VII 1, 7 <si> has no critical note (Gronovius?) and at XIV 6, 3 there is no critical note on atque and the variant at quae, read by Hertz.

Finally, it is pleasing to note that M. pays generous tribute both in his introduction and his critical apparatus to the great work done by Hertz on Gellius. Perhaps one can best compliment the editor of this Oxford text by remarking that he has produced a work which would have been respected by his great predecessor.

University of Western Australia

P. McGUSHIN


In 1958 the author published his important work Latin Fathers and the Classics, in which most attention was given to Jerome. The book to be discussed now is an at least equally interesting study. Vol. I contains, most conveniently arranged, the testimonies, numbered as far as 969. It was to be expected that the quotations from Cicero would take pride of place here, followed at some distance in an ever diminishing degree by Virgil, Varro, Sallust and others. The fragments of Varro have been collected by B. Cardauns. As regards Cicero Hagendahl arrives at results different from the conclusions drawn by M. Testard in his Saint Augustin et Ciceron (Paris 1958). He lists a much smaller number of quotations from the speeches and far more from the philosophical writings than the French author (481, n. 2). In Vol. II he gives a thorough analysis of the manner how, the intentions with which, and the background from which Augustine has drawn from the pagan authors. Here, too, Cicero and Virgil demand far and away the greatest attention. Chapter X (‘Aspects and conclusions’) contains interesting remarks on the extent of Augustine’s reading, his method of citation (by heart or from books), his manner of working and suchlike. A Bibliography and two Indices (1. Passages 2. Names, subjects) conclude the work.

It is quite impossible to summarize in a few sentences the wealth of information Hagendahl’s work contains. By way of example only a few results can be mentioned: when Augustine in De civitate Dei quoted from Cicero’s De re publica, he worked with Cicero’s text before him (543). In the years 411-413 he renewed his acquaintance with that book when preparing himself for his magnum opus on the City of God by reading and excerpting various profane
authors (572; 708). It is altogether out of the question that in that work he can have quoted Sallust from memory (634); when he worked the books lay open round about him (636). These, and similar questions so interesting for a philologist, are dealt with in a manner both lucid and convincing. Naturally the question again and again arises as to the attitude of Augustine towards the tradition of classical culture. His investigation convinced Hagendahl that Augustine's appreciation of it is so limited that it is certainly foolish to speak of a synthesis (729). It should be added that Hagendahl deliberately kept questions like the influence of pagan philosophy on Augustine (e.g. the latter's relationship with the Neo-Platonists) outside the scope of his book.

When comparing (p. 433) Augustine's style with that of Jerome, he decidedly thinks too highly of the latter when he speaks of "the easy charm and refinement that Jerome possessed to perfection".— P. 445 we read that young Augustine "in the school of rhetoric" had to turn into prose Juno's words (Aen. I 38). Was it not rather the grammar school? The fact is that we have to think here of the τρογματισμοι, set by the grammarian, in this case the ninth of this carefully graduated series, the ἑδοσοικα. Cf. Marrou, Saint Augustin et la fin de la culture antique (Paris 1949), 51. It is, indeed, only in the third book of the Conf. that he begins to speak of his pupillage with the rhetor.—P. 514 [qui habentur Cic., om. Aug.]. Augustine omits some words from a quotation from Cicero. But are we to conclude this from the mere absence of these words in some manuscripts? See Vol. I, 141, n. 3: "Qui habentur missing in some Augustinian MSS". Evidently there are manuscripts which do have them. —That the fragments from Cicero's De re publica to be found in Civ. II 9 "render the original text most faithfully" (p. 541) would seem to me to be too strong a statement, since the bishop himself says nonnullis propius factiorem intellectum . . . . paululum commutatis. — In the controversy between H. and Marrou (p. 566 ff.) as to the question whether De doctrina christiana brought something new ("quelque chose de nouveau, bien différent de ce qu'enseignait jusque là l'école antique") I would rather side with Marrou, as the latter's viewpoint is more nuanced than appears from this one sentence that is quoted (cf. Marrou's work, 515-518). After observing that Augustine's attitude here is "nettement révolutionnaire, et représente dans l'histoire de la culture une innovation remarquable", he continues (p. 516) thus: "Tout ici n'est pas nouveau". Hagendahl, who shows to have taken note of Dutch literature on his subject, does not, however, seem to know the Rectorial Address of A. Sizoo on the style problem of the ancient Christians (Eloquentia Divina, Delft 1939). Sizoo showed how with Augustine