, would expose derision to myself and all around. Animated by honourable ambition alone, I desire earnestly to show you, that I have such a true opinion of our author that it is very likely that I would finish this carefully prepared proposal of a new edition, which I have set out to be submitted to your more cultivated judgement, and bring it to completion in accordance with the dignity of the subject [14].

Chapter VII:

This truly absurd way of teaching, by which the works of Cicero are thrown together into the hands of raw youngsters thoughtlessly and without selection by teachers lacking intelligence, who are also accustomed to treat them harshly with lashes, when they fail to achieve, what neither the guides of youth very often nor of the

republic understand adequately; this sordid instruction (I say) is the reason, why very many understand so wrongly about that divine man, and is responsible for the fact that they shake all over at his name, on account of lashes thus once violently received from Orbilius full of blows. Indeed his Speeches and Letters (which were filled with the most serious questions about civil matters, the excellent skills of statesmen, and with the hidden secrets of empire) are treated by some in no other way, than as Declamations, which students recite whenever practising; as Letters which idle men write out, in their Academies with no subject-matter or companion in their counsels. Therefore these and the rest of his works, are read by others for no more worthy end, than to bring forth from them an abundance of words, just as out of a catalogue; which persuaded many to think that there was nothing to find in them besides words. Thence (as it is fair to believe) it happens, that you find in the books of several men, who pretend to make a pet of Cicero [15], only resounding words, devoid completely of ideas. At no time did such people not exist, which he himself recalled in the first book of *De Oratore*: *for what (he said) can be more insane than the hollow sound of even the best and most distinguished words, if they are not based upon thought and knowledge?** Beware however, please, of believing that I want to prohibit Cicero for boys, by whom he is never not to be handled constantly, and out of whom they are able to derive whatever is worthy of a free man. From where, I ask, can they learn thoroughly the Latin language more easily, better, faster, than from the very leader of Roman eloquence? And yet I do not deny that I disapprove of the common method of teaching. Poor little boys are forced into schools, as if

* **Cap. 12.** [*De Oratore* I.51; trans. May and Wisse].

into some sort of mill; from where, the way most of the schools are set up, they bring back hatred of books, not love: and afterwards in certain Universities all but chained by learned foolery, they reject literature itself throughout the whole of life, on account of the foolish pride of learned men, and internecine hatred on account of matters of no importance. But Quintilian said, *if a student comes to love Cicero, let him assure himself that he has made progress.*

Chapter VIII:

There are none who sometimes judge Cicero more stupidly than those from whose [16] hands he should never be shaken out (following your example, if they are wise) neither by day or at night; I mean men who are noble by reason of the splendour of their birth and their political knowledge. Perhaps they are afraid lest he is some petty and affected trader of words, lest they enter into a fellowship with an unequal man or a man of lower station; but let them come to a more appropriate view, taught better as much by us as by the facts themselves. This therefore was that Cicero, who was adorned first of all men with the highest address among mortals,* by the leading man of the Senate, Quintus Catullus, and was greeted with the common applause of the rest as PATER PATRIAE^Ä; in fact he was named thus by Cato himself, a man (if ever there was one) far from any suspicion of flattery.^Æ This was also confirmed by

* **Plin. Hist. Nat. 1. 7. c. 10.** [Pliny, *Natural History* VII.10]. **Juvenal. Sat. 8.** [Juvenal, *Satire* 8 line 244].

^Ä **Orat. in L. Pisonem, c. 3, et pro P. Sextio, c.57.** [Cicero, *In Pisonem* 6-7; *Pro Sestio* 121-122].

^Æ **See Plutarch on Cicero, and again in Appian.** [See Plutarch, *Life of Cicero* 23.6; Appian, *The Civil Wars* II.7].

the votes of citizens in the free Republic, where titles of office were granted freely as rewards for excellence: it was neither bestowed on to the most negligent Emperors, as this title itself was a little later; nor in the way that it is now granted to any little Tyrant you like by them, by whom he is hated privately before all else. Lucius Gellius (as he himself said against Piso) said that a civic crown should be given to him, on account of his protection of the Republic. Cicero was the man (as I will say again), who when the hostile party had prevailed, and now he was about to become an exile from that city, which he had just recently [17] rescued with no less wisdom than he had earlier administered it, had seen the whole equestrian order putting on mourning in his honour (as was the custom then).^{*} Why should I mention the Senate? When the same was done by the whole of Italy,^Ä just as in some public calamity; and since he himself, when shabbily dressed beseeched the people, and was followed by 20,000 of the most noble intercessors, chiefly from among the noble youths, who equally changed their clothes.^Æ Supported in this way, loved so greatly, venerated by all, and held in admiration, how easily would he be able to reject the attentions of flatterers, and to conquer enemies with open force? He repeatedly replied to those, on the other hand, who were blaming in him too much slowness and timidity: that he preferred to courteously obey the laws, even if the laws were distorted in order to destroy him; than to strive seditiously, when both defeat and victory alike would be deadly for the institutions of the Republic, and for

^{*} **Orat. pro P. Sextio, c. 11.** [Cicero, *Pro Sestio* 26].

^Ä **Ibid. c. 16, 60, &c.** [Ibid 36, 128 etc].

^Æ **Ibid. c. 12. et passim in Orat. post redit. in senat.** [Ibid 27 and in *Post Reditum in Senatu*].

the lives of the citizens. *And (he himself said in a certain passage)^{*} in the face of such grave peril, and the prospect of the downfall of the state should I fail, and an endless series of struggles should I prevail, was I, who had once been the saviour of the republic, now to gain for myself the name of its destroyer? You say that I was afraid of death. But the truth is, that I could not look upon even immortality as desirable, if it was to be achieved at my country's cost [18]; far less could I choose to die, and carry my country with me to perdition. For I have always thought – call me a fool if you will – that those who have sacrificed their lives for the state have not died so much as achieved immortality.* What a remarkable example of a good citizen and of an excellent philosopher!

Chapter IX:

So that it is understood more completely to what an extent this course of action won him the goodwill of the common people, and how greatly he was valued among the best men, you just recall, that the grief of his unjust expulsion was altogether overcome by the happiness of his swift return. Ignoring the penalty for those who took him in,^Ä all received him everywhere with the greatest reverence, and in the furthest provinces attended him with unaccustomed honours. The Senate gave thanks to them, who had aided him in whatever way, as he himself remembered in *Pro Domo Sua*: so that in the same speech he goes through the most distinguished decrees about his return, not only of peasants, of people of the mountains, and of the

^{*} **Orat. pro Cn. Plancio, c. 36.** [*Pro Plancio* 89-90].

^Ä **Orat. Pro domo sua apud Pontif c.20.** Again Plutarch, on Cicero. [*De Domo Sua* 51-53].

urban guilds, but also of cities, of nations, of provinces, of kings, and finally the whole world. Not only the congratulating Envoys gathered on his return from all the cities, colonies, praefectures, and municipia of Italy (as one can see in the speeches for Sestius [19] and against Piso) but from those also who had sent them, with wives and children, with slaves also and tenants, days of festivity were being celebrated, the public highways were crammed. The Senate and People went out to meet him outside the city (such an honour as never fell to the lot of anyone) as if *Rome, torn from its foundations, had come forward to embrace her saviour*.^{*} Thus he was led most brilliantly by all good men onto the Capitol, and (as he himself said somewhere, and as the Rhetor taunts him under the name of Sallust)^Ä brought back on the shoulders of Italy: from where not without reason he was thinking that that one day was an image of immortality.^Æ

Chapter X:

Therefore so that I present Cicero in his entirety in this conspectus, in which I have so far represented him only halved and rather small, I labour afresh at a new edition of his works: and also with this in mind, so that I should be careful to render his works more beneficial and convenient to use, for those for whose benefit they were composed; that is, evidently for the Chief and Noble men, also Philosophers, Politicians, Judges, and all Magistrates whosoever. Since these men are for the most

^{*} **Orat. in Lucium Pisonem, c.22.** [*In Pisonem* 52; trans. Watts].

^Ä **At the end of post redit. in senatu. Invect. Salust. c. 4.** [*Sallustian Invective* 7].

^Æ **Orat. in L. Pison. c. 22, and elsewhere.** [*In Pisonem* 51-53].

part distracted with other employments, indeed it is very important [20], that they traverse this teacher of theirs with uninterrupted step, and not as if with footsteps kept in suspense. Without at least moderate use of literature, they will find in other matters neither anything long-lasting, nor steady. This alone will remain, and serves life in every part agreeably: *for (our Tully said) other pursuits belong not to all times, all ages, all conditions; but this gives stimulus to our youth and diversion to our old age; this adds a charm to success, and offers a haven of consolation to failure. In the home it delights, in the world it hampers not. Through the night-watches, on all our journeying, and in our hours of country ease, it is our unfailing companion.** No one ever more frequently experienced the truth of this most beautiful description than you yourself (Most learned Man). Books are always your companions, books are always to hand, outside, in the camps, on journeys, whether at sea or crossing the land. So of what sort will that most select library be, I wonder? But once and for all it is time that I exhibited to you this plan and proposal, which I intend to follow in this new edition: I am in no doubt, that you are going to be equally scrupulous, as kindly in forgiving errors, as severe in chastising them. Truly the Terms and Conditions of the work (as they say) regard themselves thus [21].

Chapter XI:

ART. 1. Not only better paper, and more charming letters than in any edition thus far, but also the best that can either be found or made for the purpose, I promise in the name of the Bookseller, who has undertaken to provide this; and I will certainly

* **Orat. pro Archia poeta, c. 7.** [*Pro Archia* 16; trans. Watts].

take care that he keeps the promises in good faith. Nor will appearance or decoration be neglected: for displaying the splendour and exquisiteness in this edition, no less than excellence of all other sorts, four figures or masks of more gentle engraving out of bronze, originating from skilful hand, are to be fitted to the four parts, into which the works of Cicero are distributed; that is to say the Rhetorical works, Speeches, Letters and Philosophy. In the same way will be inserted in the first volume illustrations of coins, gems, stones, representing Cicero in any way, portrayed to the greatest accuracy. But before anything a small bronze image of Cicero will adorn our book, out of Kemp's Cimelium represented at its actual size. But there is nothing more choice or more elegant than this Museum of John Kemp, a most admirable man; since it is full of statues, of inscriptions, coins, and every kind of rare ancient relics, with the greatest judgement employed in collecting them. Truly this feature of the edition is so easily understood, that it is by no means necessary to use many words [22].

Chapter XII:

ART. 2. That the text (as they call it) will be the most correct of any thus far, with respect both to words and to punctuation, I undertake without reluctance. This careful method of punctuation, so advantageous and so necessary, is missing in all editions; so that it seems that this itself, if nothing else was to be fulfilled, requires a new edition. How much this lack alone makes an author difficult, and diminishes the enjoyment of the reader, not only anyone's experience, but their daily complaints, make clear enough. Therefore no man will not acknowledge that to bring a suitable cure to this wound, is a matter for boundless exertion and diligence: and yet that

portion of our task has been satisfied for a long time, since I punctuated the whole of Cicero by my own hand, to be submitted to the press whenever appropriate, some years before. I want my know-how and patience in these details to be praised, not my acuity or intellect to be admired. Doubtless Valerius Probus himself has deserved badly of the literary world according to Suetonius, as he who *attended to the collection of many copies to correct and to punctuate, and to annotate, devoted to this alone, and not any other part of grammar.*^{*} But it will not be alien to our purpose to exhibit one or two examples of punctuation. This passage, out of the third book of *de Natura Deorum*,^Ä is divided thus in Gronovius' edition [23], of course the most recent edition of all. *Quòd si tales Dii sunt, ut rebus humanis intersint: Natio quoque Dea putanda est: cui, cùm fana circuimus in agro Ardeati, rem divinam facere solemus. quæ quia partus matronarum tueatur, a Nascentibus Natio nominata est. Ea si dea est; dii omnes illi qui commemorabantur a te, Honos, Fides, Mens, Concordia. Ergo etiam Spes, Moneta, omniaque quæ cogitatione nobismet ipsis possumus fingere. Quod si verisimile non est: ne illud quidem est, haec unde fluxerunt.* Truly I would prefer to punctuate thus, which I submit to the criticism of others. *Quòd si tales Dii sunt, ut rebus humanis intersint, Natio quoque Dea putanda est: cui, cùm fana circuimus in agro Ardeati, rem divinam facere solemus; quae, quia partus matronarum tueatur, a nascentibus Natio nominata est. Ea si Dea est; Dii omnes illi, qui commemorabantur a te, Honos, Fides, Mens, Concordia: ergo etiam Spes, Moneta, omniaque quae cogitatione nobismet ipsis*

* **De illust. Grammaticis.** [Suetonius, *De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus* 24.1-4; trans. Kaster].

^Ä**Cap. 18.** [*De Natura Deorum* III.47].

possumus fingere; quod si verisimile non est, ne illud quidem haec unde fluxerunt. A passage in the speech for Balbus, drawn out of the 24th chapter, is punctuated in the following way. *Sacra Cereris, Judices, summâ Majores nostri religione confici, cæremoniaque voluerunt: quæ cum essent assumpta de Græcia, et per Græcas semper curata sunt sacerdotes, et Græca omnia nominata: sed cùm illam, quæ Græcum illud sacrum monstraret, et faceret, [24] ex Græcia deligerent: tamen sacra pro civibus civem facere voluerunt, ut Deos immortales scientia peregrina, et externa; mente domestica, et civili precaretur.* I punctuate thus, and rightly, unless I am deceived. *Sacra Cereris (Judices) summâ majores nostri religione confici caeremoniaque voluerunt; quae, cum essent assumpta de Graecia, et per Graecas semper curata sunt Sacerdotes, et Graeca omnia nominata: sed cùm illam, quae Graecum illud sacrum monstraret et faceret, ex Graecia deligerent, tamen sacra pro civibus civem facere voluerunt; ut Deos immortales scientiâ peregrina et externa, mente domesticâ et civili, precaretur.* That I have not chosen these passages deliberately will be evident to whoever is inspecting the book, whenever he should want to; and the matter is hardly ever otherwise. Not only the passages and verses quoted by Cicero from other writers will be in a different font (as has already been done properly by certain men) but some things of that kind which have not thus far been noticed, and for that reason not distinguished enough from his own words, will be printed by us in the same style as the others. Sometimes so many commas (whether you prefer *Caesa* or *Incisa* as a more Latin expression) occur, that they do not divide and articulate, but interrupt and disorder. The colon, or middle distinction, is rarely distinguished from a semicolon; at any rate if editors used the former more frequently, because, in the manuscript books of the worst ages, it used

to take the place of all the other punctuation marks. Points or full stops [25] are often inserted without any consideration, and the first letter of the following sentence is not always a capital (as it ought to be): all of which has the reader wondrously confused, affects the author with the greatest injury, and disfigures the look of the page itself. However the passages which I adduced above, compared with others, are the most free of error, as will appear when the book is opened. Also let these passages be compared with whatever edition you want, which, when the opportunity arrives, I am going to quote in what follows. These divisions and clauses of the speeches are mentioned often by our Cicero, the greatest artist of writing; and he attributes a twofold reason for them, certainly a natural break in sense, and a pause for the reader. But at that time those ends of sentences were signified by breaks in writing, strokes, dots, and other types of marks; although in following generations this whole way of writing with no divisions even between words, was changed completely for the worse by hasty copyists. *It was failure or shortness of breath (Cicero said in the third book of de Oratore), that brought about pauses at sentence endings and between words. According to the old masters (thus it was said a bit before) we should employ what are nearly verses, that is, particular rhythms. For they wanted the ends of sentences in our speeches to give us opportunities for regular breathing, and not to occur only when we are tired out.* Therefore not only with punctuation; but also by the content itself, [26] parts of the speech ought to be distinguished: *our speech should often be broken up by the use of clauses that are much smaller, though these clauses themselves should still be tied together by the bond of rhythm: that the sentence (as he says in the Orator) may not drift along vaguely like a river (it should end, not because the speaker stops to breathe, or the*

copyist has placed a mark of punctuation, but because the rhythm brings it to a necessary close). And indeed they are wasting their time with the whole set of punctuation marks, if they don't punctuate their writings according to structure and sense.

Chapter XIII:

ART. 3. After the *Dedication* a *Life of Cicero* follows (about which it is not necessary in this summary to speak at length), divided up by Consulships, and composed by Franciscus Fabricius Marcoduranus. Fabricius, a man endowed with the greatest attentiveness, judgement, and honesty, surpassed published accounts of the same life from others on many criteria: and he is not so much to be blamed for those things which escaped his knowledge, as to be praised on account of all of those which he collected with the greatest skill. Among the many things which he had neglected, this account is to be added, which we gave above in the praise of Cicero; by which indeed his departure into exile is defended from the charge of being too gentle and timid. Still to offer another example, he brought no other defence against those, who accused him of levity and inconstancy; because he had doubtless [27] more than once returned into favour with those, with whom he was accustomed to disagree before. However not he himself, but his acquaintances changed their minds, nor has any wise person ever done otherwise: *that my standard was not the public interest (as he noticed best)* but rather my own personal predilections and dislikes.* You listen to him speaking further, and, if you can, you may rebuke him.

* **Orat. pro Cn. Plancio. c. 39.** [*Pro Plancio* 93; trans. Watts].

*For we should look upon political life as a wheel, and since that wheel is always turning, we should make choice of that party to which we are directed by the interest and the well-being of the state.** He illustrates this rule with an excellent comparison.^Ä *Or, supposing that I am a passenger on a ship wafted off its course before a favouring breeze, and supposing that, instead of making for the harbour which I at some time or other may have chosen, she bears for another just as safe and calm as that, shall I fight with the elements to my own hazard, or shall I not rather yield myself submissively to their leading, especially when they point the way to safety? All my knowledge, all my experience, all my reading, all the testimony that the records of literature give us concerning men of wisdom and eminence in this and in other states, goes to prove, not that men have held the same unvarying convictions till their death, but rather that they have adapted them to political circumstances, to the tendency of the times, and to considerations of public tranquillity. This is, and this will continue to be, Laterensis, [28] my principle of action, which you fail to find in me, but upon which I have never lost my hold, nor ever will, consists, not in an immovable tenacity of opinion, but in a sweet reasonableness. Many such things very necessary to Cicero's history are omitted by Fabricius in his *Annals*, nor are they of less importance in order to dispel the common prejudices about his course of life.*

* **Ibid. c. 38.** [*Pro Plancio* 93; trans. Watts].

^Ä **Ibid. c. 39.** [*Pro Plancio* 94; trans. Watts].

Chapter XIV:

ART. 4. As I come to this author as a reservist, I will add a *Critical-Historical Dissertation* to his treatment, in my own right. It will pursue many particular topics preserved, as well as omitted, by other writers, who wrote the whole life of Cicero, or at least some part. They are such as Plutarch, Leonardus Aretinus, Constantius Felix, Henricus Bullingerus, Peter Ramus, Sebastianus Corradus, and many others. Equally the debates and inquiries of the learned, whether presenting praise or criticism of Cicero, are exposed in our Dissertation with the most fidelity and at the same time the greatest brevity; together with everything which concerns his brave or fearful spirit, justice, learning, political affiliations, style, loves (forsooth) or similar things. I have already observed two omissions by Fabricius, to which I am now adding a third. You will hardly consult any person or book that does not accuse Cicero of being too enthusiastic and frequent in praise of himself. At once they recall [29] that he greatly harassed Lucius Luceius, so that he would write out a history of his Consulship (already described by him in Latin verses and Greek prose) with prose speech;^{*} that he had desired that same favour, from a certain little Greek man,^Ä evidently so that he would produce his Consulship in Greek verses: indeed they do not despair of achieving a triumph, when they reveal the criticism from his friend Marcus Brutus,^Æ because he always had the Nones of December in his mouth: clearly that time on which he had overthrown the conspiracy of Catiline. But so as

^{*}Epist. fam. i. 5. ep. 12. [Cicero, *Ad Familiares* V.12].

^ÄPro Archia, c. 11. [*Pro Archia* 28].

^ÆEpist. fam. i. i. ep. 9. ibid. ep. 16. et ep. I. I. I. ad Att. [*Ad Brutum* I.17].

not to linger on the innumerable examples with which he could defend himself, his immense desire for praise, without which nothing either good or significant has ever been undertaken, provides him with sufficient excuse; *for magnanimity* (he himself said)* *looks for no other recognition of its toils and dangers save praise and glory; once rob it of that, gentlemen, and in this brief and transitory pilgrimage of life what further incentive have we to high endeavour?* However a desire for his name to be everlasting had not alone driven him (although he nobly acknowledged that he always had this also before his eyes)^Ä, to talk so often about himself. He was under attack regarding his own affairs no less than those of the people he was defending or accusing in many other speeches like *Pro Domo Sua*, *Pro Sestio* and *In Pisonem* [30]. Besides he was always driven necessarily to rebut and to weaken the lies and false accusations of his enemies, to confirm which by more examples would be an easy task: but that which he replied to his greatest enemy Clodius, when he made this very complaint against him, is sufficient to shut up all the others. (He said)^Æ *and since you blame me for being too boastful in sounding my own praises, who, I would ask you, has ever heard me speak of myself, save under the constraint of an inevitable necessity? For if, when crimes of theft, corruption, and passion are imputed to me, I am in the habit of replying that it was by my forethought, at my risk, and through my exertions that my country was saved, it must be considered that I am not so much boasting of my own exploits, as stating facts in answer to charges. But*

* **Orat. pro Archia poeta, c 11. and elsewhere.** [*Pro Archia* 28; trans. Watts].

^Ä **Ibid. c. 6. and in numerous other places.**

^Æ **Orat. pro Domo sua ad Pontif. c. 35, 36. It was also considered at cap. 12 orationis pro L. Sulla.** [*Pro Domo Sua* 93-94, trans. Watts; cf. *Pro Sulla* 34-35].

if, until the recent hard crisis through which the state has passed, no crime has been imputed to me save one isolated act of cruelty, when I warded destruction from our country, which, I ask, was the more dignified course? – to make no reply at all to these aspersions, or to make answer to them with a bowed head? But I have always thought it to be in the interest of the state that I should maintain by every word of mine the splendour and magnificence of the noble deed I had achieved for my country's well-being of patriots and through the support of the senate, especially in view of the fact that I was the only citizen to whom it was permitted to say an oath, in the hearing of the Roman people, that it was through my efforts [31] that this city and this republic still stood. I have transcribed this whole passage, so that with one act the shallowness of this common accusation will appear, and so that the omissions which I have imputed to Fabricius, do not seem insignificant. Our Dissertation will contain many observations of this type; but indicating these passages as briefly as possible, it will be neither too wordy nor long.

Chapter XV:

ART. 5. Then the text follows closely after, corrected in the way which I have described; and separated for ease of citation into chapters, distinguished with somewhat larger numbers. But the other paragraph-divisions are removed completely, which were made without any judgement. As it happened in certain editions in use, thus in our edition the four books of *Rhetorica ad Herennium* are also presented; it will be considered whether it was composed by Cornificius, either father or son, or by Marcus Gallio, or anyone else, which will be examined in the argument to be prefaced to the previous book. It is agreed that the author, not

lacking in learning nor eloquence, lived in the time of Cicero, or not much later. But when he relates the definitions of the same things and names as he does (which is very often) the difference betrays itself so palpably, to say nothing of the contrary opinions, that I would wonder that once Saint Jerome and Priscian, [32] or later Marinellus and Kirchmaier, attributed these books to Cicero. To the undoubted works and fragments of the last named I shall add the Invective against him ascribed to Sallustius Crispus, and the Response no less ridiculously attributed to himself: for these provide a contribution of whatever sort to his History, and they leave nothing desired by any type of reader in our edition. On account of these same reasons I am going to add *Orationem ad Populum et Equites antequam iret in exilium*, and the *Declamation*, or rather the *Epistle, ad Octavium*: for since they have found a place in the manuscript codices, why they should not obtain the same prerogative in imprints, I do not see at all. Also it has seemed good to me to add the *Consolatio* to the rest, not only for the reason that it is even now believed by certain people to be genuine; but because, as the most learned and at the same time most revered Joannes Albertus Fabricius notices, it is neatly written and worth reading.* Certain other writings I am going to leave out, so clearly spurious and barbarous, are such as *Oratio pro Marco Valerio, liber de synonymis ad L. Victurium, Orpheus sive de adolescente studioso*, and *Tironis notae Tachygraphicae*. As for the *de Memoria artificiali libellus* of Cicero, mentioned by Jacobus Lectius and others, it was fabricated by I do not know who, who snatched the opportunity of deceit [33] out of the sixteenth chapter of the third book of *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, falsely attributed to Cicero (as we have said).

* **Bibliot. Latin. in Cicerone.** [Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Latina*].

The passage runs thus. *The question whether memory has some artificial quality, or comes entirely from nature, we shall have another, more favourable, opportunity to discuss. At present I shall accept as proved that in this matter art and method are of great importance, and shall treat the subject accordingly. For my part, I am satisfied that there is an art of memory – the grounds of my belief I shall explain elsewhere.* The treatise itself is nothing other than an interpolation of the rest of this work right up to the end of the third book. Truly the skill of Memory examined by Cicero, and under the character of Antonius, is possible to be read in the chapters 86, 87 and 88 of the second book of *De Oratore*. Finally I thought that to complete everything, the *Orationem Graeca de pace*, with its Latin version, from Cassius Dio should be inserted.* This Latin, which was taken for the produce of Tully himself, and is forced into the edition of the speeches *in usum Delphini* by Charles Merovillius, bristles with scandalous Gallicisms, and is not of more honest coin, than the *Petronii Fragmenta Nodotiana*. Not to examine anything more fully at present, which is pertinent to the Text, an *Index Chronologicus* will be supplied for the Letters, which are written in order, arranging them accurately, which are of no little importance for explaining the history of those times: for they who [34] do not hold the order of historical events before their eyes, are plainly blind in the matters themselves.

Chapter XVI:

ART. 6. Succinct but accurate Synopses, or Prefaces, are placed before all the books,

* **Lib. 44.** [Cassius Dio, *Roman History* XLIV.23-33].

Speeches, Dialogues and Letters; for without these everything will be found most difficult to understand, and not read through with any profit. This is the fate of dead languages. When synopses of others appeal to us, we shall be glad to use them, under the names of their own authors. When they are either too long, or too brief, and most of all when no such things exist, then we will endeavour to hammer out new ones. I myself will present all the Philosophical works and certain rhetorical works with synopses from scratch: seeing that without this, it is in no way possible to distinguish the genuine opinions of Cicero about the matters concerned; since he was not always accustomed to say what he truly thought, but what the case, time, place, and audience demanded. This he himself acknowledged openly, in the speech recalled above on behalf of Cluentius:^{*} for when it was objected by Attius, that he had defended a clearly contrary position on a previous occasion, he explicitly replied thus. *My speech was the outcome rather of the exigencies of the moment, than of my deliberate judgement* [35]. *In my capacity as prosecutor I had made it my first object to work upon the feelings both of the public and of the jurors, and I was quoting, not from my own opinion, but from current rumour, every case that told against the courts, and I was therefore unable to pass over the case of which you speak, as it was then a matter of general notoriety. But it is the greatest possible mistake to suppose that the speeches we barristers have made in court contain our considered and certified opinions; all those speeches reflect the demands of some particular case or emergency, not the individual personality of the advocate.* If readers had noticed this passage and similar others, we would not catch Cicero being

^{*} **Orat. pro A. Cluentio, c. 50.** [*Pro Cluentio* 139].

so often cited most stupidly, nor would so many things be attributed to him so unworthily, which are most alien to his real actions and opinions. Something like this was remarked by Asconius Pedianus, in his commentary to the first *Pro Cornelio*. But this should be noticed particularly in the Dialogues, since these are commonly cited, in order to confirm things, which are diametrically opposed to his true opinions; as if it were sufficient, that this or that was stumbled upon in Cicero, without taking into account who was speaking. Is it not clear that he states his own opinions, in the book *De Oratore*, out of the mouth of Marcus Crassus? When he had to argue the case *De Haruspicum Responsis* on behalf of himself in the Senate, he wanted to seem to give some credence to Divinations and Prognostications;* he alleged the same [36] in the books of *De Legibus*,^Ä which were destined for the public: but he most clearly and indeed resolutely overturned all these things in the books of *De Divinatione*, when writing for another kind of man (evidently for Philosophers). Surely he himself is Cotta, in other words the Academic, in the books of *De Natura Deorum*? Consequently in citations taken from there in favour of innate ideas, final causes, universal agreement, and such matters; Cicero, who rejected these things, ought not to be cited, but Velleius the Epicurean in Cicero, Balbus the Stoic in Cicero, and in the same way about other things. But if any person (as many pretend to themselves) doubts that he spoke there under the character of Cotta, because he presented in the conclusion of the third book, this

* **Cap. 9. It can also be read in pro Domo sua ad Pontif.**

^Ä **Lib 2. C. 13. [De Legibus II.25].**

judgement just as the Hearer;* *here the conversation ended, and we parted, Velleius thinking Cotta's discourse to be the truer, while I felt that that of Balbus approximated more nearly to a semblance of the truth: if someone (I say) more eager for a fight than for the truth, did not see that this conclusion was entirely the same, as in more recent times to submit a heterodox book to the judgement of the Catholic Church, as we say; or, as Quintus Cicero said smiling to his brother with other words, that it would not seem to depart from common law,*^Ä I would like him to notice that Cicero openly removes the mask from himself in the books of *De Divinatione* (which, as he often says himself [37] are only a continuation of the *De Natura Deorum*),^Æ and confirms the same things completely in his own name. But fearing lest Readers did not understand his mind at last, he declares the meaning of these Books at the end of the second book of *De Divinatione*, in these words:[§]

Speaking frankly, superstition, which is widespread among the nations, has taken advantage of human weakness to cast its spell over the mind of almost every man. This same view was stated in my treatise On the Nature of the Gods; and to prove the correctness of that view has been the chief aim of the present discussion. For I thought that I should be rendering a great service both to myself and to my countrymen if I could tear this superstition up by the roots. But I want it distinctly understood that the destruction of superstition does not mean the destruction of

* **Cap. 40. et beyond.** [*De Natura Deorum* III.95; trans. Rackham].

^Ä **De divinat. I. I. c. 5.** [*De Divinatione* I.8; trans. Falconer].

^Æ **Cap.8.1.3. de Nat Deor can be joined with 7, book one de divinat and most probably cap. I.i.2.**

[§] **Ibid. c. 72.** [*De Divinatione* II.148-149; trans. Falconer].

religion. For I consider it the part of wisdom to preserve the institutions of our forefathers by retaining their sacred rites and ceremonies. Furthermore, the celestial order and the beauty of the universe compel me to confess that there is some excellent and eternal Being, who deserves the respect and homage of men. Wherefore, just as it is a duty to extend the influence of true religion, which is closely associated with the knowledge of nature, so it is a duty to weed out every root of superstition. The same rule is rigorously observed in reading the *Tusculan Disputations*, and all the other dialogues, as we will explain more fully in the synopses prefixed to them: not because I am worried about what the opinion of Cicero was about any matter (since [38] I do not believe one should swear allegiance to the words of any man) but so that it should be clear to anyone, provided they read critically and historically, what his true opinion was, whether he went astray or not. The synopses are especially needed before the Speeches, which are less pleasing and understandable than the rest of Cicero's works, because there are constant allusions and appeals to the Laws there. For although the orator and the lawyer were not the same (as is absurdly thought by thousands), and because these speeches differ as much from modern courtroom pleadings, as much as the great men of the Roman Republic differ from hired Advocates: still Cicero was not only most skilled in the laws of the Romans, but also most practised in all the subtleties, quirks and sharp distinctions of the law, which was shown most clearly by that ornament of jurisprudence Antonius Schultingius, of Franeker.* I cannot forbear, on this occasion, to bring just one passage out of the speech for Murena, where the way of

* **In Oratione de Jurisprudencia M. T. Ciceronis.** [*A.Schultingii...Oratio de Jurisprudencia M. Tullii Ciceronis*].

writing of certain Lawyers (which is equally true of several Doctors) is touched on wittily; because clearly they conceal everything of theirs with a wonderful wrapping of empty and barbarous words on purpose: *while these formulas were secret* (our man said)* *you had to beg for them from those who knew them. Later, however, when they had been published, bandied about, and thoroughly sifted, [39] they were seen to be not only devoid of all sense but positively brimming with stupidity and trickery as well.* But to keep silent about the Greeks altogether as to the fact that the moderns write like this in Latin without being driven by any necessity either from the nature of the Law or Medicine, enough evidence and to spare is provided by Celsus the medical writer and those more learned Juriconsults whose fragments we have in the Pandects. Incidentally, I add that I have considered it worthwhile to include the fragments, however many survive, of the Twelve Tables at the end of the books of *De Legibus*, on account of no light reasons, explained in their own place.

Chapter XVII:

ART. 7. The variant readings of some importance thus far published, will be added to the end of every page, with collations, done by me myself or by friends, of very many manuscript codices. This effort is not to be expended unwillingly nor sluggishly, since ancient writers have been mangled into a wretched state by ignorant transcribers, and, in that brutality of generations, not only were they all horribly mutilated, but also very many were brought to extinction; so that any writers that survived out of so much wreckage, must be regarded with wonder. But we will

* **Cap. 12.** [*Pro Murena* 26; trans. Lord].

avoid that nonsense, with which certain editors are keen to burden their book and reputation, with the greatest possible assiduity; the errors of a pure copyist are such, or the words that are equally well written with each of two forms: whether we ought to read [40] (for example) *tanquam* or *tamquam*, *unquam* or *umquam*, *paenè* or *penè*, *foelix* or *felix*, *caeterùm* or *ceterùm*, *imprimis* or *inprimis*, such examples are countless. And similar things are not ever displayed simply, but with critical observations (if it pleases God) always attached for the purpose of vain display. Also these methods of expression, which we are indifferently able to use, ought either never to be cited as variant readings, or cited simply. Or was it necessary for that most famous Jacobus Gronovius, who otherwise did not deserve badly of Cicero, to compose a note with thirty lines and consisting of the smallest character? In earnest he discussed whether it should be written as *ad confirmandum et confutandum*, or as *ad confirmandum et ad confutandum*, with the preposition repeated:* when it would have been better to say, that each way of writing is good and commonly used; which ought to be understood concerning *in*, and *ab*, and *e*, and similarly with all other prepositions. Here the ears are to be consulted, not the parchments. Therefore when a variant reading expresses the same sense, and also expresses the Latin style undefiled on either side, on such an occasion I would insert into the text that word or phrase which is more usual for the author himself, or more strongly confirmed by the testimony of the manuscripts: thus I prefer in Cicero *duo excellentes ingeniis adolescentes*, to *duo excellentis ingenii adolescentes*, [41] and *in ista barbaria* to *in ista barbarie*. In fact the Orator used *inscientia* and *inscitia*, with

* **Ad Cap. 13. l. 3. Rhet ad Heren.** [*Rhetorica ad Herennium* III.23].

so little distinction that the rhythm of the sentence alone determined which of the two he would incline towards. I want to know, why in this passage Lambinus preferred the adverb *quoque*, in accordance with his own inference, to the adverb *quidem*, when *quidem* was supported by the authority of the manuscripts? * *Vide, quaeso, si omnis motus, omniaque quae certis temporibus ordinem suum conservant, divina ducimus, ne tertianas quidem febres et quartanas divinas esse dicendum sit;* where this *quidem* serves more elegantly and emphatically, if it does not express precisely the same as *quoque*. And so we will banish such most wretched conjectures, and the pursuit of syllables, from our edition throughout. Gulielmus developed this painstaking employment with astonishing application. Thus *genium* was preferred before *ingenio* in a certain passage at the end of the first book of *De Legibus*, against the codices; as if *ingenium* were not more suitable there.^Ä For although they express much the same thing usually, since *Genius* is often understood as the soul distinct from the human mind, I do not doubt that Cicero, when he handled an inquiry concerning man's knowledge of himself and of his innate capabilities (which he does there) wrote *ingenium* deliberately. After a few lines, compelled neither by any necessity nor [42] by the authority the manuscripts, he wanted to print *a natura subornatus* as *natura sua ornatus*; which is to deform more than to correct. How many rational and perfectly correct passages did the Critics with too much time on their hands butcher in this way? In order to show off the sharpness of their intellect, and so that they do not seem to produce or accomplish

* **Ad Cap. 10. I. 3. de Nat Deor.** [*De Natura Deorum* III.24; trans. Rackham].

^Ä**Ad Cap. 22. I. I. de Leg.** [*De Legibus* I.59].

nothing of their own. How much (by the immortal God!) do several owe a debt to book worms, and cockroaches, and rot? Who by weighing particles, and measuring single letters, strive for no insignificant renown; and they read the ancient authors just for this reason, to expose or create errors, and not to bring out anything useful from them either for themselves or for others. Of this kind is Gruterus's comment on the following passage: * *quantum intervallum tandem inter te atque illum interjectum putas?* Entirely elegant in composition. And so what needs to be corrected? *Tollas intervallum* (he said) *tollas interjectum, nihil discesserit de auctoris sententia*: as if Cicero used so Laconic a method that he employed not a single word besides what was absolutely necessary to express his meaning; since he was particularly painstaking in filling out the rhythms of his sentences (for prose has its own rhythms no less than verse). Everything is undoubtedly copious in the works of Cicero, but nothing is unnecessary; in fact the more abundant, the better for him. This matter, as I think, is absolutely [43] not to be suffered, that these conjecturers claim for themselves the right to define what the author either should have written or must have written; especially when they have been supported only by the omission of some faulty codex. *Nec abducar* (said Quintus Cicero)^Ä *ut rear, aut in extis totam Etruriam delirare, aut eandem gentem in fulguribus errare*. Gruterus exclaims,^E *I was scarcely able to restrain my hand, so that I did not expel this, ut rear, because it was in no way visible on the first or second Palatine; and certainly Tully spoke in*

* **Ad c. 5. Orat. pro C. Rabirio.** [*Pro Rabirio Perduellionis* 15; trans. Grose Hodge].

Ä **De Divinat. I. I. c. 18.** [*De Divinatione* I.35; trans. Falconer].

^E **At this passage.**

Latin, although it was pruned. But he speaks no less in Latin if it were to stay there; for it is one of those phrases, which can be as well present as absent, without interruption to the thread of the conversation: and since it is found in a number of codices of good quality, it would have been more fitting to have indicated that it was not present in those two. But what do they not dare to do? It seems that one of the conjectures of Gronovius is less excusable. Concerning these words of Cicero,* *at enim qui Patriâ potestate, hoc est Privatâ quâdam, Tribunitiam potestatem, hac est Populi potestatem, infirmat, minuit is majestatem.* Gronovius said, *I do not think that anyone believes, or is going to believe that it could be written thus by Cicero.* He understood these explanations of the powers of the father and the Tribunate. But he forgot that these examples were subject to the *status* of definition (as the rhetoricians call it) *because the force [44] of the term must be defined in words* (Cicero explains the same thing there), that if someone was thus speaking more copiously: if treason, which is the conspiracy and rebellion against a mortal man, a magistrate of the most narrow authority, is reckoned so disgraceful a matter; by how much more blasphemy, which is a certain degradation and defamation of the highest god, of the creator of all things? The words *blasphemia* and *perduellio* are understood by all alike, this without defining words added; nevertheless the preachers of this present religion, no less than the ancient orators of the Gentiles, thus think the minds of their audience may be roused more effectively. I choose only a few examples out of many. Another kind of variant reading is to be neglected by rational editors, when clearly it depends equally on the ignorance of the transcriber,

* **De Inventione, lib. 2. c. 17.** [*De Inventione* II.52; trans. Hubbell].

and his boredom or his excessive haste. Suppose (said Cicero)* *aut mententiam, quem ψευδομένον vocant, dissolvas? Aut quemadmodum soriti resistas?* Gruterus remarked that the third manuscript had *autem non mentientem*, the fourth *aut non mentientem*: as if it made much difference for the public to know, that transcribers were once no less ignorant than most Typographers are today, who often do not understand a word of the work in front of them; nor would they let in fewer faults everywhere, were it not for the examinations of correctors [45]. Thus *pertractarent* is foolishly introduced in common editions in the place of *retractarent* in this passage:^Ä *qui autem omnia quae ad cultum Deorum pertinerent, diligenter retractarent et tanquam relegerent, sunt dicti religiosi e religendo, ut elegantes ex eligendo.* After the arrival of Gothic barbarism the care and arrangement of all books was in the possession of monks alone, who laboured under such stupid ignorance, that the literature was all but offered for extermination. How where some Greek passages appeared in Latin works, (just as now in the passage cited) they are accustomed to add in writing these or similar words: IT IS GREEK, IT IS NOT LEGIBLE. An empty space is often left, since they are clearly unaware of the Greek forms of letters. In thousands of ways the true script of the authors was corrupted: so that, for example, when either one who was not dictating clearly and distinctly enough enunciated words with a related sound, or when transcribing letters they confused those of similar shape. And the person dictating suggested sometimes to the scribes, not what was written in his copy, but that which he himself was thinking

* **De Divinat. I. 2. c. 4.** [*De Divinatione* II.11; trans. Falconer].

^Ä **De Nat. Deor. I. 2. c. 28.** [*De Natura Deorum* II.72].

as his mind wandered. The transcriber very often made a mistake due to repetition in the same line; from where when he noted down one word or sentence, he omitted another, thinking that he had already transcribed it; and also the opposite of this more than once produced [46] variant readings of the text. The same could be said about ὁμοιοτελευτοις, about lines with similar endings: for from this cause omissions often arise. Finally calligraphers provide the handle for many disputes when they do not want to delete an unnecessary word or sentence, and do not want to insert one wrongly omitted; evidently so that the beauty of the script would not perish, or the look of the page be damaged. But not to digress, I wonder that Cocmannus, who brought not inconsiderable labour to the task of editing the *De Oratore* more correctly, allowed a place for these lapses of copyists (on almost whichever page of writing you want) among the variant readings. *Nam me haec tua platanus* (said Cicero)*, *admonuit, quae non minus ad opacandum hunc locum patulis est diffusa ramis, quàm illa cujus umbram secutus est Socrates*. Here Cocmannus reveals that the Joanneus codex had *ad pacandum*, the Pithoeanus and Memmianus of Gruterus noted had *placandum*, another *occupandum*, another *oppacandum*; certainly all wrongly and ineptly. *Eloquentia* (Tully added in the same chapter) *Rempublicam dissipaverunt*. Here Cocmannus again brings *disparuerunt* out of the Pithoean following Gruterus, and Gulielmius conjectures *disperaverunt* more boldly (as is his wont) and most unfortunately. Therefore nothing of this kind will be evident in our edition, unless occasionally noted briefly: and I will never [47] give so much rein to me myself, that I name anybody a mushroom, a dolt, stupid, an

* **Lib. I. c. 7.** [*De Oratore* I.28].

ass, rash, impudent, or absurd because of these sumptuous delights, either more carefully noted or neglected; and much less such a worthless name as scoundrel, wicked, wild and unfeeling, sacrilegious, a plagiarist, an adulterer, or a husband of goats. But if buffoonery could be proved by examples, and if in these insignificant matters these Epithets themselves or worse were to be used, I am not unaware that I have the ability to uphold the achievement with the famous names of those still living. Or therefore is it such an extraordinary skill to unroll the manuscript books, to shake off the devouring dust, to remove the marks branded on them by the ages or the scribes, and to gather variant readings together? That hence certain men ought to claim for themselves and openly aspire to a kingship made of paper, in the freest republic of literature? They carefully dig up forgotten and decayed words out of obscurity, their little corrections have perhaps not gone too badly: but how do they show pride on account of this wretched cause? And what a feeble sign of learning, to be more than averagely experienced in letters and punctuation of words? Therefore I shall not waste in a leisurely fashion the tiniest element of our or anyone else's time, in the infamous quarrels and arguments of the Critics; rightly satisfied to bring forward the reasonings of those who got things right, I am not going to recall anything bad nor good of those who made mistakes, except very rarely. Lest I do ever audaciously bring my conjectures or the conjectures of others into the text, [48] against the good manuscripts, clearly I will beware as carefully as possible. I think that this is no more arrogant than laughable, and to be avoided not more slowly than the rudeness of the rest, who want to correct everything with the aid of faulty codices, as I said earlier. But it almost prevails no less after the invention of printing than before, when anything not sufficiently to the taste of the copyist was changed or

destroyed according to their whim. They grant themselves wondrously great liberty in adorning this Sparta, as if making material available when required by future Critics. Then also this absurd nation of Conjectural emenders existed at that time, most of whom, as now, approached these sacred objects with unwashed hands, and for that reason they disfigure, desecrate, corrupt everything. They who clearly did not understand well enough wanted to make corrections either with other words, or by using punctuation wrongly. They sometimes omitted those things which seemed superfluous, and included what seemed necessary. They often substituted words of equal significance, or which they believed to be thus, for the originals; and it was not in the habits of sacred Critics alone to bring the glosses of the learned out of the margin into the text. Therefore whatever variant readings of some importance I shall discover, whether with regard to the Latin language, or to the content, I will attentively note them down (as I have said); always making honourable mention of everyone judged to deserve it, and attributing to each one his own discoveries or corrections [49] (provided that they are worth it), however I may disagree with them in some other way, which I can do without verbally insulting them. And so (to gather the matter together) when the collective errors and hallucinations of copyists are left behind, when the trifling and heedless conjectures are rejected, and when the feminine scoldings and petty wrangles are shunned, and when the manuscripts (from where I have derived variant readings) have been indicated without any comments added; you would most easily infer that this element is going to occupy a narrower space in our edition, although we are about to bring forward perhaps a much greater store of variant and true readings than in any other. This point suggests to me, that I should add some things. Since there have been learned men, who, among other

styles of writing, related a certain amount about the Lapidary style, I wonder that none have yet emerged to comment on the Variant-Reading style (so to speak) as it deserves: for how greatly it differs from every other type of language! But if the will is taken for the reason, certainly it is a pure regal style. The Critic speaks from his throne briefly (as many have long since observed), abruptly, with a little word, with a nod. (He says) *This is not Latin, that is by no means pleasing, those words are to be marked with asterisk or obelisk, this passage mutilated, this is right at last: I cut these things back, I delete, I remove, I butcher; thus I write, thus I change, thus I distinguish, thus I restore,* and a thousand similar things. Not without reason. For just as actors, who play Royal parts, [50] are also found outside the theatre more fierce and more self-confident than others; thus in truth it is not unlikely that Grammarians, accustomed to exercise absolute power over boys, took over this style from their daily practice of speaking. Perhaps this is a suitable reason for why they so unwillingly and impatiently allow themselves to be contradicted, and, because of the most trivial argument about goat's wool, not only will they declare relentless hostilities against their enemies; but, once pens are unsheathed and smeared with gall, they think that anything is permitted to them, just as if they were truly at war. But if they sniff the smallest detraction from their celebrity and renown, which they imagine to be true, then they advance monstrously against the reputation of the enemy (it's a good thing they can't advance against their life and fortunes) taking up any weapons they can; for it is no longer a just war, but rage, butchery, fire, devastation. Thus they themselves are accustomed to speak tragically about pure trivialities. However since it is not blood, but ink that it is to be poured out in the critical contest, few altogether of our generation of fighters fear either to wound or

diminish that majesty of the ferule.

Chapter XVIII:

ART. 8. Although it is not in my plans to append the complete *Explanatory Notes* of one or more editors; I mean of course following the custom of Graevius, who was easily the most splendid of more recent Critics [51]: nevertheless the text will not appear so bare and unaccompanied, as in the editions of Victorius, Gruterus, and Gronovius: for indeed I will add brief but rich Annotations to all corrupt, difficult, ambiguous passages, or passages provoking just dispute, with the authors (as I have already said) rightly praised, when the words or observations belong to another. I will not involve myself in these passages, any more than in that chapter about Variant readings, with the quarrels and disputes of pernicky men. Asconius Pedianus and the Anonymous Scholiast will hold a proper place in our edition, inserted first by Gronovius and Graevius in their editions: and the Latin version of all Greek words and sentences will also be attached, which so commonly appear in the works of Cicero, but especially in the *Letters to Atticus*. Finally the discoveries (as they consider them) and opinions or hypotheses of modern philosophers, I will closely compare throughout with certain passages of our Philosopher, most cited from older men. However, far be it from me to imply that Cicero was plundered by them, or other ancient authors, whom very many out of them seem not even to have read. As we now return to these Annotations, first I ask, why should I burden the inner margin of the book with these matters, which are read much more clearly and more plainly when explained in the text itself? In the speech for Cluentius [52],

these words and the following need no comment.* *'Come, now, do you deny that the court was bribed?' I do not, but maintain that it was not my client who bribed it. 'Who did bribe it then?' I consider, first, that had there been any uncertainty* ó and as he continues to prove with suitable arguments, that judgement would seem to be corrupted more truly by Oppianicus than by Cluentius. But Franciscus Sylvius thought that these things should be added. *First, if he was uncertain: this is an argument from fiction. If it had been uncertain what verdict the Judges would reach, more probably the judgement would have been corrupted by Oppianicus, who was afraid lest he would be condemned; than by Cluentius, who was afraid that Oppianicus would be absolved: but when there was doubt for no one that they would condemn Oppianicus, already condemned by two previous verdicts; it ought to be certain that the court was corrupted by Oppianicus despairing of his cause, not by Cluentius hoping all would be well.* These things are all true; but are read better, more clearly, more concisely in the Speech itself. What else are such notations, except unnecessary repetition of the text in the margin? Where nothing unnecessary or far-fetched ought to be included. But how could it have happened otherwise, if Sylvius determined to complete a great volume by any means, or he thought that it was his duty to pile up little notes from everywhere without discrimination, on the model of others? [53] Was it not perhaps under the influence of both these reasons, he made additions to these words *for no man can hope to withstand prejudice without your support and that of men like you,* in the margin.Ä *Prejudice is an evil*

* **Cap. 23.** [*Pro Cluentio* 63; trans. Hodge].

Ä **Cap. 1.** [*Pro Cluentio* 3; trans. Hodge].

grace, and hatred out of some morally unsound deed, arising either from suspicion of this man's deed, or stirred up by the conversation of some morally unsound man: which has so much influence, also so much strength for crushing even innocence, that Aristotle wrote that it was to be feared by strong men, in the third book of his Ethics. Perhaps we would understand nothing here without the authority of Aristotle. But these are things to be ashamed of. Such things (if you want) could be said fittingly in some Ethical treatise, but not at all in this type of passage. Therefore all the universal morals of this passage, which constitute the greatest portion of the Annotations in the unfinished edition of Graevius (as also the patchworks of other critics, who were not admitted into that mass) shall be thrown right out of our edition without any favour or exception, since we have a much more generous estimate of the capacities of our readers. How idly Sylvius, concerning these most trite words of his speech, *in tune with your kindness,** said the same thing? *Sometimes praises of the Judges are to be scattered, so that they become more kind; and this is to be done briefly, so that suspicion of toadying does not insinuate itself;* as if he was bound to teach the rules of Rhetoric, not to solve Ciceronian difficulties [54]. As I dismiss Sylvius, I do not ever attribute boastfully to myself those things which were observed either by almost everyone, or by any one man, before me. Indeed Davisius noticed well (as he was accustomed to do), in the recent Cambridge edition of the *Tusculan Disputations*, that Eustathius had made an unsightly error, which made Pherecydes of Syros a man of Babylonia; and no less that Augustine Bishop of Hippo and John Tzetzes talked idly, who made him not only Syrian, but also

* **Cap. 10.** [*Pro Cluentio* 29; trans. Hodge].

Assyrian. But he should not in the least claim this as his own, not to mention others, which was a long time ago corrected in my *ad Serenam Epistolis*.^{*} *Pherecydes Syrius* (Cicero said)^Ä *primùm dixit animos hominum esse sempiternos*. To this end Davisius rightly noticed that *Syrum* (for *Syrium*) was read wrongly in the vulgate, and, after quoting authorities for the island of Syros as the birthplace of Pherecydes, triumphantly he declares, *that it would not be possible to be doubtful that I brought back the true reading*; as if the most famous Critics from the whole world of literature had not done this, whom I will name at another time. But Gronovius did not correct Gruterus here. These few, and brief, examples out of thousands, we may select for the opening of the book. Or was it necessary for Hottomannus, so that I do not add more, highlighting the name of Medea in the speech *Pro Lege Manilia*, to recite the story of this sorceress from Ovid at greater length?^Æ Or to insert childish in such a work Poetic stories [55] and tales, unless it is some small history barely known, or perhaps it is not a clear enough allusion? But without these mythological notes, and parallel or twin passages of Cicero, or other writers, are Architects of notations able to construct a large book (as I have said), which is very often a large evil? In this way Manutius increased his edition, in this way others increased theirs. We knew such men in more than one region, who were accustomed to judge gracefully about books according to mass. *Who then* (as I complain with Roland

^{*} **Ep. 2. N. 5. Pag. 28.** [Toland, *Letters to Serena* p.28].

^Ä **Tusc. Disput. lib. I. c. 16.** [*Tusculan Disputations* I.38].

^Æ **Cap. 9.** [*Pro Lege Manilia* 22].

Maresius)* would tolerate so many notes, so many observations? For how much longer will all the margins of books be filled with so many varying and often useless readings? For in these extra ornaments is a great loss of time; and while they spend time on these things and are in difficulty concerning the words the youth generally does not attend carefully enough to the content (which is the most important thing): and sometimes the writers themselves were cast out of their hands, before they were fully weighed and read through carefully. Certainly I can read through the whole of Cicero swifter than a tenth of the Notations and Commentaries written on him. And what of the fact that if so many Critics, while they brought healing hands, made books worse, which they wanted to heal? Why when similar sentences were collected from anywhere, and which they often crammed in a passage to which they don't belong, they make their pages wonderfully swollen and overgrown. If something seemed the correct thickness [56] of a book, they knew how to repair this by lengthy and superstitious explanations of the religious rites of the ancients. So far spoke Maresius. Still I would recall the many most inept methods of composing Notations (not to linger on this custom almost common to all men, that of robbing and copying from each other ad nauseam) while I display an example, lest you think that I am writing a satire in full against learned patchers-up of texts. Therefore let it suffice that when those long lectures of every type are removed, I guarantee again that suitable notes, but with as few words as possible, are going to be applied by me to doubtful or obscure passages everywhere. Also when the matter demands, I will openly acknowledge that *it is not clear*. But as I closed the preceding chapter with

* **Lib. I. ep. 17.** [Maresius, *Epistolae Philologicae*].

the war of the Critics, so I will close the present one (which is in your hands) with peace: I mean this resounding applause, and these most excessive praises, which they pile up on themselves and those like them without any limit or shame. They flatter and agree completely with each other, certainly so that they get in return equal encomia, or perhaps lure forth bigger: for they decorate themselves boastfully with those praises on account of their learned nonsense; with which the most celebrated Chieftains and highest Emperors are accustomed to be praised, for their splendid deeds. But, when these things were not enough for their pride or ambition, they devised appropriate proclamations for themselves; for one is the sun of Gaul, another the star of Britain, this man is the little eye of Germany, this the phoenix of Holland, and [57] finally the fifth is the safety and good sense of the Muses, the flower and elixir of literature. As for their being decorations, lights, senators, and dictators of the Republic of Letters, all these things are common: for Zoilus decorates literature with a new light, now Bavius alone cultivates them and supports them as they fall, Orbilius rules broadly in these things alone, and Maevius placed the whole world in his debt; for such a man has hitherto been called *Marcus*, not *Manius*, as he ought to be, and that one should have been called *Decimus*, not *Decius*. They are all most famous, the greatest men, most learned, most special; the most celebrated, even if they wrote nothing at all, and are not known by their own neighbours. But they demand in turn, and all but extort, these Titles by humbly conferring them on all and sundry. Although most press the palm of others with blandishments of this type, however none doubt that they themselves deservedly earn them. But let them continue to rub and to stroke each other, while we hasten to the end.

Chapter XIX:

ART. 9. Beyond some of our own particular Indices, there will be an *Index rerum et verborum* greater than any thus far, nor will a single Ciceronian word be absent from it; in this way it will fulfil the function of Indices *in usum Delphini*, and it will very conveniently obviate the need for more indices than are necessary. This chapter by no means requires a longer discussion [58]. I will add just this (most noble man) that besides new preferable methods of emending, and the opportune expulsion of all superfluous and trifling things, I will labour with all my strength to ensure that whatever surpasses and outshines in any other editions you like, this one encompasses entirely. But since we have happened to mention the Indices it will not be irrelevant, given this opportunity, to mention that an Index is to be assembled of the most notable passages from Cicero in books for the defence of the Christian Religion, which ought not to lightly recommend it. Indeed Euhemerus, Oenomaus, and writers of this type, offered an incitement for the Greek Fathers, who did not hesitate nor think it irreligious to hold up to everyone's mockery those mythical, physical or political, wooden or stone gods of the pagans, and to traduce the secrets of so many years. To the Latin Fathers Cyprianus, Tertullian, Minutius, Lactantius, and others fighting in the same battle line, Cicero almost alone provided weapons and at the same time resources, as is clear from their own works, and from the passages invoked by the Commentators. And truly Tully could be called the hammer of Superstition before all mortals. But lest I seem to exceed the measure in this praise bestowed upon him, I summon the evidence of Arnobius who is beyond any

reservation.* *For, in the first place, [59] we cannot be led to believe this at first (he said) that that immortal and supreme nature has been divided by the sexes, and that there are some male, others female. But this point, indeed, has been long ago fully treated by men with ardent genius, both in Latin and Greek; and TULLIUS, the most eloquent among the Romans, without dreading the vexatiousness of a charge of impiety, has above all, with greater piety, declared – boldly, firmly, and frankly – what he thought of such a fancy type; and if you would proceed to receive from him opinions written with true discernment, instead of merely brilliant sentences, this case would have been concluded; nor would it require at our weak hands a second pleading, as it is termed. But why should I say that men seek from him subtleties of expression and splendour of diction, when I know that there are many who avoid and flee from his books[†] on this subject, and will not hear his opinions read, overthrowing their prejudices; and when I hear others muttering angrily, and saying that the senate should decree the destruction of these writings by which the Christian religion is maintained, and the weight of antiquity overborne? But, indeed, if you are convinced that anything you say regarding your gods is beyond doubt, point out Cicero's error, refute, rebut his rash and impious words, and show that they are so. For when you would carry off writings, and [60] suppress a book given forth to the public, you are not defending the gods, but dreading the evidence of the truth. The inconstancy of people! What these Pagans muttered at least and threatened, afterwards these Christians in fact achieved; as we will teach in the argument of the*

* **Lib. 3. adversus Gentes.** [*Seven Books against the Gentes* III.6-7; trans. Bryce and Campbell].

[†]**Books such as *De Natura Deorum*, *De Divinatione* and *De Fato*, which stand against superstition.**

third book of *De Natura Deorum*. Before the *Indices* (which I had almost forgotten) the whole article about Cicero will be collected, with additions inserted in appropriate places, out of the *Bibliotheca Latina*, by a man of amazing learning, already mentioned above, Joannes Albertus Fabricius; who reviewed as many Editors and Commentators as there were, whether of the whole work or some part of Cicero's work, with the greatest candour, judgement, and thoroughness. The same he provided not only for the remaining ancient Latin writers, but also for the Greeks: and certainly his *Bibliotheca Graeca* will be thought worthy of the highest regard, while any honour remains for Literature.

Chapter XX:

But I implore and I supplicate you (HOHENDORF), on account of your kindness, to allow no one out of your friends, who are all such truly learned men, to make so monstrous a mistake; as if I were too happy to scold Grammarians shamelessly, if not indeed unfairly; and I seem not only to reproach thus far at the Critics, but also to absolutely despise them. Persuaded by scorn of the former age (someone perhaps will say) or by contempt of our own, Toland despises the works of both [61]. I certainly acknowledge that I admire no faults of men of the present, nor of the past: but that I look down upon Grammarians and Critics, I deny this justifiably; and I shall not allow that any man (whoever he is) ever grants more than me either to the art itself, or to those who use these things skilfully. For who, besides one initiated thoroughly in the practice of Grammar, is able to speak clearly, fittingly, or elegantly, much less to deliver the origins and etymologies of languages? Who, unless strong in critical skill, can make correct or appropriate choices, or distinguish

fraud from truth, the lofty from the humble, genuine from spurious? Who can explain ambiguity, who can elucidate complex matters? Finally who has the ability to write SUITABLY, CLEARLY, ELEGANTLY, when abandoned by these aids? Which the leader of the art Cicero recommended, and which I selected as a motto for myself (if only with good omens!). Therefore I do not remark upon the failures of the art, but of the men: nor clearly of all men ó far from it - but only of those who are foolishly boastful about things of no importance and who gnaw the shell instead of the kernel; who, inflated by a most vain exhibition of knowledge, however love to grow old in nonsense; who rejoice to entangle themselves and others with quarrels, and not only most easily sally forth into reproaches, but they throw at each other the insults of porters and craftsmen. What sane man can deny that such sarcastic wranglers existed once, and exist even now? But who would think thence that the faults of a few were to be rubbed off on the whole order thence, or who would hold against all indiscriminately, [62] what is true only of certain men? This would be to accuse yourself of the same charge that you prove against others, and shamefully to mistake in those men things which you profess to teach. But that acrimony of the pen, which we rebuke, doglike eloquence, addiction to quarrelling, and amplification of minute matters, are not so appropriate for Grammarians, that they apply equally to none of the other occupations: seeing that these things do not peculiarly emanate from any particular art, since they are found among the cultivators of all disciplines, who have no or insignificant judgement; but they arise from the nature and character of men, who by necessity show themselves good or evil, quarrelsome or peaceable in whatever business you like. Sometimes Philosophers lose their reason no less than Philologists, and Theologians do not more rarely ruin the minds of men than Doctors

ruin their bodies, doing wrong with words and deeds. For that reason are all Theologians, Doctors and Philosophers to be derided? Or even are Philosophy, Medicine and Theology themselves to be completely forbidden and proscribed? Who would dare, the very idea of it is unspeakable, to say such things? However we know Theologians, for example, who drag every speech and the deeds of otherwise thinking men into an inferior place; who dismiss nobody ever, whom they set up as an opponent to themselves, unless combed and mangled satisfactorily, who are no more prepared to add some plausibility to their impostures, than slow to recognise their errors in any way; who on account of the lightest matters, pious chimeras, and [63] most sacred trivialities (so to speak) they religiously condemn all those who disagree with them to hell. But what has this to do with Theology itself? Therefore not only Grammarians roll themselves in sordid matters of this kind; nor do they alone endeavour to call forth whomever they wish into the arena, and, in proportion as anyone is preminent, to expel them from their position: not only Critics disdainfully, indeed despotically, take upon themselves to decide about everything; nor are they alone busy to burden the reputation of others, and their works, with false accusations. And so you see, or rather let others see (since my character is better known to you) that I was carried away by enthusiasm not for finding fault but for correcting, when I freely commented on the faults of certain Grammarians at the end of the seventeenth chapter, and the eighteenth; but I addressed nobody by name, either alive or dead, since I am angry with nobody, not even the most unfriendly. I cannot fail to not feel dispiritedly about certain people, and he is a feigner who pretends otherwise: but as the mind is not provoked against them, so the language shall not be unrestrained. I will disclose their errors frankly (when necessary);

leaving to fair-minded readers their own judgement: readers who, whether we like it or not, will put aside partiality and give each his due; which all others too will do sooner or later. If I were to object that Critics should be held in slight esteem ó whose characteristic is to have a judgement which is sharp, firm, remarkable - I would be imprudently cutting down my own vineyards, since I act the Grammarian in this edition of Cicero, and the Critic, according to my own strengths. Meanwhile you easily notice two classes of men [64], that is those who refuse true humanity and sound doctrine to Professors of the art of Grammar, on that account itself; and those, on the other hand, who keep everyone away from the mysteries of literature as though they were uninitiated, with the exception of teachers of Criticism. To these, the first group seem to be reaping another's harvest; to those, the second group seem not to do their own job properly. Both are completely unjust. What would you proclaim and admire more in Joannes Georgius Graevius while he was alive, his stunning and all but boundless learning, or his modesty on top of that, candour, patience, most cultivated and at the same time most pure morals? Good god, how generous he was of his own! Such cheerfulness in expression, in voice! How loving of Liberty! How much charm in conversation, how much authority in writing! However he was a Grammarian, Critic, and Professor second to none. Similarly a most splendid man, and never mentioned without honour, was Ezechiel Spanhemius, recently special Legate of the most serene King of Prussia, who although especially devoted to courtly and political life, was however no less initiated and involved in the most obscure mysteries of Criticism than any Professor ever, and brought back immense praises from the Professors themselves. But how far he was from any pride, acrimony, affectation, envy, abuse! Day would fail me, if I were to review the

many living and flourishing at this time, who even though they are not Professors of the humanities [65], however do not yield the first place to any who earn their living by these studies. Also as many Professors are most known to me today, and venerated up to my final breath, who illuminated their Universities no less with polished manners and every type of sophistication, than with learning and judgement. But no one out of so many comes to be cited by name, lest I seem either to be fishing for favour with foul flattery, or to condemn the rest by silence itself (against my custom). But I have portrayed the morals and character of certain of them with so many vivid colours, that it is not altogether difficult to recognise them. Perhaps this is the truth. It was not however in my plan to bring forward any of them onto the stage, but with most simple mind and true faith to contend against the faults themselves. But if I have therefore run into the offence of some, the answer is ready, *if the cap fits, wear it*. Certain others are not so much to be feared, as to be ignored by all means *whose minds*, as our author says, *were narrow, cringing, and depraved, were so choked and darkened with refuse*,* among whom envious, hated, idle, obscure men may lie as much as they like, as far as I am concerned [66].

Chapter XXI:

I turn to you now, (famous Baron) who is not only my Patron, but also the Patron of Literature itself, so that I can finally make an end to this discourse. If someone more learned of your friends undertook to complete this task, it would not only release me from a great burden, but also deliver me from a very invidious position. But I

* **Orat. post redit. in Senatu, c.4.** [*Post reditum in Senatu* 10; trans. Watts].

foresee men not of a single order set on growing hateful. They will particularly gnaw at our labours with the tooth of Theon, they who are rivals, haters, detractors of another's fame and diligence; and whatever is conceived and attempted as lofty or eminent by any, they endeavour with all their might to diminish and to bring him into contempt. Then there are those who will be impatient with our efforts, who will find fault with them and blame them just because they are ours. We do not give satisfaction to them perhaps because we are alive. But the spite of both will delay me no more than the severity of those with nothing to do, they who love to abuse rather than to say nothing in their coffee-shops and salons. The remnant portion of men, which is bigger and better, will judge without love, without desire, without hatred, without envy. But so that I may freely open the whole of myself to you, nothing drives me more quickly to complete this edition of Cicero than that style, which is the artist of speaking, should come out most fully polished and shaped: in my opinion that is the best style [67] which is skilfully adjusted to what is appropriate, with every variety of matters carefully assessed; clearly so that big things are said seriously, great matters elegantly, things of moderate importance temperately, smaller matters concisely, and brightly or fittingly when it was necessary. But, you say, what is the point of this discourse about the types of styles? So that after I have efficiently escaped these Critical and rough matters, I may prepare myself to write a History, and to decorate the noblest matters in writing. *Everybody knows* (as Tully said divinely, just as all else) *that the first law of History is not daring to say anything false; that the second is daring to say everything that is*

*true; that there should be no suggestion of partiality, none of animosity when you write.** But this good intention and, as it were, the light of truth is by no means sufficient, since History is equally a witness of the ages and teachers of life. Therefore it is right that the order of events and times should be preserved methodically; so that words clearly and neatly come together to suit the matters, people and places; so that the causes of deeds and events are set out, small and useless matters are not counted, and inconvenient digressions not intermingled; finally so that fallacies are not purveyed instead of facts, or mud (as it is said) instead of pure water, just as it is abundantly to be seen in certain Volusian papers, which are not worthy of any other light than that of Vulcan. Indeed in this way the matter stands, that you should regard everything written by me thus far, or to be written anew, [68] as though it were composed in passing; for, whatever I have done, I have always been intent on this task, in which I would consecrate for immortality in the temple of Honour the names of those I praise there: also the remaining men, especially the traitors of the fatherland, branded with the truest marks of wrongdoing, I would hand over to the memory of men, that is, for everlasting dishonour and ill fame. And so there is hope, that after so many nocturnal studies spent on Cicero, I may at least speak Latin, not the language of the *Twelve Tables*: although I do not aim on the model of certain Ciceronians (discussed in the *Historical-Critical Dissertation*) to thus confine the limits of Roman eloquence, and to reduce it within such narrow boundaries, that I would not choose the words received from the Senecas, from both Plinys, from Tacitus, from the Quintilians,

* *De Orat. I. 2. c. 15. [De Oratore II.62].*

from Suetonius, Frontinus and Vegetius, Aulus Gellius, ancient Panegyricists and Rhetors, and other authors of the bronze and iron age (who are often better men than their ages) received by more rational Grammarians. I will not only not compose a speech as if a mosaic work, with Greek to be interspersed with Latin (as happens to some people); but I shall also wait until it has boiled down, that I should not produce anything under ripe, crude, or incorrect. I propose the most noble subject-matter for myself, that revolution, and as it were the circle of political changes of the Republic, from the year 1688 to the conclusion of the second war for the liberty of Europe [69], whether it is going to be a stable and honourable Peace, or a war cleverly disguised under the name of peace. The first reason for writing is the renunciation and expulsion of King James on account of bad administration of the kingdom (intent on power outside the laws, and with a false heir to the kingdom): the final intention is the confirmation and support for lawfully transferring Royal succession onto the most serene Hanoverian family (on account of preserving our ancestral liberty). From here come the treaties enacted more than once, and the military alliance established, with the most august Emperors, with the Holy Roman Empire, with the very powerful orders of the Dutch, with other kings and in the same way republics, struggling for altars and fireplaces against the same French tyrant. In this Theatre the glory of EUGENE is going to make each page; and even if I am roused by enthusiasm for his deeds, I also have a wonderful desire to give satisfaction to the immortality of the praises of MARLBOROUGH. Indeed I will speak from the heart what I believe, and what I have already often said to you; if the ruler of MINDELHEIM had been an enemy to me, still I would be unable not to be a friend to him, since he had waged so many wars for freedom of the people against the

continuous enemy of us Britons, and was still waging them daily while it was permitted. *Posterity certainly will be astounded hearing and reading of his commands, provinces, of the Rhine, of the Meuse, of the Danube, of your countless battles, incredible victories, monuments, deeds and triumphs; especially since for this man alone out of all of us, [70] the allies have not hesitated to trust him completely, and since only one was found in so many years, whom the allies rejoice to see coming into their cities with the army.* I thought such and so great a Hero should be praised in Cicero's words, in so far as I was following his own example, which he himself set out, in the beginning of his essay on his Consulship, *it used up Isocrates' entire perfume cabinet along with all the little scent boxes of his pupils, and some of Aristotle's paints as well.** What future Englishman himself is there who one hundred years from now will not boast that he himself was of the same country as MARLBOROUGH? As we now boast of Edward the Third and Henry the Fifth, and the Montforts and the Talbots, without partisan leanings. O beautiful evidence of most glorious of Kings WILLIAM! *No one* (he said) *of mortals has a calmer small brain or more rapid little heart:* meaning the most deliberate counsel and at the same time the bravest spirit, using metaphors which are very much in use in our language. I do not doubt that parents or teachers will reply to our distant descendants asking about his most celebrated name, as Cicero replied once about Trebonius: that he was a man, *who preferred the freedom of the English people to the friendship of one man, and preferred to be a repeller than a partner of tyranny.* Hence these tears. But the greatest field in this work remains the just proclamations

* **Ad Att. I. 2. ep. I.** [*Ad Atticum* II.1.; trans. Shackleton Bailey].

uttered about him: and we shall not be lacking in praise of anyone else from the most dear fatherland, or [71] of the common cause of the allies. Therefore if you want to know according to what principle our history is to be gauged, since we are not at all accustomed to measure matters by individual sympathies, that principle was supplied for us in the first book of *De Officiis*, by my Cicero and yours. *In general (he said)* those who are about to take charge of public affairs should hold fast to Plato's two pieces of advice: first to fix their gazes firmly on what is beneficial to the citizens that whatever they do, they do with that in mind, forgetful of their own advantage. Secondly, let them care for the whole body of the Republic rather than protect one part and neglect the rest. The management of the republic is like a guardianship, and must be conducted in the light of what is beneficial not to the guardians, but to those who are put in their charge. By consulting the interests of some of the citizens and neglecting others, they bring upon the city the ruinous condition of unrest and strife. Consequently some appear as populares, and others as devotees of the best men, but few as champions of everyone. That was the reason for serious strife in Athens. In our republic it has caused not merely unrest but even disastrous civil war. That is something which any serious, courageous, citizen who is worthy of pre-eminence in the republic will shun with hatred. He will devote himself entirely to the republic, pursuing neither wealth nor power, and will protect the whole in such a way that the interest of none is disregarded. He will expose no one to hatred or unpopularity by making false accusations. He will, in sum, so adhere to justice [72] and what is honourable that in preserving them he will endure any reverse, however*

* **Cap. 25.** [*De Officiis* I.85-87; trans. Zetzel].

serious, and face death rather than abandon those things I have mentioned. Electioneering and the struggle for positions of honour is an altogether wretched practice. Again Plato's words on the subject are splendid: those who compete between themselves over who should administer the republic act as if sailors were to fight over which of them should be principal helmsman . You behold my guiding star, HOHENDORF, and at the same time the end of my Dissertation. Farewell.

READERS:

I would like to ask, that they do not take evidence from this rushed Dissertation either of the writing or the character of future works: and, while the forms are being prepared in Holland, if anything should be conveyed across either for learned counsel or aid (addressing letters to me tarrying in London) I would receive that with the gratitude it deserves.

THE END

So that the last little page is not left empty, it seemed good here to add an Epigram, inscribed in a certain book, in which I congratulated Prince Eugene on his fortunate return from the summer expedition in the year 1709, ennobled with many victories.

To the Most Serene Prince,
Risen from the most ancient and Royal family,
EUGENE OF SAVOY,
And having achieved the most celebrated reputation
Of all Heroes and Commanders;
Always conqueror of himself no less than others,
Owing everything to himself, nothing to Fortune;
Treachery, cruelty, greed,
Having been put to flight with his enemies;
Learning, Philosophy, knowledge of civil matters,
United with military praise:
this little book is offered in gratitude,
As a token of the highest admiration and deference,
After having added new laurels with innumerable triumphs.

JOHN TOLAND,

1709.

