

Cambridge University Press

978-1-316-61249-1 - M. Tulli Ciceronis: De Finibus Bonorum Et Malorum Libri I, II

J. S. Reid

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

---

M. TVLLI CICERONIS  
DE FINIBVS BONORVM  
ET MALORVM  
LIBRI I, II

Cambridge University Press

978-1-316-61249-1 - M. Tulli Ciceronis: De Finibus Bonorum Et Malorum Libri I, II

J. S. Reid

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

---

Cambridge University Press

978-1-316-61249-1 - M. Tulli Ciceronis: De Finibus Bonorum Et Malorum Libri I, II

J. S. Reid

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

M. TVLLI CICERONIS  
DE FINIBVS BONORVM  
ET MALORVM

LIBRI I, II

EDITED BY

J. S. REID, LITT. D.

FELLOW OF CONVILLE AND CAIUS COLLEGE  
AND FORMERLY PROFESSOR OF ANCIENT  
HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY  
OF CAMBRIDGE



CAMBRIDGE  
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

1925

Cambridge University Press

978-1-316-61249-1 - M. Tulli Ciceronis: De Finibus Bonorum Et Malorum Libri I, II

J. S. Reid

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

**CAMBRIDGE**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

[www.cambridge.org](http://www.cambridge.org)

Information on this title: [www.cambridge.org/9781316612491](http://www.cambridge.org/9781316612491)

© Cambridge University Press 1925

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1925

First paperback edition 2016

*A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library*

ISBN 978-1-316-61249-1 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

## PREFACE

WHEN many treasures of Latin literature were re-discovered at the opening of the Renaissance period, no Latin writer aroused so much interest and enthusiasm as Cicero. Before the end of the fifteenth century many editions of his works had appeared. The labours of the great early scholars bore more fruit for the study of Greek than of Latin literature<sup>1</sup>. Increased attention to Latin, and especially to the Latin of Cicero, was promoted by Erasmus. An important date in the history of Latin scholarship is 1566, when the complete edition of Cicero's works by Lambinus was published. Lambinus had perhaps a more intimate knowledge of Latin usage than any scholar who lived before Madvig. In the *Onomasticon Tullianum*, published by Orelli and Baiter in 1836, is reprinted a life of Lambinus by P. Lazzeri (a learned Jesuit who was Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Rome and was protected in that post by Cardinal Zelada when the Jesuit Order was dissolved, but resigned his Chair and accepted the post of Librarian to the Cardinal, his protector), in which are reproduced many statements of Lambinus himself concerning his own life and works. He died in 1572 at the age of 52. His death is stated to have been due to terror inspired by the massacre of St Bartholomew's day. His friend, Petrus Ramus, who was his colleague as Professor in the Collège de France, was one of the victims. Ramus had been persecuted during the preceding years for his conversion to Protestantism. Lambinus feared to share his fate, and the horror inspired by the massacre is said to have been the cause of his death.

By far the greatest exponent of Ciceronian Latinity who has appeared since the time of Lambinus is J. N. Madvig, whose *magnum opus* was his edition of the *De Finibus*. An admirable account of his life and work is given by Sir John Sandys, in his *History of Scholarship*, III, 319–323. To appreciate fully the services which Madvig rendered to Latin studies, it is necessary to understand the low estate of those studies when he began his career. Readers of his commentary on the *De Finibus* are sometimes repelled by his continual denunciations of "Goerenzius"

<sup>1</sup> See a quotation from Erasmus in Sandys' *History of Scholarship*, vol. II, p. 125.

or “Gzius,” who intrudes as perpetually as King Charles’ head intruded on everything that Mr Dick tried to write. This Goerenz was reputed in Germany to be the best Latin scholar of his day. He was born in 1767 at Fürstenwalde in Saxony. He studied at Meissen and at the University of Halle, in which University he was made (1792) “Adjunct” Professor. Later (1795), he was placed at the head of the Gymnasium at Plauen, the capital of the Vogtland. A little later (1800) he was made rector of the Lyceum at Zwickau, a town about 80 miles from Dresden, in the great manufacturing region of which Chemnitz is the chief place, and was called in 1817 to Schwerin as Director of the Gymnasium (afterwards styled Fredericianum) where he died in 1836, having retired in 1833 owing to ill-health. There is some evidence to show that Goerenz was really successful as a school-master. Success in teaching has often been obtained on a small modicum of scholarship, and has frequently led to an excessive estimate of the schoolmaster’s learning. Herein seems to lie the secret of the reputation which Goerenz enjoyed. An article on him written by a good scholar, F. W. Döring, praises Goerenz as possessing all the highest qualities of the man of learning.

The Manuscripts on which the text of Madvig rests were all carefully described by him in his preface. He benefited much by the labours of Orelli and Baiter. A fresh and independent examination of the text was given in the Teubner edition of Cicero’s works, by C. F. W. Müller. Where the two texts of Madvig (in the latest edition) and Müller agree, I have accepted their readings excepting in a few passages, which are indicated in my critical notes. Comments which I wished to make on the text have generally been incorporated with the explanatory notes, a convenient plan since general Latin usage or Ciceronian Latin usage in very many cases must be the ground of decision between various readings. Müller has accepted the views of Madvig as to the relative value of the principal sources for the text. The two “Palatine” mss. (A and B) are of the first importance. There are corrections in A by a second hand. The effect of A<sup>2</sup> is usually to bring the reading nearer to that of B, but the corrections were not derived from B. A is defective, ending at the 16th section of the fourth book. The third fundamental ms. is one in the library at Erlangen (E) which is usually in close agreement with

## PREFACE

vii

B, and on the whole the agreement of ABE is very marked. BE are less trustworthy than A where the order of the words is concerned, and in orthography B is inferior to A; thus *his* is without exception in B written as *hys*, an indication that in the MS. from which B was copied, *hiis*, derived from *iis*, was written for *his*.

Madvig demonstrated that all known MSS. of the *De Finibus* descend from an original which was far enough removed from the age of Cicero to have become already corrupt in many places. The derivation of existing MSS. from this *archetypus* is not in one and the same line of descent.

Among MSS. other than ABE, a certain Paris MS. (n. 6331) receives some attention from Madvig. The collation of this *codex* made by Nigoles, and published in the *Revue de Philologie* for 1880, is more accurate than those previously made, and where I have had occasion to refer to P, I have followed Nigoles.

On the general character of the philosophical writings of Cicero I have written at length in the Introduction to my edition of the *Academica*, to which I will only refer, so far as this topic is concerned. The references in Cicero's letters to the writing of the *De Finibus* are also discussed in that Introduction (pp. 30, 31). I have only to add one or two remarks. The question raised about Tubulus and Scaevola in *Att.* 12, 5, 3 (written on June 11 or 12 in the year 45) has some connexion with the *De Finibus*, 2, 54.

As to the Greek sources of Books I and II there has been much debate. The most natural suggestion is the one that has been most frequently made, viz. that Cicero used a work of Antiochus of Ascalon; for whom see the passages in my edition of the *Academica* which are indicated in the Index, s. v. Antiochus. I must protest against the assumption, which has been often made, that Cicero had no first-hand knowledge of the writings of Epicurus. The hypothesis that he resorted to some Greek to give him an epitome of the Epicurean philosophy for the purposes of the *De Finibus* is in no way demonstrable, nor is it even probable. A judgment on this issue must depend mainly on a comparison of Cicero's statements with those in other ancient sources referring to the same topics, and this I have endeavoured to make in the course of my commentary. Usener in the Preface, pp. lxx sq., of his great work entitled *Epicurea* (Leipzig, 1887), passes a severe judgment on Cicero's use of his Greek

originals, with the exception of those belonging to the Academic School. Of this side of Cicero's philosophical writing he writes thus: "Longe alium sibi que parem Tullium in eis librorum partibus observas, ubi Academici personam induit. hic eleganter acuteque disertum, hic facetum, hic scriptorem videas scribendo delectatum sibi que merito placentem. hic denique eruditio quoque emicat non vulgaris."

I must defend Cicero from one attack made upon him by one of the greatest scholars of our time, whom I admire with all the world. In the Introduction to his great and most important work entitled *Doxographi Graeci*, Diels repeatedly charges Cicero with tampering with his Greek originals. But his allegations concern only some passages in which enumerations of philosophers are given with very brief references to their doctrine. The assumption of Diels that the existing catalogues found in the *Doxographi* were the only ones from which Cicero might have drawn his information seems to me to be neither provable nor probable. In *Quellenforschung*, both historical and philosophical, it has been a common error to underestimate grossly the compass of the ancient literature which has disappeared. Certain severe strictures by Diels on the Latin expressions chosen by Cicero to represent the Greek are somewhat discounted by infelicities in the Latin written by the critic himself, who presents his readers with such things as "ambaginibus" and "praestavisse."

J. S. REID.

CAMBRIDGE  
18 August, 1923

I wish to express my sincere thanks to my friend, Dr Louis C. Purser, for the assistance he has kindly given in seeing the ms. of my edition of Cicero's *De Finibus* through the press, ill-health having prevented my doing so myself. My long association with Dr Purser in the furtherance of Ciceronian study has been a most valued experience of my life, and I feel much indebted to him for all the time and trouble which he has bestowed on the work.

I would also like to thank Mr A. D. Nock of Clare College, my friend and former pupil, for valuable help.

J. S. R.

CAMBRIDGE 1925