

The Editorial Project

The Republic of Letters is at last become a Country of Reason and Light, and not of Authority and implicit Faith, as it has been but too long.¹

As is to be expected from any good book proposal, Toland made certain in *Cicero Illustratus* to demonstrate the necessity of his touted project, this new edition of Cicero's complete works. His case begins with the apparently dire state of the tradition, and goes on to lament the consequent decline in Cicero's status, and the insufficient respect paid by Toland's contemporaries to one of the greatest legacies of antiquity. Cicero might be one of the most regularly cited of the ancients, but he is rarely truly understood, leading Toland to declare himself "able to safely assert that this same *Cicero* is nearly unknown to not a few in this literary world, even if admittedly no man's name is heard more often on everyone's lips—and that most deservedly".² Toland's aim, therefore, is to rehabilitate Cicero's reputation, and to restore the Ciceronian tradition to its rightful position of dominance in the cultural sphere. Toland considered this undertaking to be a public service, much as Cicero himself had done: these works had been written for one purpose, as instructive guides for the young man destined for a political career, and they should be returned to that purpose. Toland's goal was to "render [Cicero's] works more beneficial and convenient to use for those for whose benefit they were composed: clearly for Chief and Noble men, also Philosophers, Politicians, Judges, and all types of Magistrate".³ This edition, then,

would be the means by which Cicero returned to prominence, resuming a position of authority in the public consciousness.

This was the argument formed to explain the merit of the project, articulated across the first 10 chapters of *Cicero Illustratus*; these intentions, however virtuous, needed to be underpinned by a viable methodology. This facet of Toland's plans is outlined across chapters eleven to nineteen of *Cicero Illustratus*, chapters which are numbered as nine articles, with each article addressing the main responsibilities of the editor in turn. The first task selected for consideration by the putative editor is the creation of the book itself; chapters eleven and twelve therefore present Toland's intentions with regard to the physical form and appearance of his edition. In chapter eleven, Toland describes the quality of the paper he would use, and the decorations which would adorn the edition, including various representations of Cicero on the frontispiece and within the work. In the twelfth chapter, the appearance of the text is the subject, with Toland explaining the typographical principles he intends to follow, and how he would punctuate the works. After the appearance of the edition has been covered, the subsequent articles discuss how Toland intends to approach the editorial procedures concerning the content of the edition. This includes considerations of the supplementary material required by such an edition, with Toland's plan for a life of Cicero to preface the works as the subject of the thirteenth and fourteenth chapters. Also provided to ensure the reader has all the information they need to appreciate Cicero will be certain spurious works from the tradition, discussed in chapter fifteen, and a series of indices, proposed in chapter nineteen.⁴ The text itself inevitably receives the most attention from Toland. The seventeenth chapter describes at length how he proposed to undertake the task of textual criticism, and the sixteenth and eighteenth chapters consider the notes and annotations necessary to explicate the meaning of the text for the reader. It is a comprehensive treatment of the various aspects of the editorial project, outlining the actual strategies with which Toland intended to achieve his stated aim of the rehabilitation of Cicero.

A convincing treatment of these topics was crucial, the unifying purpose of their discussion being not only to persuade Eugene of Savoy and any other recipient that Toland was not simply capable, but the most appropriate person for the task, but also to claim for Toland the elusive—yet immensely valuable—mantle of scholarly or editorial authority. The attempt to legitimise 'Toland as editor' infiltrates every aspect

of the text. This notion of 'authority' is of course amorphous, yet the means by which it was pursued or constructed in the realm of print culture has been elaborated in more recent scholarship, in which the formation of that authority through interaction with cultural contexts has been asserted, rather than merely the presumption of authority through engagement with scholarship in the medium of print. This shift in perspective has been a reaction against the idea that the book itself was the source or creator of authority, on account of an inherent power it possessed in the eyes of its reader, emanating from its permanency.⁵ The work of Steven Shapin in relation to the history of science encouraged a change in outlook.⁶ Shapin's work emphasised the active function of trust in the processes by which knowledge was successfully transferred, arguing that the fundamental role of trust necessitated that knowledge be framed in terms which recognised the dominant cultural forces, as these determined what was credible or authoritative. This theory of trust was transferred into the arena of print culture by Adrian Johns; he argued that an editor needed to provide the reader with recognisable signs of credibility—signs dictated by the cultural context—if the reader's trust was to be won, allowing the work to shape knowledge.⁷ Toland's strategies in *Cicero Illustratus* endorse this reorientation of the construction of authority in print. Throughout the work Toland shapes his own approaches in relation to the scholarly and cultural contexts with which he was engaging, consistently presenting his methods as responses to existing practices, targeting first the editorial tradition to which he intended to contribute, namely the tradition of the *Opera Omnia* editions of Cicero, and second, the theatre of scholarship into which he was entering.

1 EDITING CICERO'S *OPERA OMNIA*

To begin, then, with Toland's engagement with the Ciceronian editorial tradition—a tradition forced to the forefront by Toland's consistent shaping of his own plans for handling the various duties of an editor in response to the efforts of his predecessors, more often than not articulating his views on the existing tradition with colourful polemicising. Toland apportioned a great deal of the blame for the deterioration of the tradition on the Critics and Grammarians, determining them to be responsible for the decline,

Whether [it was] the result of some editors being too careless and yawning over their work, or because some had the benefit of fewer resources and less leisure, or finally whether (as is certainly more common) this resulted from the ridiculous affectation shown by most Grammarians and Commentators, from a conceited display of learning, from the rhetorical exaggeration of petty matters, or – the least tolerable of all – from arrogance.⁸

Focusing on his predecessors in this way not only consistently reinforced Toland's claim for the necessity of a new edition by elaborating on the damage which had been inflicted on the text, but also provided him with the means to situate himself and his edition, and to carve out an editorial identity using recognisable features of the existing tradition as reference points.

When Toland made this attempt to enter the Ciceronian editorial tradition, the most recent addition had been only 20 years previously, when the Dutch classical scholar Jacobus Gronovius produced an edition in Leiden in 1692.⁹ In spite of this contribution, together with a steady influx of editions of Cicero's complete works onto the market across the seventeenth century, the editorial tradition had actually somewhat stagnated in the century preceding *Cicero Illustratus*, due to the dominance of one particular text. In Hamburg in 1618 an edition was produced which had been edited by the Dutch antiquarian Janus Gruterus; the editions printed for the rest of the seventeenth century almost exclusively reprinted the 1618 text, and it would go on to dominate the Ciceronian text into the nineteenth century. While the existence of this well-respected text might have been to Toland's disadvantage, a point more favourable to his endeavour was the fact that had Toland actually completed the proposed edition, it would have been the first edition of Cicero's complete works produced fully in England.¹⁰ This was a gap in English print production which had been noted by the antiquarian Thomas Hearne, whose correspondence reveals that he had also proposed completing such an edition, which given the ideological distance between himself and Toland may well have turned out a very different prospect.¹¹

Seeking to clarify further his assertion that Cicero had suffered at the hands of his editors, Toland's criticism of his predecessors reaches across the tradition to the earliest editions of Cicero's works. The very first print edition of the complete works was produced 1498 in Milan under the direction of Alexander Minutianus. Across the sixteenth century 24

new editions of the Cicero's works appeared, a number which does not include the reprints of those editions. The Aldine Press in Venice produced three editions of the *Opera Omnia*, while the Juntine Press in Venice produced only one edition between 1534 and 1537, but one which proved immensely influential due to the efforts of its editor Petrus Victorius. Paris was the next most active site of production in the sixteenth century, in particular because of the industriousness of the printers Jodocus Badius Ascensius and Robertus Stephanus, who oversaw two and three editions respectively. It was also a Parisian printer—Jacques du Puys—who was responsible for the first edition of Dionysius Lambinus' contribution in 1566, which went on to dominate the tradition for the best part of a century. Elsewhere in France, most Ciceronian production took place in Lyon, especially at the business of Sebastien Gryphius, who created an edition overseen by Johannes Michael Brutus in 1540, which was reprinted in Lyon seven times. Beyond Italy and France, Geneva and Basel were the foremost centres of production, with editions printed by Andreas Cratander and Johannes Hervagius in Basel prominent in the first half of the sixteenth century, and Fulvius Ursinus and Dionysius Gothofredus' editions, both of which modified Lambinus' work, being produced numerous times in Geneva in the later sixteenth century. In the seventeenth century—during which only seven new editions were created—production centred around Leiden, Amsterdam, and Lyon, reproducing either the Gothofredus-Lambinus edition of 1588, or the 1618 Gruterus edition.

Toland's predecessors in the endeavour of editing Cicero included some of the most prominent names in the history of scholarship. Into this catalogue Toland hoped to insert himself, having never really engaged in classical scholarship, and certainly possessing only a limited reputation as a classical scholar.¹² Toland had to maintain a careful balance, situating himself within the tradition to a sufficient extent that he was able to profit from its authority, while also making a case for its shortcomings and failures so as to prove the need for his own contribution.

2 NEGOTIATING EARLY MODERN SCHOLARSHIP

The second issue at hand when Toland applied himself to this project was the status of scholarship in early modern England. For Toland to accrue authority for both himself and his edition, he needed to demonstrate not only a facility with scholarship, but also a position on the methodological

and ideological disputes which dictated that as-yet uncoded activity. This was not an easy task; the scholarly sphere in which Toland aimed to participate was in a state of conflict, and his editorial plans would compel him to acknowledge and respond to that conflict if he were to prove himself a legitimate prospect.

In 1696 a Swiss-born biblical scholar called Jean Le Clerc (1657–1736) had produced a weighty—in both physical and intellectual terms—text, entitled *Ars Critica*.¹³ This was a work in which Le Clerc attempted to, if not quite codify, at least produce a comprehensive manual for the appropriate conduct of criticism.¹⁴ Describing the Critic he hoped the work would produce, Le Clerc explained:

I undertake to fashion this Critic, not as a man swollen with pedagogical conceit, or burdened with the trifle of insignificant erudition; but as a man who uses his reason no less than his memory, and who knows that we understand few things completely in the monuments of the Ancients; and therefore judges others modestly, and is prepared to learn from everything. I want him before all else to endeavour to understand what the Ancients wanted, and to carefully caution himself, so that he does not think he knows what he does not know. But while he labours at these studies, I do not want him to ever bid farewell to Philosophical or Mathematical studies, so that he improves only his memory having forgotten his own opinions. Both are continuously joined, so that while Philology provides material for us from the Greek and Latin Writers, which we use when it is necessary, Philosophy arranges all that material, and collects individual examples from these passages.¹⁵

This passage, and the work as a whole, articulates the changed perspective which had arisen in scholarship across the seventeenth century: the status of erudition—in the sense of an overwhelming reverence for and knowledge of the ancients—as a source of authority was being questioned, as the importance of the exercise of reason and observation, of criticism and scientific approaches, of testing and investigating the validity of sources, challenged the reliance on ancient authorities associated with erudition.

This increase in the prominence of critical tendencies in scholarship across the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries has been cited as further evidence of the victory for reason and science in this period, and the consequent decline in the influence wielded by the classical world. Traditionally, this process has been identified with the term

‘revolution’, whether that be an intellectual or a scientific or a historical revolution, with the obvious implication that a violent and complete change in culture had taken place, namely the abandonment of humanist scholarship as the new science with its critical tendencies evolved.¹⁶ This notion of rupture and the death of humanist scholarship has now been amply rebutted, particularly in the work of Anthony Grafton.¹⁷ Instead, the disputes which arose over the increased prestige and importance granted to criticism within scholarship have been shown to be continuations of disputes and practices which had always been present within humanist scholarship. Foremost among these debates, and dominating English scholarship in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, is the conflict referred to as the Quarrel between Ancient and Moderns, but which manifested in England as the Battle of the Books.¹⁸ This was a conflict—in its simplest terms—between those who idealised and glorified the knowledge of antiquity, who sought only to imitate the achievements of the ancients, believing that they could not be surpassed, and those who saw in modern learning and critical techniques the opportunity to advance and refine their knowledge, to break free of the constraints of their ancient sources, and to progress to a new level of understanding of their world and their past. This difference in attitude expressed itself in England as a quarrel over the purpose of ancient texts, and consequently how they should be approached, issues which were particularly fraught in relation to philology and historical scholarship.¹⁹ Should the ancient text remain a source of authority and knowledge, or should its validity as a source or document be tested with the tools of criticism made available by philology?

Philology was the most useful tool by which the Modern or the Critic might evaluate the ancient texts, providing the means by which spurious texts could be identified and exposed, flaws in the text caused by scribal errors and manuscript deterioration could be identified, and the accuracy of the text determined through the judicious application of linguistic and historic evidence. William Wotton (1666–1727), a prominent advocate for the Moderns, claimed philology for his side:

There are Thousands of Corrections and Censures upon Authors to be found in the Annotations of Modern Criticks, which required more Fineness of Thought, and Happiness of Invention, than, perhaps, Twenty such Volumes as those were, upon which these very Criticisms were made. For, though, generally speaking, good Copies are absolutely necessary;

though the Critick himself must have a perfect Command of the Language and particular Stile of his Author, must have a clear Idea of the Way and Humour of the Age in which he wrote; many of which Things require great Sagacity, as well as great Industry; yet there is a peculiar Quickness in Discerning what is proper to the Passage then to be corrected, in distinguishing all the particular Circumstances necessary to be observed, and those, perhaps, very numerous; which raise a judicious Critick very often as much above the Author upon whom he tries his Skill, as he that discerns another Man's Thoughts, is therein greater than he that thinks.²⁰

In this passage the crucial points of conflict between Ancients and Moderns in philology are laid bare: first, the Modern approached to the text as an object from a distant past, to which knowledge of that past must be applied in order to evaluate it, while the Ancient saw the ancient text as eternally relevant; second, the Modern saw himself as almost above the his ancient author, equipped with the tools with which the text could be exposed and purified, a challenge to the authority of the ancient texts which inevitably provoked the Ancients, for whom that authority was sacrosanct. The question here was not one of modern scholarship overwhelming its humanist predecessor, but the use to which that scholarship—a humanist product in itself—should be put.

Inevitably, questioning the authenticity and validity of the ancient texts had consequences for historical scholarship. The disputes which dominated history in the seventeenth century shared the same basic concern as philology: what value should be placed on the ancient texts?²¹ The traditional reliance on—and imitation of—the available narratives and chronicles of the past was being challenged by the application of source criticism to those texts and the consequent exposure of their flaws. Again, this split was not as divisive as the traditional narrative would suggest. The practitioners of the *Ars Historica*, who maintained the understanding of history as fundamentally didactic and associated with rhetoric, still engaged in source criticism, just directed to a different end from their more critical contemporaries.²² Antiquarianism was a crucial influence on this development; the antiquarians' precise approach and methodological gathering and organising of evidence filtered through into the treatment of manuscripts and books.²³ The development of bibliographic methods compounded this, with the production of significant collections of the ancient texts, in particular Johannes Albertus Fabricius' *Bibliotheca Latina* and *Bibliotheca Graeca*, published in 1697 and from 1705 respectively.²⁴ Le Clerc's *Ars Critica* offered advice on the conduct of historical scholarship,

engaging in an extensive examination of the value of Quintus Curtius as historical evidence, an examination which found Curtius wanting.²⁵ Again, the conflict manifested in historical scholarship was primarily between those who saw antiquity as continually relevant and useful, to be referred to and imitated, and those who saw it as the past, to be judged and evaluated within its proper historical context.

The early modern editor of a classical text was therefore faced with complex path to navigate. How could editorial authority be developed when the notion of authority in relation to the classical text was subject to such disturbance? Was the editor best served by relying upon the authority of erudition, manifested as an extensive familiarity with the ancient texts and respect for the importance of their contents? Or should the editor employ the extensive critical techniques of philology, elucidating the flaws and problems in the text, acknowledging its problematic and unreliable status, and attempting to rectify it as far as possible? As Toland explained how he would undertake the criticism of the text, how he would represent the author, and how far he would annotate and interpret the text in the commentary, his strategy in each case was articulated in terms which drew on arguments compelling to differing stances in the debates, rather than explicitly allying himself to a particular point of view.²⁶ These strategies share one unifying aim: the diminishment of editorial intervention. Toland argued that the voice of the author and the needs of the reader had been neglected in favour of unnecessary and unjustified power of the editor over the text, and it is this undue influence which had compounded the decline in Cicero's reputation. In the following chapters, Toland's methods of justifying this attitude towards the editorial project will be evaluated, and an ability to exploit the scholarly discourse for his own ends will be demonstrated. This being Toland, however, the position he openly articulates inevitably constitutes only part of the picture; closer examination of his arguments reveals a strategy for enforcing his own authority over Cicero, as an interpreter of the Roman's 'true' nature.

NOTES

1. Jean Le Clerc, *Parrhasiana* (London, 1700 [originally published in French in Amsterdam, 1699]), 108.
2. *CI*, 11: "tuto nihilosecius asseverare possum, eundem hunc *Ciceronem* non paucis in ipso orbe Literario pene ignotum esse; etiamsi nullius profecto nomen, idque meritissimo, in omnium ore frequentius versetur".

3. *CI*, 20: “eoque etiam animo, ut eadem commodiora prorsus et utiliora iis, in quorum gratiam conscripta sunt, officiosus reddam; Principibus scilicet viris et Nobilibus, Philosophis etiam, Politicis, Iudicibus, et omnibus quibuscunque Magistratibus”.
4. On Toland’s discussion of the Ciceronian spuria, see Katherine A. East, “Apocryphal Cicero: John Toland’s *Cicero Illustratus* and Notions of Authority in the Early Enlightenment”, *IJCT* 23.2 (2016): 108–126.
5. This argument was made by Elizabeth L. Eisenstein, *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), who claimed that print was by its nature authoritative, as its form granted it the quality of fixity, which in turn created the perception of veracity and hence authority.
6. Steven Shapin, *A Social History of Truth: Civility and Science in Seventeenth-Century England* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1994), particularly xxv–xxxi.
7. Adrian Johns, *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1998), particularly 1–57. This was in direct contrast to Elizabeth Eisenstein.
8. *CI*, 4: “sive quod editores aliqui oscitantes nimis et imprudentes fuerint, sive quod aliqui subsidiis minus et otio gavisii sint: sive hoc denique (quod frequentius certe) ex plerorumque Grammatistarum ac Commentatorum ridicula affectatione, ex fastidiosa doctrinae ostentatione, ex declamatoria rerum pusillarum amplificatione, aut ex arrogantia minime ferenda evenierit”.
9. Given the focus of *Cicero Illustratus*, and the overwhelming body of evidence were it to be otherwise, this book will focus solely on the editions of Cicero’s complete works. The editions discussed here are all catalogued in Appendix A, together with the shorthand used to refer to each edition throughout this book. I will provide further elaboration on the individual editions when addressing them in subsequent chapters. In creating this and later discussions of the Ciceronian *Opera Omnia*, certain works, in addition to the editions themselves, were used particularly: Johann Konrad von Orelli and Johann Georg Baiter, eds., *Onomasticon Tullianum, part 1: continens Tullii Ciceronis Vitam Historiam Litterariam* (Zurich: Orelli, Fuesslin & Co., 1836), 197–215; Johannes Albertus Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Latina sive Notitia Auctorum Veterum Latinorum* (Hamburg: Benjamin Schiller, 1712 [1697]), 88–149; Johannes Albertus Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Latina nunc melius delecta rectius digesta et aucta diligentia Io. Aug. Ernesti*, ed. Johann August Ernesti (Leipzig: Weidmann Heirs & Reich, 1773), 137–234; John C. Dunlop, *History of Roman Literature from its Earliest Period to the Augustan Age* (Philadelphia: E. Littell, 1827), 55–56; Terence J. Hunt, *A Textual History of Cicero’s Academici Libri* (Leiden: Brill, 1998).

10. Two editions had been printed in London: the edition by Lambinus printed by John Jackson and Edmund Bollifant in 1585, and the edition by Gruterus printed by John Dunmore in 1681.
11. See Thomas Hearne, *Remarks and Collections*, vol. 2: March 20, 1707–May 22, 1710, eds. Charles E. Doble, David W. Rannie and H.E. Salter (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1886), 128–129, 186, 192, 207, 269–270.
12. In 1711 Toland had published a translation of four of Pliny's letters, but otherwise his engagement with classical scholarship was as a tool for his broader endeavours, in his efforts at Latin composition, and his use of classical sources for his works.
13. Jean Le Clerc, *Ars Critica in qua ad studia Linguarum Latinae, Graecae et Hebraicae via munitur* (London: Robert Clavel, Timothy Childe & Andreas Bell, 1698 [1697]).
14. For an interesting survey of the history of the term *critice* in this period see Benedetto Bravo, "Critice in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries and the Rise of the Notion of Historical Criticism", in *History of Scholarship*, eds. Christopher R. Ligota and Jean-Louis Quantin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 135–141.
15. Le Clerc, *Ars Critica*, a3^v: "Hic Criticum, non pedagogico fastutumentem, aut farragine quadam jejunae eruditionis onustum, formare aggressus sum; sed non minus iudicio, atque memoria sua utentem, et qui probe calleat quam pauca penitus in Veterum monumentis intelligamus; ideoque modeste de aliis iudicet, et ab omnibus discere sit paratus. Volo eum ante omnia niti intelligere quid Veteres velint, et sibi diligenter cavere, ne opinetur se scire quod nescit. Sed dum hisce studiis operam dat, nolo eum Philosophicis et Mathematicis umquam ita valedicere, ut iudicii sui oblitus memoriam tantum excolat. Utraque perpetuo coniungenda sunt, ita ut dum Philologia nobis congerit materiem, e Graecis, Latinisque Scriptoribus, qua, ubi necesse erit, utamur; Philosophia omnem illam materiem, ordine certo digerat, et singula suis locis colloctet. Nisi hoc fiat, moles quaedam indigestae eruditionis comparatur, aptior obruendis audientium animis, quam iis collustrandis."
16. This is the position taken by Robert Mandrou, *From Humanism to Science, 1480–1700*, trans. Brian Pearce (Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press, 1979); Robert R. Bolgar, *The Classical Heritage and its Beneficiaries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1954), 369–379. The emphasis on a Scientific Revolution has recently been reasserted by David Wootton, *The Invention of Science: A New History of the Scientific Revolution* (New York: Harper, 2015). The most significant account of a 'crisis' in this period is Paul Hazard, *The Crisis of the European Mind: 1680–1715*, trans. J. Lewis May (New York: NYRB Classics, 2013 [1935]). For a summary of the historiographical approaches

- to this period see Christopher R. Ligota and Jean-Louis Quantin, "Introduction", in *History of Scholarship*, eds. Christopher R. Ligota and Jean-Louis Quantin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 13–25.
17. This argument is expressed in general terms in Anthony T. Grafton, *Defenders of the Text: The Traditions of Scholarship in an Age of Science, 1450–1800* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991), 1–22; *Bring Out Your Dead: The Past as Revelation* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001), 1–15, 97–117; Ann Blair and Anthony T. Grafton, "Reassessing Humanism and Science", *JHI* 53.4 (1992): 535–540. More specifically, it is made regarding astrology in Anthony T. Grafton, *Cardano's Cosmos: The Worlds and Works of a Renaissance Astrologer* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999); hermeneutics and law in Anthony T. Grafton, *Commerce with the Classics: Ancient Books and Renaissance Readers* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997), 135–183; the practice of scholarship in Anthony T. Grafton, *The Footnote: A Curious History* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997), and *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983), 1–9; and historical scholarship in Anthony T. Grafton, *What Was History? The Art of History in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 1–33.
 18. Traditionally, this conflict between Ancients and Moderns was characterised as indicative of the transition from humanism to science. See John B. Bury, *The Idea of Progress: an Inquiry into its Origin and Growth* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1920), and Richard F. Jones, *Ancients and Moderns: a Study of the Background of the Battle of the Books* (St. Louis: Washington University Press, 1936). This narrative has been re-evaluated following the contribution of Hans Baron, "The Querelle of the Ancients and Moderns as a Problem for Renaissance Scholarship", *JHI* 20.1 (1959): 3–22, which shifted the origins of the Quarrel from the seventeenth century to the Renaissance itself. Joseph M. Levine, in his *The Battle of the Books: History and Literature in the Augustan Age* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991), then built on Baron's reading to recharacterise the dispute as a conflict between the purposes of humanist scholarship—recover the knowledge of the ancients—and the methods developed to achieve that recovery. In Levine's hands the Battle became one between literature and learning, rather than humanist and modern scholarship. On the Quarrel in France, see Anne-Marie Lecoq, *La Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes: XVIIe–XVIIIe siècles* (Paris: Gallimard, 2001).
 19. The literature on this intellectual conflict is extensive. Useful starting points include Levine, *The Battle of the Books*, and *The Autonomy of History: Truth and Method from Erasmus to Gibbon* (Chicago, IL: Chicago

- University Press, 1999); Grafton, *What Was History?* 1–33, 189–254; David Spadafora, *The Idea of Progress in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1990), 21–25; John F. Tinkler, “The Splitting of Humanism: Bentley, Swift, and the English Battle of the Books”, *JHI* 49.3 (1988): 453–472.
20. William Wotton, *Reflections Upon Ancient and Modern Learning* (London: J. Leake, 1694), 318.
 21. For a more detailed discussion of the changes in historical scholarship in this period see Chap. 4.
 22. See particularly Grafton, *What Was History?* 1–33.
 23. On the relationship between antiquarianism and the conduct of historical scholarship in this period see Grafton, *What was History?* 83–92; Theodor Harmsen, *Antiquarianism in the Augustan Age: Thomas Hearne 1678–1735* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2000), 23–29; Graham Parry, *The Trophies of Time: English Antiquarians of the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 9–21. Arnaldo Momigliano highlighted the significant role played by antiquarianism in shaping the historical methodologies of the seventeenth century, situating it as part of the so-called ‘historical revolution’. See Arnaldo Momigliano, “Ancient History and the Antiquarian”, *JWCI* 13 (1950): 285–315; cf. Peter N. Miller, “Introduction: Momigliano, Antiquarianism, and the Cultural Sciences”, in *Momigliano and Antiquarianism: Foundations of the Modern Cultural Sciences*, ed. Peter N. Miller (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007), 2–12.
 24. Fabricius was an acquaintance of Toland, and his influence is apparent in *Cicero Illustratus*, an aspect which will be drawn out across the following chapters.
 25. Le Clerc, *Ars Critica*, III.411–472.
 26. Toland’s engagement with the Battle of the Books has been previously considered by Chiara Giuntini in the article “The Classical Roots of Toland’s Thought”, *I Castelli di Yale: quaderni di filosofia* 4 (1999): 19–38. Giuntini argued that Toland engaged with both sides in the Battle, endeavouring to serve his own ends, a reading of his relationship with scholarly debate which will be further elaborated here.

The Radicalization of Cicero

John Toland and Strategic Editing in the Early
Enlightenment

East, K.A.

2017, XIV, 283 p. 5 illus., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-3-319-49756-3