

MINUCIUS FELIX AND CYPRIAN: THE QUESTION OF PRIORITY

GEORGE L. CARVER

Arizona State University

Studies in the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix have concentrated mainly on the relationship between it and the *Apologeticum* of Tertullian. Comparatively little attention has been paid to the *terminus ante quem* of the *Octavius*. References to the *Octavius* by Lactantius in the *Divinae institutiones* furnish, as is well known, a *terminus ante quem* in the early fourth century.¹ Yet most scholars continue to believe that the *Octavius* was composed before Cyprian's earliest work, the *Ad Donatum*, and that Cyprian knew the *Octavius*. The work considered to offer the most convincing evidence for Cyprian's dependence on the *Octavius* was the *Quod idola dii non sint*. But in the last half century, fresh study of the *Quod idola*, especially by Diller, has increased doubts that always existed about its authenticity.² Clearly, it has ceased to determine the *Octavius'* relation to Cyprian. Beaujeu, in his introduction to the 1964 Budé edition of the *Octavius*, was the first scholar to attempt a serious study of that relationship based exclusively on parallel passages between the undoubtedly authentic works of Cyprian and the *Octavius*.³ In his view, the evidence proves the *Octavius* was a source for several works of Cyprian.

It is my conviction that Beaujeu's arguments are not sound and that a careful analysis of the parallels, however meager they are, gives solid

¹*Div. inst.* 1.11.55; 5.1.21-22.

²In his article "In Sachen Tertullian-Minucius Felix," *Philologus* 90 (1935) 98-114, H. Diller argues that the *Quod Idola* is the work of a plagiarist of the fourth century. He is supported by B. Axelson in "Quod idola und Laktanz," *Eranos* 39 (1941) 67-74. Favoring Cyprianic authorship of the *Quod Idola* are H. Koch, "Quod idola dii non sint: ein Werk Cyprians," in *Cyprianische Untersuchungen, Arbeiten zur Kirchengesch.* 4 (Bonn 1926) 1-78, and M. Simonetti in "Sulla paternità del 'Quod idola dii non sint'," *Maia* 3 (1950) 265-88. The standard works assign the *Quod idola* to Cyprian; see Quasten, *Patrology* II, 363-64; Altaner-Stuiber, *Patrology* 174. For a discussion of work on the authorship of the treatise, consult M. M. Sage, *Cyprian* (Cambridge, Mass., 1975) 373-75. This work will be referred to as "Sage."

³J. Beaujeu, *Minucius Felix: "Octavius"* (Paris 1964) LXVII-LXXIV. This work will henceforth be referred to as "Beaujeu."

evidence for Cyprian's priority. In discussing this, I shall limit the inquiry to the principal parallel passages, as Beaujeu does. I shall, however, reserve for another paper study of the genre of the *Ad Donatum*, whose *mise en scène* Beaujeu believes to imitate the *Octavius*.⁴

Beaujeu opens his discussion by tabulating parallels between several works of Cyprian and the *Octavius*, which he divides into two groups: seven designated as certain, and twelve as probable.⁵ This list must be reduced drastically. Several of the parallels classed as certain cannot be regarded as even probable, while most of the probable ones contain merely similar turns of phrase that could easily be fortuitous.⁶ Only one set of

⁴Beaujeu LXX–LXXII.

⁵Beaujeu LXIX.

⁶A detailed discussion of the passages listed by Beaujeu follows. Only those passages have been omitted which I have studied in the body of the article, i.e., *De bono pat.* 3/398.18~*Oct.* 38.6; *Ad Don.* 1/3.1 ff.~*Oct.* 2.3,4; *Ad Demetr.* 25/369.24~*Oct.* 1.4. The first five sets of parallel passages listed below are classified by Beaujeu as certain; the remainder, as probable. (1) *Ad Demetr.* 16/362.15~*Oct.* 17.2: the thought that men are distinguished from animals by erect posture and heavenward gaze is extremely common. Linguistic similarities do not distinguish these passages from similar ones, e.g., Ovid, *Met.* 1.84 f. (2) *De hab. virg.* 14/197.28 and *De lapsis* 12/245.11~*Oct.* 26.8: there are some similarities of language, mainly *a caelesti vigore*. Since the thought is a commonplace, more extensive and detailed parallels in language would be needed to substantiate the claim of certain dependence. (3) *Ad Demetr.* 15/361.18~*Oct.* 27.5: Beaujeu's references (15/341.18 and 27.4) must be in error. There are resemblances in verbal details, but the motifs of burning and torture in regard to exorcism should indicate caution in asserting dependence. (4) *De hab. virg.* 7/192.14~*Oct.* 36.4: the only verbal resemblances lie in *Deo dives est*. Since the sentiments, based on *Lk.* 12.21, are traditionally Christian, the assertion of dependence is not warranted. (5) *Epist.* 37.1/577.4~*Oct.* 37.1, 1.2: the parallels in *congregitur cum dolore* and *cum dolore congregitur* show the sort of minor transpositions we find in Minucius' borrowings, but much more would be needed to establish dependence. (6) *Ad Demetr.* 7/355.24~*Oct.* 5.13: the only verbal parallels lie in *grandine caeditur* and *grando caedens*. A more likely source is Philo, *De prov.* 1.37–56. See R. Reitzenstein, "Philologische Kleinigkeiten," *Hermes* 51 (1916) 610–15. (7) *Ad Don.* 2/4.10–13~*Oct.* 14.3–4: C. Becker in *Der Octavius des Minucius Felix* (SB Bayer 1967, 2) (Munich 1967) 6–10, 71–73, argues persuasively that major sections of the interlude (*Oct.* cc. 14, 15) are derived from Plato's *Phaedo* 89d, 90d. (Becker's work will henceforth be referred to as "Becker.") I see no significant resemblances in language in the alleged parallel passages. Rhetorical deceptions are an extremely common theme. (8) *De lapsis* 11/244.19~*Oct.* 16.5: the similarity lies in the idea that riches shackle a man, risky ground for asserting dependence. (9) *Ad Don.* 2/4.13–15~*Oct.* 16.6: the linguistic parallels are slight; the thought that eloquence falsifies speech is common. (10) *Ad Don.* 9/10.24, 25 (*O si et possis in illa sublimi specula constitutus oculos tuos inserere*)~*Oct.* 17.11 (*oculi in summo velut in specula constituti*): the verbal similarity may suggest dependence, but caution is needed especially here, since Cic. *Nat. D.* 2.140 also shows verbal parallels with *Oct.* 17.11 and the thought is commonplace. (11) *Ad Don.* 9/11.1~*Oct.* 28.10–11: Beaujeu LXXII argues that the former is a condensation of the latter. Since there are no similarities in language and homosexuality is a *topos*, dependence is impossible to prove. (12) *Ep.* 55.30/648.1~*Oct.* 36.2: the phrase *uberius ac/et plenius* is common to both passages, but is not at all unusual. Cf. Cypr. *Ep.* 63.8/707.12

parallels, in my opinion, gives signs of certain dependence: *De bono patientiae* 3/398.18 and *Octavius* 38.6.⁷ Two more sets, I believe, show strong probability of borrowing: *Ad Donatum* 1/3.1ff., and *Octavius* 2.3,4; *Ad Demetrianum* 25/369.24 and *Octavius* 1.4, which Beaujeu classes as probable and as certain, respectively. Less probability can be claimed for *Ad Donatum* 1/3.7 and *Octavius* 2.3 and for *Ad Donatum* 13/14.15–18 and *Octavius* 37.9.

As *De bono patientiae* 3 and *Octavius* 38.6 show unmistakable evidence of direct copying, their relationship deserves special attention. The relevant passages are as follows:

Nos non habitu sapientiam sed mente praeferimus, non eloquimur magna sed vivimus, gloriamur nos consecutos quod illi summa intentione quaesiverunt nec invenire potuerunt. (*Oct.* 38.6)⁸

nos autem, fratres dilectissimi, qui philosophi non verbis sed factis sumus, nec vestitu sapientiam sed veritate praeferimus, qui virtutum conscientiam magis quam iactantiam novimus, qui non loquimur magna sed vivimus, quasi servi et cultores Dei patientiam quam magisteriis caelestibus discimus obsequiis spiritalibus praebeamus. (*De bono patientiae* 3/398.18–23).⁹

(*plenius et uberius*), Tac. *Dial.* 18.2 (*plenior et uberior*), Caes. *BC* 1.53 (*pleniora* . . . *atque uberiora*). (13) *De lapsis* 2/237.20 (*spectaculum gloriosum praeuistis Deo*) ~ *Oct.* 37.1,1.1 (*Quam pulchrum spectaculum deo*). Similar language, though not so close, occurs in Sen. *De prov.* 2.9. The sentiment as applied to martyrdom is common in both Stoic and Christian works. (14) *Ad Don.* 13/14.15–18 (*tam ille timere cogitur quam timetur* . . . *sit licet* . . . *clausum ac protectum latus numero stipatore tueatur*) ~ *Oct.* 37.9 (*Set tam times quam timeris, et quamlibet sis multo comitatu stipatus, ad periculum tamen solus es*): the thought of fearing as much as being feared is proverbial; cf. Sen. *De ira* 2.11.3; *De clem.* 1.19.5; *Ep.* 14.10. But the linking of this idea with that of the uselessness of the throng of clients does seem unusual and may indicate probable dependence. (15) *Ad Don.* 3/5.14–16 ~ *Oct.* 37.10: Cyprian describes the rich man gleaming in purple garments, delighted by the fasces. Minucius speaks of glorying in the fasces and in purple garments. The concepts are of such a general nature and the resemblances in language so slight, that the assertion of dependence would, in my opinion, be unwarranted. (16) *Ad Don.* 8/10.2–4 ~ *Oct.* 37.12: both passages deal with the turpitude of theatrical pieces and the depiction of adultery. Detailed similarities in language are lacking. The lack of distinctive features in thought and language would preclude proof of dependence.

⁷Two scholars, who have written recently, generally agree with my contention that Beaujeu's list is grossly inflated and that *De bono patientiae* 3 and *Octavius* 38.6 show clear signs of dependence. They are Sage 56–58 and G. W. Clarke, *The Octavius of Marcus Minucius Felix* (New York and Paramus, N.J., 1974) 373, note 664. The latter work will be referred to as "Clarke."

⁸All references to the *Octavius* are taken from the Teubner edition of J. P. Waltzing, *M. Minucii Felicis Octavius* (Leipzig 1912). In this passage, however, I have removed the *qui* after the initial *nos*, an emendation by Ursinus.

⁹All references to Cyprian's works are taken from the edition of G. Hartel, *S. Thasci Caecili Cypriani opera omnia* (CSEL 3) (Vienna 1868).

Beaujeu maintains, in brief, that had Minucius copied Cyprian, it would have been astonishing if he had left out the line *qui virtutum . . . novimus*, since it supports his argument perfectly.¹⁰ Evidence for Cyprian's inserting this line exists, he continues, because it is closely linked in theme with the immediately preceding section of the *De bono patientiae*. Further, Beaujeu thinks that the *Octavius'* *habitu* and *mente* are more suitable in their context than are Cyprian's *vestitu* and *veritate*, inaccurate terms, as he alleges, introduced for the sake of alliteration. Beaujeu thus combines with arguments from integration the hazardous assumption that failure to borrow a useful phrase indicates lack of dependence.

Obviously, one can only speculate as to why Minucius omitted Cyprian's *qui virtutum . . . novimus*, if he was the imitator. His doing so, however, would show nothing unusual. His love of tight parallelism could account for his extracting the two *non-sed* phrases, thus omitting *qui virtutum . . . novimus*, which does not fit this pattern.¹¹ As I shall show later, Minucius uses broken quotations from his sources with the result that phrases separated in the source become juxtaposed in the copy. Between Minucius' *gloriamur . . . potuerunt* and Cyprian's *qui virtutum . . . novimus* there is a basic identity of contents, namely that Christians possess virtues whose absence the pagan hides by vain boasts. Minucius then may be borrowing this idea from Cyprian but phrasing it in his own words.

The fact that Cyprian's *qui virtutum . . . novimus* is integrated through *iactantiam* with the second chapter of the treatise scarcely entails the view that it is an addition inserted between borrowings from the *Octavius*. Beaujeu seems to think that Cyprian's own lines can be distinguished from lines he borrows by the fact that the former are more smoothly integrated into the context than the latter. But *vestitu . . . praeferimus*, a line which Cyprian allegedly borrowed from the *Octavius*, is equally well knit into his motifs through *sapientiam*. Likewise the supposed change of *habitu-mente* to *vestitu-veritate* cannot be attributed to a fumbling attempt to add alliteration, since both *vestitu* and *veritate* are integral to the thought of the preceding chapter.

Generally speaking, the phrases and thoughts which an author imitates are less suited to the new context than to the original piece. Caution, however, is needed in applying this principle to compositions of skilful writers, such as Cyprian, who could improve on their sources. In such cases, the presence of borrowing must be determined by careful study of the

¹⁰Beaujeu LXXII-LXXIV.

¹¹See, for example, C. Becker, *Der "Octavius" des Minucius Felix* (SB Bayer 1967, 2) (Munich 1967) 82, 84. This work will be referred to as "Becker."

techniques an author uses in incorporating material from undisputed sources.

We should be aware initially of an intrinsic difficulty in assuming that Cyprian copied a phrase of the *Octavius* when he wrote the *De bono patientiae*. Since Minucius does not deal with the theme of patience, there is no apparent reason why Cyprian should choose to draw on his work. The great influence, furthermore, of Tertullian's *De patientia* is so pervasive in Cyprian's treatise and so germane to its subject that the imitation of a single line from a work alien to that theme seems unlikely.¹² Also difficult is the assumption that Cyprian borrowed one insignificant phrase from a work with which he had shown no contact at all during at least a four-year period of steady writing.¹³ By contrast, Minucius habitually uses isolated phrases taken from different authors¹⁴ as well as from several works of one voluminous writer, such as Cicero or Seneca.¹⁵

The possibility must be considered that literary imitation in this case does not arise from the use of a text of the *Octavius* in front of Cyprian's eyes, but from the simple integration into the *De bono patientiae* of an isolated passage from an otherwise forgotten work. Although mental associations are notoriously capricious, we would be justified in asking why the benefits of patience raised associations with the *Octavius* in Cyprian's mind and why other passages from that work had not been recalled for so long by Cyprian. A short phrase of three or four words could be more plausibly attributed to fortuitous recall, but here there would be the detailed recollection of a twelve-word line. If Cyprian's memory were that accurate, it is strange that he would have written the simple *loquimur* rather than Minucius' *eloquimur*, since the more unusual compound form would tend to stick more firmly in the mind. In other imitations, Cyprian shows no tendency to achieve variety by changing compound forms to simple ones, and no other purpose is served in this context by the substitution. The careful reworking of details from a fairly long passage so as to make it fit into an elaborate period would also argue against spontaneous recall. Cyprian would have drastically changed the original

¹²For the relationship of Tertullian's *De patientia* to the *De bono patientiae*, see R. Kaderschafka, *Quae ratio et rerum materiae et generis dicendi intercedere videatur inter Cypriani librum de bono patientiae et Tertulliani librum de patientia* (Pilsen 1912).

¹³The *De bono patientiae* is dated 256. For this, see Sage 380. Since the writing of the *Ad Demetrianum* in 252, no parallels with the *Octavius* occur, even if one accepts all the parallels of Beaujeu's table.

¹⁴See, for example, Beaujeu XXXVIII: "Ainsi Minucius Felix nous apparaît-il avant tout comme un compilateur; et de ce fait il est peu de pages, peu de phrases de son oeuvre, derrière lesquelles le philologue ne décèle une source livresque.

¹⁵Beaujeu XXXIII-XXXIV lists fourteen works of Cicero and some ten works of Seneca that Minucius draws on.

construction, splitting it twice by two long insertions (*autem . . . factis sumus* and *qui virtutum . . . novimus*). The revision would entail not only detailed remembrance of the twelve-word passage, but the recall, as well, of the next line of Minucius' text (*gloriamur . . . potuerunt*), since its thought would have been incorporated, though out of Minucius' order, in Cyprian's *qui virtutum . . . novimus*.

If we turn now to the passages quoted above, Cyprian's *nec vestitu sapientiam sed veritate praeferimus* appears to have developed naturally from the dominant concepts *sapientia* and *veritas* elaborated in the preceding paragraph, rather than from imitation of *Octavius* 38.6.¹⁶ The motifs worked out negatively in Cyprian's second chapter are similar to those in Tertullian's treatise and find their positive application in the third chapter. The balance and antithesis prominent in the second chapter merge smoothly with the antithetical style that marks the entire third chapter, including the disputed phrases. Although parallelism is as distinctive of Minucius' style as it is of Cyprian's, there is, apart from 38.6, no noticeable parallelism in *Octavius* 38. If Cyprian copied the *Octavius*, he would have split the double antithesis *non . . . praeferimus* and *non . . . vivimus* only to create another double antithesis from the first member—a rather pointless borrowing.

Octavius 38.5 blends reminiscences from Cicero, Seneca, and Tertullian.¹⁷ Some think that 38.7 contains a reminder of Tacitus' *Dialogus*, but this is disputed.¹⁸ That Cyprian would have borrowed only 38.6—the only section in a compilation that shows no dependence on an earlier work—strains credibility by its neatness. In doing so, Cyprian would have deliberately skirted an allusion to his beloved Tertullian in 38.5.

In *De bono patientiae* 3 there is a complex pattern of alliteration in "v" and internal double "t" in which the phrases supposedly borrowed from the *Octavius* fit without awkwardness. Still more exceptional is the spontaneous alliteration which Cyprian's alleged substitution of *vestitu-veritate* for *habitu-mente* makes with *vivimus*. *Vivimus* was more likely part of an alliterative pattern that was destroyed than the other way around.

If Cyprian imitated *Octavius* 38.6, he would have virtually copied a

¹⁶*De bono patientiae* 2/397.13–398.17 reads as follows: *Hanc patientiam se sectari philosophi quoque profitentur, sed tam illic patientia falsa est quam et falsa sapientia est. unde enim vel sapiens esse vel patiens possit qui nec sapientiam nec patientiam Dei novit? . . . quare si sapientia illic vera non est, esse non potest et vera patientia. nam si patiens ille est qui est humilis et mitis, philosophos autem nec humiles videmus esse nec mites sed sibi multum placentes et hoc ipso quod sibi placeant Deo displicentes, apparet illic non esse patientiam, ubi sit insolens adfectatae libertatis audacia et exerti ac seminudi pectoris invecunda iactantia.*

¹⁷Consult Beaujeu 161 *ad* 38.5.

¹⁸Beaujeu 161 *ad* 38.7; Clarke 374, note 666.

twelve-word line of which eight words appear in the identical form they had in the source and whose word order remains unchanged. By doing so, he would have greatly departed from his method of using source material in the *De bono patientiae*, as the many passages inspired by the *De patientia* show.¹⁹ Study of the parallels between these two works reveals that when Cyprian imitates passages of approximately the length of *Octavius* 38.6, he uses at most three words from his model, and rarely that many.²⁰ The words borrowed usually appear in different case and tense forms from those in the source and in a different order, with the result that none of the parallels with the *De patientia* approaches the sort of direct copying we find in the parallel with *Octavius* 38.6.

In testing the contrary hypothesis—that Minucius copied Cyprian's text—we notice first the faulty train of thought in *Octavius* 38.6. Since *sapientia* is a key word in 38.6, we expect that the wisdom of Christians in 38.6 contrasts with that of the pagan philosophers in 38.5.²¹ But in 38.5

¹⁹A collection of parallels may be found in Kaderschafka (above, note 12) 9–20.

²⁰The following parallel passages show the closest verbal resemblances between the treatises on patience of Tertullian and Cyprian. The citations from Tertullian are from the edition of J. W. P. Borleffs, *Q. Sept. Florentini Tertulliani libros de patientia, de baptismo, de paenitentia (Scriptores christiani primaevi 4)* (The Hague 1948). The passage from Tertullian is cited first, then that from Cyprian. Cf. also *De pat.* 2/19.13–16 ~ *De bono pat.* 4/399.9–12; *De pat.* 2/19.16–17 ~ *De bono pat.* 4/399.4–5; *De pat.* 2/19.20 ~ *De bono pat.* 4/399.3–4; *De pat.* 3/20.7 ~ *De bono pat.* 6/401.19–21; *De pat.* 3/20.16–17 ~ *De bono pat.* 6/401.22–23; *De pat.* 3/20.23–21.2 ~ *De bono pat.* 23/414.11–12; *De pat.* 6/28.1–2 ~ *De bono pat.* 10/404.2–3; *De pat.* 14/42.9–10 ~ *De bono pat.* 16/408.23.

(1) *qui [flore]m L[ucis] huius super iustos et in[iustos] a[e]qualiter spargit* (2/19.12–13); *super bonos et malos aequaliter facit diem nasci et lumen solis oboriri* (3/399.6–7).

(2) *et a servo suo tingitur* (3/20.6–7); *Dominus baptizatur a servo* (6/401.15).

(3) *Igitur natales inpatientiae in ipso diabolo deprehendo, iam tunc cum dominum deum universa opera quae fecisset imagini suae, id est homini, subiecisse impatienter tulit* (5/24.7–9); *exordia ipsa denique videamus. diabolus hominem ad imaginem Dei factum impatienter tulit: inde et perit primus et perdidit* (19/410.24–26).

(4) *tam necessarias enim Moysei cum domino congregantis impatienter exceperat moras!* (5/27.12–13); *dum Moysi cum Deo conloquentis moras non potest ferre* (19/411.6).

(5) *[patientia] pacem gubernat . . . linguam frenat* (15/43.22–44.3); *patientia est . . . quae linguam frenat, quae mentem gubernat, pacem custodit* (20/411.26–412.1).

(6) *[patientia] scandala pellit, martyria consummat* (15/44.4); *[patientia] passiones et martyria consummat* (20/412.9).

A discussion of the style of Cyprian in the *De dominica oratione* in his imitations of Tertullian's *De oratione* is found in M. Réveillaud, *Saint Cyprien, L'oraison dominicale* (Paris 1964) 3–7. For Cyprian's use of biblical quotations, see M. A. Fahey, *Cyprian and the Bible*, *Beitr. zur Gesch. der bibl. Hermeneutik* 9 (Tübingen 1971).

²¹*Oct.* 38.5: *Proinde Socrates scurra Atticus viderit, nihil se scire confessus, testimonio licet fallacissimi daemonis gloriosus, Arcesilas quoque et Carneades et Pyrrho et omnis Academicorum multitudo deliberet, Simonides etiam in perpetuum conperendinet: philosophorum*

nothing is said about their wisdom; only their scepticism and hypocrisy are mentioned. The analogue of 38.5–7, the peroration of Caecilius' disquisition, refers to *sapientia*, but only as a virtue Christians are urged to acquire.²²

Octavius 38.6 sets wisdom in outward appearance against wisdom in mind. Yet there is no mention of the demeanor of philosophers, which *habitu* suggests. Nothing has really been said about the philosophers' sham virtues with which Christian virtue can be contrasted. The phrase *adversus sua vitia facundos* speaks of the philosophers' hypocrisy, but no comparison is drawn between true and false virtues. In 38.6 *non loquimur magna sed vivimus* seems to imply that pagans, unlike Christians, are guilty of boasting about the possession of virtues that are absent from their lives. But are the pagan philosophers of 38.5 boastful? Socrates is *testimonio . . . fallacissimi daemonis gloriosus*, but that will not do for 38.6, which supposes boasting about virtue possessed, not about ignorance.

The lack of exact correspondence between *Octavius* 38.5 and 38.6, however, may not in itself prejudice Minucius' originality. If Cyprian could have improved upon the *Octavius*, the possibility exists that hazy expressions and vague parallels in *Octavius* 38 are features of Minucius' independent writing. This, in fact, seems to be indicated, since 38.1–4 replies to a series of charges made by Caecilius, with the result that pagan and Christian practices are, in effect, contrasted.²³ The replies of 38.1–4, moreover, do not always fit precisely the charges Caecilius levels against the Christians.²⁴ The contrasts then between pagans and Christians in 38.5–6 may be developed in the same loose way, so that it would be wrong to interpret the lack of exact contrast as evidence of Minucius' copying.

But *Octavius* 38.6 follows the second chapter of *De bono patientiae* more naturally and with greater clarity than it follows 38.5. Under this circumstance, the awkward sequence in 38.5–6 becomes more significant. In *De bono patientiae* 2 Cyprian deals with the false wisdom of the philosophers. Minucius in 38.6 proclaims the true wisdom of the Christians. Against this background the opening *nos* of 38.6 stresses the transition from pagan to Christian wisdom. Cyprian refers to the philosophers' nakedness as an empty badge of false virtue. Minucius

supercilia contemnimus, quos corruptores et adulteros novimus et tyrannos et semper adversus sua vitia facundos.

²²*Quamquam si philosophandi libido est, Socraten, sapientiae principem, quisque vestrum tantus est, si potuerit, imitetur* (Oct. 13.1).

²³Octavius replies in chapter 38, sections 1, 2, 3, and 4 to charges which Caecilius makes in 12.5, 12.6, 11.4, and 12.6 respectively.

²⁴For example, the charges made in 12.5, 6 are met only indirectly by the replies of 38.1, 2.

opposes wisdom in outward display to the wisdom of the heart. Cyprian maintains that the philosophers' boasting proves their lack of patience. Minucius' Christians are said to live great lives rather than proclaim great virtues.

Cyprian's third chapter also clarifies the haziness of 38.6. Minucius' *sapientiam* . . . *praeferimus* seems to imply that Christians are the true philosophers. But Cyprian states this directly. Minucius' *eloquimur magna* hints that boasting is intended. Cyprian, however, refers explicitly to the philosophers' boasting about sham virtues. Minucius' *vivimus* and the implied *magna* create a kind of obscure zeugma. But Cyprian leaves no doubt that "to live great things" means to practice genuine virtue. Minucius' *gloriamur* . . . *potuerunt* speaks more clearly of boasting than does the ambiguous *eloquimur magna* preceding it. Hence one can conjecture that the thought of *gloriamur* . . . *potuerunt* was inspired by Cyprian's *virtutum* . . . *novimus*, which precedes and clarifies *loquimur* . . . *magna*. Minucius, furthermore, does not state in *gloriamur* . . . *potuerunt* precisely what the Christians obtained which lay outside the philosophers' grasp.

The *nos* of 38.6 does not conform to Minucius' style in the use of that pronoun at the beginning of a sentence. There are eight other instances in the *Octavius* in which nominative *nos* appears within the first three words of a sentence.²⁵ In all but 33.1, where initial *nos* is contrasted with *deo* later in the sentence, the pronoun is stressed either by *igitur*, *proinde*, *tamen*, *enim*, or by *at* and *sed*, none of which occurs in 38.6. The awkwardness of the construction following *nos* led the sixteenth-century editor Ursinus to add *qui* after *nos*, an emendation adopted by Boenig, Halm, and Waltzing.²⁶ Faulty imitation of Cyprian seems, however, to explain the difficulty more reasonably.

In *Octavius* 38.6 the direct object *sapientiam* is placed after *non*. This word order is normal in the *De bono patientiae* in handling *non* . . . *sed* correlatives, since in the four places outside chapter three in which a single direct object is used in this construction, it is placed after the negative.²⁷ But

²⁵*Oct.* 14.7, 28.2, 28.3, 31.5, 33.1, 36.7, 37.11, 38.4.

²⁶There is also little in *Octavius* 38.5 that can be contrasted specifically with *nos* in 38.6. Although Minucius speaks in general terms in 38.5 of sceptical philosophers who are to be left to themselves to procrastinate, argue on, etc., the philosophers are not portrayed clearly as exemplifying a false wisdom against which the genuine wisdom of Christians is contrasted in 38.6.

²⁷*De bono pat.* 6/401.5–6: *nec hoc* . . . *Iesus* . . . *docuit, sed*; 10/404.9–11: *Ioseph* . . . *non tantum patienter ignoscit, sed et gratuita venientibus frumenta largiter et clementer impertit*; 13/406.16–17: *non enim praesentem gloriam sequimur sed futuram*; 16/408.18–19: *fratri in te peccanti non tantum septuagies septies sed omnia omnino peccata dimittas*. In 8/403.3–6

the position of the direct object in 38.6 does not conform to Minucius' practice elsewhere. In the seven other examples of a single direct object of a single verb brought into a *non . . . sed* construction, the direct object is located before *non*.²⁸ In five of these the direct object is the first word before *non*; in two, the second word before *non*.

If Cyprian's treatise was the model for the *Octavius*, the peculiar marks Minucius exhibits in reworking other sources are strikingly present.²⁹ In 38.6 he would have used broken quotations of Cyprian's third chapter, with the result that two phrases separated in the source became grouped together through omission of an intervening phrase. There are minor variations in the phrases copied: *non* for *nec*, *eloquimur* for *loquimur*, *habitu . . . mente* for *vestitu . . . veritate*. Deletion of Cyprian's *autem . . . sumus* causes the juxtaposition of *nos* and *non*. Minucius' *gloriamur . . . potuerunt* paraphrases Cyprian's *qui virtutum . . . novimus*. Minucius' imitation would be considerably shorter than its model, arranged on a simpler pattern, and highlighted by parallelism less involved

three direct objects in a complex construction precede *non*: *illos adversarios, illos blasphemos, illos . . . inimicos, si . . . , si . . . , non solum . . . sed . . . admittit*. In the following passages, however, two direct objects follow *non*: 14/407.16–17; 16/408.22–23.

²⁸*Oct.* 15.2: *ut . . . nostram sententiam non eloquentiae tumore, sed rerum ipsarum soliditate libremus*; 17.3: *qui hunc mundi totius ornatum non . . . perfectum volunt, sed . . . conglobatum*; 25.10: *impunitatem fecerit non castitas tutor sed inprudencia felcior*; 31.5: *at nos pudorem non facie sed mente praestamus*; 31.5: *convivia non tantum pudica colimus sed et sobria*; 31.8: *sic nos denique non notaculo . . . sed . . . signo facile dinoscimus*; 39: *ostendisset etiam veritatem non tantummodo facilem sed favorabilem*. It is worth noting the close resemblance of 31.5 with 38.6: *At nos pudorem non facie sed mente praestamus* (*Oct.* 31.5). In 31.5 *nos* follows naturally from the context of 31.1–4, where contrast with *vos* is developed. In the remainder of 31.5, Minucius elaborates on the modesty of Christians; in the case of 38.6, on the contrary, there is no documentation in the sequel of the claims made in 38.6. Further, it is significant that Minucius did not use the *non facie sed mente* of 31.5 in 38.6, although *facie* fits *philosophorum supercilium* of 38.5, where there is no mention of the philosophers' dress or appearance in general. The suspicion is that the less appropriate *non habitu . . . sed mente* arose from the influence of Cyprian's *vestitu* and from mention of the philosophers' nakedness in Cyprian's second chapter.

²⁹Becker's study of Minucius' style in reworking his sources is valuable here. Especially relevant are the following observations: "Bei Minucius ist die Aussage knapper; nur Tertullians erster und letzter Satz begegnen bei ihm. Darin aber reicht die Entsprechung sehr weit: Worte . . . und Wortstellung . . . sind fast unmerklich variiert" (p. 82). "Wie Minucius überhaupt nach Gleichmässigkeit, nach formaler Ausgeglichenheit strebt, so hat er seine Vorlagen . . . mehrfach konzinner gestaltet" (p. 84). "Dass die Anlage eines Satzes oder Gefüges beibehalten wird, einzelne Wörter aber durch Synonyma ersetzt werden, dass bei den Verba Kompositum und Simplex ausgetauscht werden, dass einzelne Glieder verschoben werden oder aus einem benachbarten, inhaltlich nicht benutzten Satz ein einzelnes Wort, eine Wendung herausgenommen wird . . . dergleichen begegnet im *Octavius* gegenüber Cicero allenthalben . . ." (p. 85).

but more visible. Each of these phenomena is symptomatic of his style of imitation, as passages he used from Cicero, Virgil, Seneca, and Tertullian demonstrate.³⁰

Another trait, hitherto unreported, that emerges in Minucius' use of

³⁰Minucius' reworking of his sources may be seen in the following:

(1) Principio caelum ac terras camposque liquentis
lucentemque globum lunae Titaniaque astra
spiritus intus alit, totamque infusa per artus
mens agitat molem et magno se corpore miscet.
inde hominum pecudumque genus, vitaeque volantum,
et quae marmoreo fert monstra sub aequore pontus. (*Aen.* 6.724–29)

Mantuanus Maro nonne apertius, proximius, verius "principio" ait "caelum ac terras" et cetera mundi membra "spiritus intus alit et infusa mens agitat, inde hominum pecudumque genus" et quicquid aliud animalium? (*Oct.* 19.2)

(2) Ut, si quis in domum aliquam aut in gymnasium aut in forum venerit, cum videat omnium rerum rationem modum disciplinam non possit ea sine causa fieri iudicare sed esse aliquem intelligat qui praesit et cui pareatur, multo magis in tantis motionibus tantisque vicissitudinibus, tam multarum rerum atque tantarum ordinibus, in quibus nihil umquam immensa et infinita vetustas mentita sit, statuatur necesse est ab aliqua mente tantos naturae motus gubernari. (*Cic. Nat. D.* 2.15)

Quod si ingressus aliquam domum omnia exculta, disposita, ornata videres, utique praeesse ei crederes dominum et illis bonis rebus multo esse meliorem: ita in hac mundi domo, cum caelo terraeque perspicias providentiam, ordinem, legem, crede esse universitatis dominum parentemque ipsis sideribus et totius mundi partibus pulchriorem. (*Oct.* 18.4)

(3) De vestris semper aestuat carcer, de vestris semper metalla suspirant, de vestris semper bestiae saginantur, de vestris semper munerarii noxiorum greges pascunt. nemo illic Christianus, nisi plane tantum Christianus; aut si et aliud, iam non Christianus. (*Tert. Apol.* 44.3)

. . . denique de vestro numero carcer exaestuat; Christianus ibi nullus nisi aut reus suae religionis aut profugus. (*Oct.* 35.6)

(4) vereor ne cui vestrum ex Stoicorum hominum disputationibus, non ex meo sensu deprompta haec videatur oratio; dico, quod sentio, tamen . . . (*Cic. Parad.* 1.6); ne non tam ex nostris disputationibus nata sententia quam ex tuis sensibus prolata videatur. (*Oct.* 5.1)

All four sets of parallels exemplify the condensation and simplification that Minucius' sources undergo. The process of broken quotation may be studied in the first and third sets. In the first set, we find that Minucius has copied verbatim some phrases (e.g., *principio caelum et terras; spiritus intus alit*), has shortened and paraphrased others (e.g., *infusa mens agitat* for Virgil's *totamque . . . miscet*), while other sections of the original have been completely omitted (e.g., *magno . . . miscet; vitaeque . . . pontus*). In the third set, we see that he appropriates only the first and last sentences of Tertullian, which are varied slightly, e.g., *exaestuat* for Tertullian's *aestuat*. This results in grouping together in the *Octavius* sections that were separated in the source. In the fourth set, the juxtaposition of *ne* and *non* in the *Octavius* results from omission of *cui vestrum* and the relocation of an adapted *ex Stoicorum hominum disputationibus*. The process is very similar to the juxtaposing of *nos* and *non* in *Octavius* 38.6. Minucius' *tam . . . quam* creates more prominent parallelism than that in the source.

several passages in the works of Cicero and Seneca also reinforces the case for Cyprian's priority. In the *Octavius* we have seen that segments of a passage extending over several lines may be virtually excerpted by the familiar technique of broken quotation, thus causing the omission of intervening sections in the original. It is striking that one or more words from the omitted sections are often placed in the *Octavius* within a few lines before or after the connected passage adapted from the source, hence outside the relative positions that words of the omitted sections occupied in the source.³¹ A considerable distance separating these words from other occurrences of the same vocabulary minimizes the possibility that words that seem to be derived from the omitted sections of the source passage may not, in fact, stem from the source, but from Minucius' usual vocabulary. If we examine the *Octavius* for this trait in the three contacts with Cyprianic passages that show the strongest evidence of direct dependence, we find the same phenomenon.

Thus in *Octavius* 38.6, if Minucius imitated the *De bono patientiae* 3, we

³¹This phenomenon will be observed in the following:

(1) Xenophon paucioribus verbis eadem *ferē* peccat; facit enim in iis quae a Socrate dicta rettulit Socratem disputatem formam dei quaeri non oportere . . . (Cic. *Nat. D.* 1.12.31) Socraticus Xenophon formam dei veri *negat* videri posse et ideo quaeri non oportere. (*Oct.* 19.13)

The section *paucioribus* . . . *peccat* of Cicero is omitted in the *Octavius*. Yet a single word *ferē* appearing in that section appears in *Octavius* 19.15, only seven lines earlier. The subject of 19.11 is Chrysippus, not Xenophon. The only other instance of *ferē* in the *Octavius* is in 19.15. In the Chrysippus passage of 19.11, Minucius draws on the analogous section in *De natura deorum* 1.15.39, in which *ferē* does not occur.

(2) Exposui fere non philosophorum iudicia sed delirantium somnia. (*Nat. D.* 1.16.42)

Exposui opiniones omnium ferme philosophorum, quibus inlustrior gloria est, deum unum multis licet designasse nominibus . . . (*Oct.* 20.1)

Both passages conclude doxographies. Minucius replaces Cicero's *ferē* with *ferme*, but *ferē* appears in *Octavius* 19.15, three lines earlier.

(3) Ignis aurum probat, miseria *fortes viros*. (Sen. *Prov.* 5.10) Itaque ut aurum ignibus, sic nos discriminibus arguimur. (*Oct.* 36.9)

In *Octavius* 36.8, seven lines earlier, *virī fortes* appears. The adjective *fortis* occurs only here and in 20.6 where *fortiorem* is used; *fortis* modifies *vir* only in 36.8.

(4) Quid enim potest esse tam apertum tamque perspicuum, cum caelum *suspeximus caelestiaque* contemplati sumus, quam esse aliquod numen praestantissimae mentis quo haec *regantur*. (*Nat. D.* 2.2.4)

Quid enim potest esse tam apertum, tam confessum tamque perspicuum, cum oculos in caelum sustuleris et quae sunt infra circaque lustraveris, quam esse aliquod numen praestantissimae mentis, quo omnis natura inspiretur, moveatur, alatur, gubernetur. (*Oct.* 17.4)

Two of the Ciceronian words omitted in the *Octavius*, *caelestis* and *rego*, appear respectively in *Oct.* 17.2 and 17.6, and the noun *suspectus* in 17.2 *Caelestis* also appears in 11.1, 13.1, 16.5, 18.5, 19.4, 19.14, 26.8, 26.12, 32.7; *rego* also appears in 5.12, 8.2, 19.7, 20.2, 25.12, 27.1. The

saw that he would have virtually copied two phrases (*nec vestitu . . . praeferimus* and *qui . . . vivimus*) but would have left out the intervening *qui virtutum conscientiam magis quam iactantiam novimus*. One word *novimus* from the omitted section appears predictably in 38.5, one line of the Teubner edition from the derivative passage.³²

Likewise, *Octavius* 2.4 (*ut . . . vegetaret*) lacks *blandientis*, *autumni*, and *amoena* which appear in its parallel *Ad Donatum* 1/3.7, 8.³³ Yet in *Octavius* 2.3 we find *blanda*, *autumnitas*,³⁴ and *amoenissimam*, with no form of the last occurring anywhere else in the *Octavius*.

Octavius 1.4 lacks *ad verae religionis* . . . and *superstitionis* in its parallel *Ad Demetrianum* 25/369.24, 25.³⁵ In *Octavius* 1.5, however,

substantive *suspectus* appears only in 17.2; the verb *suspicio* appears in 14.6 and 16.5, only in the latter in the sense "to look up."

(5) Nec vero universo generi hominum solum sed etiam singulis a dis immortalibus consuli et provideri solet. (*Nat. D.* 2.65.164) Nec universitati solummodo deus, sed et partibus consulit. (*Oct.* 18.3)

Solet (*colet* P) appears in 18.3, two lines after the parallel passage. *Soleo* also appears in 2.4, 24 (23).4, 38.2. The related noun *providentia* appears in 18.4 and 18.5; it also appears in 5.12, 17.8, 19.10, 20.2, 40.2. *Provideo* appears in 14.6.

(6) Quem Diogenes Babylonius consequens in eo libro qui inscribitur de Minerva partum Iovis ortumque virginis ad *physiologiam* traducens diiungit a fabula. (*Nat. D.* 1.15.41)

Babylonio etiam Diogeni disciplina est exponendi et disserendi Iovis partum et ortum Minervae et hoc genus cetera rerum vocabula esse, non deorum. (*Oct.* 19.12)

The omitted word *physiologiam* is reflected in the related adjectival form *physiologica* in 19.11, appearing one line prior to the Diogenes passage, and nowhere else in the *Octavius*. *Physiologia* appears in the section of the *Octavius* that deals with Chrysippus and Zeno, but in the analogous sections of the *De natura deorum* dealing with these philosophers (1.15.39–41 and 1.14.36 respectively), there is no word related to *physiologia*, as there is not in the entire doxography of Velleius, aside from 1.15.41.

³²*Novimus* also occurs in *Octavius* 19.15, 25.8, 31.8, and 37.11. A related phenomenon is the clustering within a few lines of the parallel section of some of its vocabulary; for example, *vivimus*, which occurs at 38.4 twice, and *veritas*, which occurs at 38.7, 39.1, and 40.2.

³³. . . *mulcendis sensibus ac fovendis ad lenes auras blandientis autumnii hortorum facies amoena consentit* . . . (*Ad Don.* 1/3.7, 8); . . . *ut et aura adspirans leniter membra vegetaret* . . . (*Oct.* 2.4). This is the first of three sets of parallels on which Beaujeu rests his case for the *Octavius*' priority. In fairness to him, we should bear in mind that probability of dependence between these parallels is reinforced by similarities in the *mise en scène*, which I am reserving for separate study. Beaujeu LXXI–LXXII mentions the presence of *blanda* . . . *curatio* and *autumnitas* within the five lines preceding the passage in the *Octavius*, but takes this to support his argument. Cicero's comment is apropos: *facilius est enim apta dissolvere quam dissipata connectere*. (*Orator* 235)

³⁴Occurrences of the same or similar words are: *blandus*: 38.2; *blandior*: 8.5, 29.5, 33.1; *autumnus*: 17.7, 29.3.

³⁵*ad verae religionis candidam lucem de profundo tenebrosae superstitionis emergere* (*Ad Demetr.* 25/369.24, 25); *et cum discussa caligine de tenebrarum profundo in lucem sapientiae et veritatis emergerem* (*Oct.* 1.4). *Octavius* 1.4 appears to conflate *Ad Demetrianum* 25 with

superstitiosis occurs, as does the phrase *ad veram religionem*.³⁶ Although *religio* is found twenty-one times in the *Octavius*, only in 1.5 and 38.7 is it modified by *vera* and only in 1.5 does *ad* appear in connection with *religio*.³⁷

To sum up, comparison of *Octavius* 38.6 with the *De bono patientiae* indicates that the haziness and awkwardness of the former can be understood best by hypothesizing its adaptation from the latter. Departures from Minucius' usual style were also seen in 38.6. If Cyprian used *Octavius* 38.6, his manner of imitation would have differed totally from the freer, more imaginative technique he displays in adapting passages from the *De patientia*. But if Minucius copied from Cyprian, the precise marks he shows in imitations of classical authors emerge. Minucius' tendency, moreover, to scatter isolated words from a source near his allusion to that source is also illustrated in parallels with Cyprian. It remains to integrate evidence derived from study of the Cyprianic parallels with evidence from research in the genre of the *Ad Donatum*, the North African inscriptions, and the ancient testimonia.

Pontius' *Vita Cypriani* 2/XCI.21, 22: *Postquam et sacras litteras didicit et mundi nube discussa in lucem sapientiae spiritalis emersit* . . . It is significant that the metaphorical use of terms for light and darkness to denote Christian and pagan life respectively, especially in the context of conversion, is rare in the *Octavius* but extremely common in Cyprian's works. Outside of 1.5, the *Octavius* nowhere employs the noun *lux*; *lumen* appears in 9.7, 17.6, 32.9. Neither *lumen* nor *tenebrae* is used in these passages in the metaphorical sense to indicate Christian life and pagan death. Likewise, *veritas*, though appearing twenty-three times in the *Octavius*, is never used in connection with *lumen* or *tenebrae* and in only four passages (aside from 1.4) is it used with *obscurus*, *perspicuus*, and *umbra* (in 13.5, 14.3, 14.7, 34.5). The metaphorical application of such terms as *lux*, *tenebrae*, *caligo*, *lumen*, *tenebrosus*, *luminare* is very common in Cyprian's works of all periods, as the following selections attest: *De Dom. Or.* 1/267.11–13; *Ad Don.* 1/5.1–3; 4/6.4–7; 6/8.9–11; 14/15.5; 15/15.25; *De Unit.* 3/211.9–10; 3/211.19–21; 5/214.10–11; *De lapsis* 1/237.12–13; 5/240.3–5; 25/255.22–23; *De Zel. et Liv.* 10/425.21–22; 10/426.2–4; 11/426.6–7; *De Op. et El.* 13/383.13–15.

³⁶*Superstitiosus* also occurs in *Oct.* 2.4; *superstitio* in 5.7, 6.2, 9.2, 10.3, 13.5, 22.7 (24.2), 25.1, 25.8, 33.2, 38.6.

³⁷The closest occurrence of *religio* to 1.5 is at 5.7.