

#### CAMBRIDGE LIBRARY COLLECTION

Books of enduring scholarly value

#### Classics

From the Renaissance to the nineteenth century, Latin and Greek were compulsory subjects in almost all European universities, and most early modern scholars published their research and conducted international correspondence in Latin. Latin had continued in use in Western Europe long after the fall of the Roman empire as the lingua franca of the educated classes and of law, diplomacy, religion and university teaching. The flight of Greek scholars to the West after the fall of Constantinople in 1453 gave impetus to the study of ancient Greek literature and the Greek New Testament. Eventually, just as nineteenth-century reforms of university curricula were beginning to erode this ascendancy, developments in textual criticism and linguistic analysis, and new ways of studying ancient societies, especially archaeology, led to renewed enthusiasm for the Classics. This collection offers works of criticism, interpretation and synthesis by the outstanding scholars of the nineteenth century.

#### Cicero, De Natura Deorum Libri Tres

First published between 1880 and 1885, Joseph B. Mayor's three-volume edition of *De Natura Deorum* is remarkable for its thorough commentary. This volume contains Cicero's Book 2, which presents the Stoic argument for the existence of the gods and their providential ordering of the universe. Set within the home of the orator Caius Aurelius Cotta, it follows the Epicurean and Academic arguments of Book 1. Here the Stoic Balbus defends his basic premise that the majesty of creation — the harmony existing among infinitely varied phenomena — can only derive from the wisdom of divine reason. As the fullest expression of Stoic theology in *De Natura Deorum*, this book provides crucial insight into the school's views on cosmology, divine providence, and the role of deities in representing the natural universe. It reveals Cicero's intellectual range as he evaluates the major metaphysical debates dividing the Roman philosophical schools.



Cambridge University Press has long been a pioneer in the reissuing of out-of-print titles from its own backlist, producing digital reprints of books that are still sought after by scholars and students but could not be reprinted economically using traditional technology. The Cambridge Library Collection extends this activity to a wider range of books which are still of importance to researchers and professionals, either for the source material they contain, or as landmarks in the history of their academic discipline.

Drawing from the world-renowned collections in the Cambridge University Library, and guided by the advice of experts in each subject area, Cambridge University Press is using state-of-the-art scanning machines in its own Printing House to capture the content of each book selected for inclusion. The files are processed to give a consistently clear, crisp image, and the books finished to the high quality standard for which the Press is recognised around the world. The latest print-on-demand technology ensures that the books will remain available indefinitely, and that orders for single or multiple copies can quickly be supplied.

The Cambridge Library Collection will bring back to life books of enduring scholarly value (including out-of-copyright works originally issued by other publishers) across a wide range of disciplines in the humanities and social sciences and in science and technology.



### Cicero, De Natura Deorum Libri Tres

With Introduction and Commentary

VOLUME 2

EDITED BY JOSEPH B. MAYOR
CICERO
AND J. H. SWAINSON





#### CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paolo, Delhi, Dubai, Tokyo

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781108010986

© in this compilation Cambridge University Press 2009

This edition first published 1883 This digitally printed version 2009

ISBN 978-1-108-01098-6 Paperback

This book reproduces the text of the original edition. The content and language reflect the beliefs, practices and terminology of their time, and have not been updated.

Cambridge University Press wishes to make clear that the book, unless originally published by Cambridge, is not being republished by, in association or collaboration with, or with the endorsement or approval of, the original publisher or its successors in title.



## M. TULLII CICERONIS DE NATURA DEORUM

LIBRI TRES



# M. TULLII CICERONIS DE NATURA DEORUM

#### LIBRI TRES

WITH INTRODUCTION AND COMMENTARY

вч

JOSEPH B. MAYOR, M.A.,

TOGETHER WITH

A NEW COLLATION OF SEVERAL OF THE ENGLISH MSS.

By J. H. SWAINSON, M.A. FORMERLY FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

VOL. II.

Cambridge:

AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

1883

[The rights of translation and reproduction are reserved.]



#### PREFATORY NOTE.

In the Preface to my former volume I expressed a hope that the remaining volume might be completed for publication before the end of the year 1881. This hope has been disappointed partly owing to the labour of expanding into a separate work the Sketch of Ancient Philosophy, which formed part of the Introduction to the First Book, and partly from the unforeseen difficulties which I have encountered in the endeavour to explain fully the scientific views of the Ancients, as they are reported by Cicero in his Second Book. The consequent increase in the size of the Commentary has made it necessary to devote a whole volume to this Book, and the publication of the third and last Book must still be deferred to another year.

In the present volume I have been enabled to improve on the Apparatus Criticus of my former volume, owing to the kindness of the authorities of Merton College, Oxford, in lending me their valuable Codex (Oxf. o, here denoted simply as Oxf.) written in the 12th century. It is older than any other English Ms



vi

#### PREFATORY NOTE.

of the De Natura Deorum with the exception of the fragmentary Harleian no. 2622 (K), and is closely allied with the oldest of all the Mss, the Vienna Codex of the 10th century (v). I have inserted a full collation of the Merton Codex amongst Mr Swainson's Collations of English Mss, showing such a remarkable resemblance between it and v, that the one might easily be supposed to have been copied from the other.

As regards the Commentary I have again to thank Mr H. J. Roby and my brother, the Cambridge Professor of Latin, both for their careful criticisms of my own work and for the notes to which their initials are attached. I have also to thank Prof. W. G. Adams of King's College, and my kind neighbours Dr Woolley and Dr Henry Kane, for allowing me to consult them in regard to physical, astronomical or physiological difficulties. We are greatly in want of good books in English on the history of Ancient Science, especially of Astronomy, which occupies so large a space in this portion of Cicero's treatise. The best known English work on the subject, that by Sir G. C. Lewis, is utterly unmethodical, a mere collection of unconnected essays; while the famous French history of Delambre consists mainly of analyses of particular treatises, and is too technical for ordinary readers, not to mention its occasional carelessness in points of detail, of which an example may be seen in the account of Posidonius cited in my note on § 92 multis partibus. Schaubach's Geschichte der griechischen Astronomie is more



#### PREFATORY NOTE.

vii

helpful to a scholar, but unfortunately it only comes down to Eratosthenes; and Rudolf Wolf in his excellent *Geschichte der Astronomie* is only able to allow a limited space to the Astronomy of the Ancients.

While I have been engaged in the study of the scientific writings of the Old World, it has often occurred to me to deplore the neglect into which they have fallen amongst ourselves. The early guesses of Greek science exhibit in a most interesting way the development of the human mind, and they are so closely connected with the philosophy of their time, that it is scarcely possible to form a right estimate of the one without knowing something of the other. Why might not Cambridge, which has now admitted into her final classical school the Art, Philosophy, History and Law of the Ancients, add to these also the Science of the Ancients as a new alternative subject? It would be easy to have examinations in Mathematical and Biological Science in alternate years; and, if in one vear students were asked to bring up for examination specified treatises of such authors as Euclid, Archimedes, Geminus and Ptolemy, and in another year portions of Aristotle, Theophrastus, Pliny and Galen, particularly the De Usu Partium of the last, I think it would not only call attention to some very excellent and much neglected writings, but also provide a useful link between our literary and our scientific education.



#### TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Introduction:			PAGE
(1) Analysis of Book II			xi—xv
(2) Sources of Book II.			xvi—xxii
Text of Book II. with Critical Notes			1—64
Commentary on Book II			65—292
Mr. Sweinger's Colletions of Pools II			202 210

M. C. II. b



#### INTRODUCTION.

#### ANALYSIS OF BOOK II.

Introduction, ch. 1 § 1—3.

- A. Proof of the Divine Existence, ch. 11 § 4—ch. XVI § 44.
- B. The Divine Nature, ch. XVII § 45—ch. XXVIII § 72.
- C. Providential Government of the Universe, ch. xxix § 73—ch. lxi. § 153.
  - D. Providential Care for Man, ch. LXII § 154—LXVI § 167.
- A. The Divine Existence proved (a) from the observation of the heavens, (b) from general consent, (c) from various recorded epiphanies, (d) from the fact of divination. §§ 4-12.
- Ab. Further explained. Cleanthes derives the consensus of belief from four causes, (1) presentiments of the future (i.e. divination just treated of), (2) the blessings of life, (3) terrible and unusual phenomena of nature, (4) the order of the heavenly bodies (treated of under a). §§ 13—15.
- Ae. Argument of Chrysippus: (1) the universe shows the operation of superhuman, i.e. of divine power; (2) the universe is too beautiful to be the habitation of man alone, it implies a superhuman inhabitant. §§ 16, 17.
- Af. Man inhabits the lowest region of the universe; the pure ether of the higher regions is fitted for nobler inhabitants. § 17.
- Ag. Still even man is gifted with reason, and this, like the grosser elements of which his body is composed, must be derived from the universe, as its source. § 18.
- Ah. The universe being perfect must contain that which is essential to perfection, viz. mind. § 18.

b 2



xii

#### INTRODUCTION.

- Ai. The sympathy which unites all the parts of the universe shows that they are pervaded by one Divine Spirit. §§ 19, 20.
- Ak. Zeno's argument for the divinity of the universe (and therefore indirectly for the Divine Existence, since the universe exists). (1) What has reason is better than what has not reason, therefore the universe, as the best of things, must possess reason: similarly it may be proved to be wise, blessed, eternal, and therefore God. (2) The universe must be sentient because it has sentient parts. (3) It must be rational because it gives birth to what is rational. §§ 20—22.
- Al. Physical argument for divine existence: (1) heat is the cause of motion and of life; the whole universe is pervaded by heat; in heat we find the governing principle  $(\eta \gamma \epsilon \mu o \nu \iota \kappa \acute{o} \nu)$  of the universe: therefore it must have in the highest degree that reason which is found even in the inferior parts of the universe. §§ 23—30. (2) The mundane heat is far purer than our earthly heat, therefore it must possess the properties of heat in a far higher degree; and it acts freely without any coercion from without. §§ 30, 31. (3) What is self-moved is soul: the mundane heat is self-moved, and therefore of the nature of soul. (4) If the universe were not possessed of reason, the whole would be inferior to the part which is possessed of reason, which is absurd. § 32.
- Argument from the Scale of Existence. (1) We observe the gradual ascent from vegetable to animal life, from animal to human, the last showing the potentiality of virtue and wisdom: hence we infer a yet higher stage, the divine, which is essentially and always virtuous and wise. §§ 33, 34. (2) All things are striving after perfection, but in the case of the lower limited natures, this tendency cannot fulfil itself: in universal nature it can. § 35. (3) Since it is confessed that the universe is the best of all things, it cannot be limited to vegetable or animal or merely human existence. It must be actually and essentially wise and good (and therefore divine): for a potentiality which has never risen into actuality throughout eternity would be inferior to that of man. § 36. (4) Man is born to contemplate and imitate the universe to which The universe alone is perfect and its own end. It must therefore be possessed of what is best, viz. reason. § 37. (5) Ideal excellence can only be found in that which is complete in all its



#### ANALYSIS OF BOOK II.

xiii

parts; the universe alone is absolutely complete; therefore the absolute Ideal can only be found in the universe. § 38.

An. The heavenly bodies also are divine: (1) because they are composed of the purest ether corresponding to our vital heat. §§ 39—41. (2) Since each of the lower elements, earth, water, air, has its living occupant, it is probable that it is so too with the highest element, ether: and since the nature of the animal depends upon the element in which it lives, it is probable that those which live in the purest and most active element will possess the keenest and purest intelligence. §§ 42, 43. (3) The intelligence of the stars is shown by their orderly movements, which proceed not from nature or chance, but from their own free-will. §§ 43, 44.

#### B. The Divine Nature. §§ 45—72.

Ba. The divine form, as it is seen in the beings already recognised as divine, viz. the universe and the heavenly bodies. §§ 45—49.

- (1) The populace and the Epicureans wrongly hold that God is in the form of man. §§ 45, 46. (2) The sphere is the most perfect of solids, and circular revolution is the most perfect of movements, and this is the form and this the movement of the universe and the stars. §§ 47—49.
- Bb. The divine activity, as shown in the movements and the operations of the heavenly bodies, of the sun (1), of the moon (2), of the planets (3), of the fixed stars and the heaven itself (4). §§ 49—57.
- Bc. The divinity of nature shown in its creative and artistic, as well as in its providential activity. §§ 57, 58.
- Bd. The Gods of the popular religion are either names for benefits received from the Gods (1), or personified virtues and passions (2), or the spirits of departed benefactors (3), or personified forces of nature (4). §§ 60—70.
- Be. One divine Being is to be worshipped under these various forms in holiness and purity, avoiding all superstition. §§ 71, 72.
  - C. Providential government of the universe. §§ 73—153.
- Ca. Introductory. The sneers of Epicurus are grounded in ignorance (1). Division of subject (2). §§ 73—75.



xiv

#### INTRODUCTION.

Cb. Providential government inferred from a consideration of the Divine nature: (1) It is a part of our idea of God that he should be active, and active in the noblest way, and consequently in regard to the noblest object, i.e. the universe: (2) if he is not so, then he must be inferior to some other power which rules the universe; but such inferiority contradicts the very definition of Deity; therefore he cannot be subject to any other power; therefore he must rule the universe himself: (3) the Gods form a community, and it is natural to suppose that they possess those same social virtues, which we believe that we have derived from them; but that they possess them in higher perfection and manifest them on a vaster scale in the great city of the universe: (4) when we confess the benevolent wisdom displayed in the universe and the heavenly bodies and agree that these are divine, we confess that all things are ordered by divine Providence. §§ 76-80.

Providential government inferred from the consideration of the universe itself as embodying an intelligent principle first imparted to it by a creative energy. (1) Meaning of the term 'nature.' (2) The universe is a vast organism permeated and controlled by an intelligent nature, all the parts of which co-operate for the good of (3) The fact that all the parts, of which the universe is composed, are combined as is best for beauty and utility, can only be explained as the result of intelligence. Nature exhibits a skill infinitely beyond the reach of art, but even art testifies to the existence and intelligence of the artist. If the orrery attests the wisdom of Archimedes, much more must the movements of the heavenly bodies attest the wisdom of the Creator. (4) The absurdity of attempting to explain the universe as the result of the fortuitous concourse of atoms. (5) Custom blinds men, or they could not fail to acknowledge that the wonders of nature are the works of God. §§ 81—98.

Cd. A detailed review of the wonders of nature. (1) The earth and other elements. §§ 98—101. (2) The sun, moon, and planets. §§ 102, 103. (3) The constellations. §§ 104—115. (4) The several parts of the universe are held together by a strong centripetal force, which is the cause of warmth and light to all things, and out of which all are developed anew in the cyclical regeneration. §§ 115—118. (5) Thus there is a harmony and sympathy between the remotest parts of the universe, and our earth is benefited by a stellar



#### ANALYSIS OF BOOK II.

xv

influence. § 119. (6) Wonders of vegetable life. § 120. (7) Wonders of animal life. §§ 121-129.

- a. General adaptation of animal nature for the preservation of the individual. §§ 121—123.
- $\beta$ . Special adaptations in particular cases for the same purpose. §§ 123—127.
- γ. Adaptations of animal nature to ensure the preservation of the species. §§ 128, 129.
- $\delta$ . Adaptations of external nature to meet the wants of plants and animals. §§ 130—132.
- (8) The hand of Providence is most plainly visible in man. §§ 133—153.
- a. In the provision made for supporting his life by food and air. §§ 134—138.
- $\beta$ . In the framework of his body and his erect position. §§ 139, 140.
  - γ. In the organs of sense. §§ 140—146.
  - δ. In the gift of reason. §§ 147, 148.
- ε. In the gift of speech through the wondrous mechanism of the vocal organs. §§ 148, 149.
- $\zeta.$  In the capacity for action through the mechanism of the hand. §§ 150—152.
  - η. In the capacity for meditation and worship. § 153.
  - D. Providential care for man. §§ 154—167.
  - Da. Whatever tends to man's good was designed for him. § 154.
- Db. The universe exists for the sake of its rational inhabitants, viz. Gods and men. § 155.
- Dc. We may see this in the heavenly bodies, which, besides their general use for the preservation of the universe, afford also a beautiful and instructive spectacle to man, and man alone of animals. § 155.
- Dd. The vegetable kingdom exists for his sake, as plainly as the harp for the sake of the harpist; many of its products can only be utilized by his labour and skill, and only appreciated by his finer sense. §§ 156—158.
  - De. Even the animals are created for him, to clothe him, guard



xvi

#### INTRODUCTION.

him, feed him, carry him, draw for him, exercise his strength and courage. §§ 158--161.

- Df. So the inorganic world needs the labour of man to provide what is useful to him and him alone. §§ 161, 162.
  - Dg. Divination is the exclusive possession of man. §§ 162, 163.
  - Dh. Cumulative force of these proofs. § 163.
- Di. The care of the Gods extends to individual men. From them each man receives wisdom and virtue. §§ 164—167.
- Dk. External misfortune is no sign of the Divine wrath or neglect: to the philosopher all things turn out for good. § 167.

Conclusion. § 168.

### ON THE SOURCES OF THE SECOND BOOK OF THE DE NATURA DEORUM.

In discussing the sources of the First Book we have seen what was Cicero's method in the composition of his philosophical treatises. They are adaptations from Greek originals; and, as the comparison of the περί ἐνσεβείας of Philodemus has shown us, Cicero borrows not only the topics and arguments, but even the quotations of the author whom he follows. We need not therefore suppose with Teuffel (Hist. of Rom. Lit. § 173. 10, ed. 1) that, because Cicero quotes from Aristotle, Zeno, Cleanthes, and Chrysippus, in the course of his Second Book, he had himself studied the writings of these philosophers with a view to its composition. It is much more probable that he is following in the steps of some later writer or writers, and using the quotations which he found there ready to hand. we ask who is the writer whom Cicero is most likely to have followed, the answer is undoubtedly-Posidonius, who is referred to in 1 123 as familiaris omnium nostrum, and whose treatise 'on the Nature of the Gods,' there cited, has been shown to be the probable authority for the criticism of the Epicurean system, contained in the latter half of Bk. I (cf. Introduction, vol. I, p. lii foll.). This supposition is confirmed by the fact that the treatises which immediately preceded and followed the present, viz. the Tusculan Disputations and the De Divinatione (not to mention other writings of Cicero) are in great part taken from Posidonius; see, for the former, Heine De font. Tusc. Disp. Weimar 1863, P. Corssen De Posidonio Rhodio.



#### SOURCES OF THE SECOND BOOK.

xvii

Bonn 1878, and, for the latter, Schiche De font. lib. de Divinatione, Jena 1875, Hartfelder Die Quellen v. Ciceros 'de Divinatione,' Freiburg 1878. But the strongest argument for the Posidonian authorship of the original which Cicero here follows, is to be found in an examination of the book itself, in the agreement between the opinions there expressed, and opinions elsewhere attributed to Posidonius, sometimes in opposition to, or in contra-distinction from, other writers of his school.

The main points of distinction between Posidonius and the Stoics in general appear to have been (1) his easy and flowing style and general literary tastes, (2) his wide scientific interest, (3) his admiration for Plato and Aristotle, and his modification of the older Stoic doctrines so as to bring them more into accordance with the Academic and Peripatetic doctrines. As to (1) we are told by Strabo III 2, § 9 Ποσειδώνιος οὐκ ἀπέχεται τῆς συνηθοῦς ἡητορείας, ἀλλὰ συνενθουσιά ταις ύπερβολαις, which agrees with what we read in § 20 of our book, haec cum uberius disputantur et fusius, ut mihi est in animo facere, facilius effugiunt Academicorum calumniam; so Galen tells us (Hipp. et Plat. p. 399 K.) that Posidonius was in the habit of relieving his philosophical discussions with illustrations from the poets and historians, which again is quite in accordance with the speech of Balbus; compare, for historical illustration, & 6-11 on divination, § 61 on apotheosis, § 69 on the office of Lucina, § 165 on particular providences; for poetical quotations compare § 4 and § 65 from Ennius on the divinity of the heavens; from Euripides on the same subject § 65; from Attius, illustrating the theistic argument from the impression produced by the sight of the first ship § 89; from Aratus describing the constellations §§ 104-114; from Aratus again on the Golden Age § 159. We need not suppose that all these exactly correspond to quotations in the original. Cicero has no doubt given at times examples from Roman history instead of Greek history; and Posidonius had not Cicero's temptation to tax the attention of his readers with long quotations from Aratus. It may be said however that, whatever his authority, Cicero's natural taste would have led him to rhetorical treatment of his subject: and this is certainly true. On the other hand, it must be remembered that community of taste would naturally lead him to select Posidonius in preference to other Stoics. I do not however lay so much stress on this point as on those which I have next to deal with.



xviii

#### INTRODUCTION.

It is evident that the subject of Natural Theology is one which requires for its treatment a wide acquaintance with science; and in point of fact we find this book of Cicero's dealing more or less with almost all the sciences known to the ancients, from the most general physical speculations down to particular theories of geometry and astronomy and the various sciences of observation, such as geography, botany, zoology, anatomy, anthropology, and sociology. Now we know that Posidonius was generally regarded as the most learned and most scientific of all the Stoic philosophers; thus Galen, who quotes him largely on questions relating to human physiology and psychology, calls him ο επιστημονικώτατος των Στωικών διά τὸ γεγυμνάσθαι κατά γεωμετρίαν (Hipp. et Plat. p. 652 K.); Cleomedes confesses that he compiled his treatise on Astronomy principally from his writings (Cleom. 11 7 τὰ πολλὰ τῶν εἰρημένων ἐκ τῶν τοῦ Ποσειδωνίου εἰλήπται), and Strabo, who often cites him in his Geography, speaks of him as ἀνὴρ τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς φιλοσόφων πολυμαθέστατος (Str. XVI 2 § 10). I shall proceed to show in detail that, as far as we are able to test the matter, there is a remarkable agreement between the scientific views of Posidonius and those put forward in this book. First as to Astronomy, which occupies the most prominent place in the argument, Cicero refers expressly to the orrery of Posidonius (§ 88), as illustrating and justifying the process by which we infer the existence of a superintending mind from the observation of the movements of the heavenly bodies. What Cicero says of the constitution of the sun and planets, and of their being nourished by terrestrial vapours, is in accordance with what we are told of the views of Posidonius (see §§ 39, 40, 118 with the notes). Cicero tells us that the sun is many times larger than the earth (§ 92), that the moon is rather more than half the size of the earth (§ 103), that Venus and Mercury are between the earth and the sun (§ 52), all this agrees with what we read in Cleomedes, sometimes with the express addition that he is quoting from Posidonius, while it is inconsistent with the views of the older Stoics. The same agreement is to be found in regard to the properties of the sphere and its peculiar mobility (§ 48), the stability of the universe and the question as to the Cyclic Conflagration, on which Posidonius appears to have expressed himself as doubtfully as Cicero (§§ 85, 115, 118). Lunar influence again (§§ 19, 50, 119) was a favourite study of Posidonius. He was the first to establish the true theory of the tides (see nn. on §§ 19, 132), the inquiry into which was stigmatized



#### SOURCES OF THE SECOND BOOK.

xix

by the elder Stoics as frivolous and unworthy the attention of a philosopher. Like Cicero, he contrasted the denser atmosphere immediately surrounding the earth with the fine ether, which filled the upper regions of the universe (§ 17), he described the inhabited world as an island surrounded by the ocean (§ 165), and, as we learn from Seneca, he paid particular attention to the phenomena of volcanos (§ 96). Both Strabo and Galen refer to him as the chief writer on the influence of the climate of a country upon the mental and moral constitution of its inhabitants (§§ 17, 42); and Galen tells us he laid great stress on the use of diet for controlling the irrational elements of the mind (§ 42). For here too Posidonius differed from the older Stoics: he recognized an irrational element in man's nature, softening down the broad demarcation drawn by Chrysippus between the different kingdoms of nature, and adopted Aristotle's view, that each higher function of the soul involves the lower, so that all the functions are found combined with rationality in man (§§ 33, 34, 85); while certain plants make an approach towards animal life (§ 120), and animals towards human life (§ 29). The rational soul is not only an emanation from Deity (§ 17), but it is itself eternal, not, as the older Stoics believed, doomed to perish in the Cyclical Conflagration (§ 62). On the origin of civilization Cicero's view (§§ 148, 150) is in complete accordance with what Seneca tells us of Posidonius (Ep. 92). Both rationalize the old belief in a Golden Age (§ 159), and attribute the early inventions of mankind to philosophic lawgivers and kings. Even Cicero's patriotic eulogy of Roman piety is not without a parallel in Posidonius (§ 8).

I go on now to the 3rd point mentioned above, the admiration shown for the writings of Plato and Aristotle. In my note on § 32 I have pointed out that Cicero's deus philosophorum, applied to the former, may be matched from the fragments of Posidonius, while it is quite opposed to the language of the older Stoics. So Aristotle is praised in § 95 and § 125; and the notes on §§ 13, 17, 26 (spontaneous generation), 33 (scale of existence), 34 (union of higher and lower functions in man), 36 (movement of all things towards perfection), 42 (each element has inhabitants corresponding to it), 43 (nature, chance and freewill), 44 (voluntary movement of stars), 51 (the Great Year), 56 (opposition of sublunary and superlunary regions), the fine passage about the cave-dwellers quoted from Aristotle's de philosophia § 95, the whole section on zoology §§ 121—



XX INTRODUCTION.

129, much of the section on anatomy §§ 134—146, show how largely the author whom Cicero follows was influenced by Aristotle. No doubt this is true generally of the Stoic school, but the views put forward in some of the above-cited passages are opposed to those of the older Stoics, and may with much probability be attributed to Posidonius, of whom Strabo says (II 3 § 8) πολὺ γάρ ἐστι τὸ αἰτιολογικὸν παρ' αὐτῷ καὶ τὸ ἀριστοτελίζον.

The next point for consideration is whether we have any grounds for supposing that the treatise of Posidonius, quoted in I 123, would deal with the same topics as Cicero's similarly named work. Schwencke (Jahrb. f. class. Philol. 1877 pp. 129-140) points out that in general the Stoics treated the question of the Existence and Nature of the Gods separately from that of the Providential Government of the World. Thus the  $\pi\epsilon\rho$ i  $\pi\rho$ oνοίας of Chrysippus is a distinct work from his  $\pi\epsilon\rho$ i  $\theta\epsilon\hat{\omega}\nu$ , and Diogenes Laertius mentions them in different parts of his 7th book, the former in c. 138, the latter in c. But of Posidonius, and of him alone, we are told that he treated of both subjects under the title of  $\pi \epsilon \rho \lambda \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu$  (Diog. l.c.). His treatise consisted of five books, in the 1st of which he maintained the divinity of the heaven and the universe, in the 3rd (so Cobet, not 13th as in Hübner's ed.) argued in favour of the providential government of the world, while in the 5th he confuted the Epicurean doctrine (N. D. 1 123). It seems not improbable therefore that, as Schwencke suggests, the first four books of Posidonius may have corresponded with the quadruple division with which Cicero commences his second book.

One other slight indication of the author may be found in § 165, where Rhodes is put on a level with Rome, Athens and Sparta, see Mr Roby's note on the passage. As Panaetius was born at Rhodes, while Posidonius resided there for the greater part of his life, this might at first sight appear to be equally in favour of either authorship, but there can be little doubt that such an allusion is more natural in the mouth of one who, like Posidonius, presided over the University of Rhodes and took a leading part in its politics, than of one who spent the active years of his life in Athens and in Rome and never returned to his native land after he had once left it (Cic. Tusc. v 107).

I think that the various considerations adduced above leave little doubt as to the Posidonian authorship of Cicero's treatise, but there are some facts which appear to militate against this and which have



#### SOURCES OF THE SECOND BOOK.

induced Hirzel (Untersuchungen zu Cicero's philosophischen Schriften I 191-244) to assign a number of different authorities for the different parts of Cicero's book. In the first place Cicero writes to Atticus (Att. XIII 8) in June 45 B.C., the year before the N.D. appeared, asking for an epitome of the writings of Caelius by Brutus, and for Panaetius  $\pi \epsilon \rho i \pi \rho o \nu o i as$ . Must we not suppose that he asked for them with the intention of using them for the book which he was then preparing, especially as we find that he quotes from Caelius in § 8, and as he chose Panaetius as his authority in the first two books of the De Officiis? Much that has been said in favour of the claims of Posidonius is also applicable to Panaetius. He wrote a good style, was an admirer of Plato and Aristotle, and departed on many points from the rigid dogmatism of the older Stoics. We are not told however that he paid much attention to science, and there are certainly parts of this second book which could not possibly have been derived from him. For instance Divination is defended in §§ 7-12 and again in 162, 163, but we know from Cicero himself Div. 1 12, 11 88, 97, as well as from other writers (see Zeller IV p. 567), that Panaetius was a disbeliever in divination; Schiche and Hartfelder even suppose his treatise  $\pi \epsilon \rho i \pi \rho ovoias$  to have been the authority used by Cicero for the second book of his de divinatione, in which the negative side is supported. Again the immortality, or rather the eternity of the soul is maintained in § 62, but, as we see from the Tusculans (1 42, 78), this was entirely rejected by Panaetius. Also the manner in which his opinion in regard to the Cyclic Conflagration is referred to is inconsistent with the idea that Cicero could have been there copying from him. Still there is the fact that Cicero was studying his  $\pi \epsilon \rho i \pi \rho o \nu o i as$  at the time when he was engaged on his own book on the subject. But so also he was studying Phaedrus  $\pi \epsilon \rho i \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu$ , when writing about the Epicurean theology, and yet we have seen reason to believe that his authority for that portion of his treatise was not Phaedrus, but Zeno, see vol. 1 p. xliv foll. If Cicero used Panaetius for his treatise on Divination, which is merely a sequel to the N. D., this would be quite sufficient explanation for his request to Atticus, but he may also have thought of getting further material either for his exposition or for his criticism of the Stoic doctrine on Providence. Hirzel however is of opinion that the second book shows signs of having been compiled from different sources, and that while one part is taken from Posidonius, another part is from Apollo-

xxi



xxii

#### INTRODUCTION.

dorus and a 3rd from Panaetius. In order to see what grounds there are for this opinion we must examine more minutely the structure of the book. It is divided, as shown in the analysis, into four parts (1) the proof of the Divine Existence, (2) the nature of the Gods, (3) Providential government of the world, (4) Providential care for man. But the slightest examination is sufficient to show that these divisions overlap, that much for instance of the 1st section, e.g. Zeno's argument for the divinity of the universe (§§ 20-22) and the argument for the divinity of the stars (§§ 39-44), would more naturally come under the 2nd, and much of the 3rd, e.g. §§ 133— 153 might just as well come under the 4th. Moreover there are actual repetitions, as on the divinity of the stars (§§ 54, 55 compared with §§ 39-44); and we seem to have a double beginning for the 4th section (in § 133 facilius intellegetur a dis immortalibus esse provisum &c. and 153 restat ut doceam omnia hominum causa facta esse), which has misled, as I think, both Hirzel and Schwencke to commence the 4th section at § 133. It appears to me however that these difficulties arise mainly from want of care, on the part of Cicero. in marking the transitions from one part of his argument to another, and particularly, as Schwencke remarks, where he has to supply short connecting links in place of omissions. It is possible also that Posidonius may have given short summaries of the preceding argument at the commencement of each book, which Cicero may have mixed up with the substance of the book itself. The general framework, as seen in the analysis, seems to me to hold well together, if (1) we allow the use of the indirect argument for the Divine Existence in the latter half of the 1st section, (we have many instances of this indirect argument in the 9th book of Sextus Empiricus, which is evidently closely related to our own, cf. n. on Ak § 20); (2) if we remember that the question proposed for examination in the 2nd section is not 'who are Gods', but 'of what nature the Gods are', (quales sint corpore animo vita, as we read 165); and (3) if we admit that in the nature and constitution of man we may see a proof of a creative intelligence (which would naturally fall under the 3rd section) apart from the question whether the welfare of man is the chief end designed in the creation and government of the world (which is the subject of the 4th section). The particular points in which Hirzel endeavours to show a disagreement between Cicero and Posidonius are, I think, all cleared up by Schwencke, who has also no



#### SOURCES OF THE SECOND BOOK.

xxiii

difficulty in refuting the rather wild suggestion that the 2nd section is derived from Apollodorus, as being the chief writer on the interpretation of myths.

My notes show a distinct connexion between this book of the N. D. and the 9th book of Sextus Empiricus on the one hand and the treatises de Providentia of Philo and Theodoret on the other. I am not aware whether there has been any careful investigation of the sources of these books, but I should conclude that they were, in part at least, taken either from Posidonius directly or from writers who had copied from him.

<sup>1</sup> Compare particularly the quotation from Xenophon in § 18 with Sext. IX 92, that from Aristotle § 95 with Sextus IX 20, the comparison of the movements of the heavenly bodies to the movements of an army or a ship in §§ 85, 87, 89, with Sext. IX 26, 78; and the reference to the orrery in § 88 with Sextus IX 114.