Directing the Eye of the Soul: Form and Function in an Ancient Scenic Monologue (Cyprian, *Ad Donatum*)

MATTIAS GASSMAN

Abstract: In *Ad Donatum*, written soon after his baptism ca. 248, Cyprian exhorts a newly baptized friend, Donatus, in a garden that Cyprian describes in his own voice. Many scenic dialogues survive from Greco-Roman antiquity, but *Ad Donatum* is the only known ancient scenic monologue. This article seeks to explain Cyprian's choice of this apparently unique form. Contrary to a hypothesis first advanced in 1899, the dialogic opening preserved in a handful of manuscripts was inserted in or after the fifth century, while the parallels sought in other works (especially Minucius Felix, *Octavius*) only underscore the uniqueness of *Ad Donatum*'s structure. A close reading suggests that Cyprian used the frame-scenes to give particular immediacy and force to his exhortation to neophyte readers: they allow Cyprian to direct the reader first to himself (both speaker and proof of God's transforming grace), to the evils of the world, and then to God. They also present a vivid and attractive picture of the Christian life as a peaceful retreat from worldly troubles. Thus, Cyprian is able to prove his case, as he promises in *Ad Donatum* 2, with reference only to the "facts" (*res*), not empty rhetoric. Wealthy neophytes are the main audience, but an allusion to a "profane eavesdropper" (*arbiter profanus*) in the opening section could also be a nod to pagan readers. Though *Ad Donatum* is not an apology, Cyprian, a prominent convert, likely did have non-Christian friends in mind, as well as neophytes and (probably) more experienced Christian readers. The unthreatened tranquility of the frame-scenes, finally, contrasts with the more embattled peace described in works from the 250s; *Ad Donatum* thus illustrates the reality of the Christian life as it seemed to Cyprian before his ordination and the beginning of the Decian persecution.

.

In around the year 248, not long after he was baptized, Cyprian, the future bishop of Carthage, addressed a brief exhortation to a newly baptized friend.[1] Cyprian envisions himself and his addressee, Donatus, sitting in a pleasant garden during the autumn vintage vacation (1). Honoring an old promise to talk with Donatus about God, Cyprian assures him that he will tell the straightforward truth rather than indulge in empty talk (2). He then describes his doubts before conversion (3) and the transforming effects of his baptism (4), promises spiritual power to the neophyte who remains faithful (5), and depicts the evils of both public and private life (6–13). After exhorting his listener to embrace their one remedy, devotion to God (14–15), Cyprian concludes by announcing the onset of evening and directing Donatus to their meal and the singing of Psalms (16).

None of the themes of *Ad Donatum* is unusual, though Cyprian expounds them with particular eloquence.[2] The work's form, by contrast, is apparently unique: a discourse set within frame scenes that are described by the same present tense, first-person narrative voice that gives the work's core exposition. It is, in fact, the only known ancient scenic *monologue*.

The later Roman Empire witnessed the production of numerous dialogic texts, from the literary dialogues of Augustine and Macrobius to polemical and catechetical question-and-answer collections.[3] The more sophisticated dialogues are prefigured in a work of Christian apologetic likely written in the early third century, the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix, which shows the title character and a young pagan friend presenting elaborate cases for and against Christianity that draw on Tertullian's *Apologeticum* and classical authors such as Seneca and Cicero.[4] As I will discuss below, *Octavius* likely influenced *Ad Donatum*, which was read in turn by Augustine and other fourth- and fifth-century Latin writers. Nevertheless, neither *Octavius*

nor earlier, Classical dialogues offer a formal precedent for Cyprian's work. Minucius Felix had begun his work with an authorial preface, framing the dialogue proper with scenes set in the past tense; Cicero, the most illustrious Latin dialogist and Minucius's model, had done likewise in the now-fragmentary *De re publica*, for example, and *De natura deorum*, but put brief description of the scene in the mouths of the interlocutors of *De legibus*.[5] Closer to Cyprian's technique, even this last still lacks its most distinctive feature: not only does Cyprian omit any preface and make the frame scenes an integral part of his exhortation, those scenes are recounted, in lavish detail, by a narrator who is the sole speaker of a monologue that is unfolding as the reader listens. "That," as Michael Winterbottom has observed, "is unprecedented."[6]

Faced by such an unusual choice of form, scholars have tried to assimilate *Ad Donatum* to the dialogic genre or, less commonly, treated it as an epistle. Such approaches have often reflected a neglect for the work's literary qualities: although there have been insightful discussions of particular themes and sections,[7] *Ad Donatum*'s reception has been hampered by a tendency to see its style, unusually ornate for the ordinarily lucid Cyprian, as a holdover from his earlier career as a secular rhetorician.[8] Winterbottom's article, which demonstrates the care and sophistication with which Cyprian wrote *Ad Donatum*, decisively refutes this interpretation.[9] Leonardo Lugaresi, in turn, has offered a subtle discussion of Cyprian's attack on worldly spectacles that contrasts those sections to the description of Donatus's garden in section 1.[10]

Building on the work of Winterbottom and Lugaresi, this article aims to show how the unique structure of *Ad Donatum* supports Cyprian's rhetorical aims. It will first address interpretations that treat the work as an epistle or a dialogue, including those founded on a variant reading, passed down in a handful of manuscripts, that transforms the work into a dialogue by putting an address from Donatus before the first frame scene. After arguing that the

work is indeed a monologue, I will offer an analysis that shows how Cyprian uses the frame scenes both to set the mood for his exposition and, more importantly, to grasp and direct the reader's attention during his exhortation to Christian faith and virtue. A key strength of the scenic monologic form is its ability to show Cyprian in the process of teaching, without breaking the illusion of an intimate conversation. As the concluding section will argue, the monologue is aimed in the first instance at new converts such as Donatus, yet a hint in the opening frame scene appears to acknowledge pagan readers. I will thus sketch the ways in which the work's form may have helped Cyprian to address both Christian and pagan audiences, before considering, in the concluding section, how *Ad Donatum*'s themes shed light on the earliest, all-but lost phase of Cyprian's ecclesiastical career.

AD DONATUM A DIALOGUE? REFUTING THE GOETZ-HYPOTHESIS.

Many scholars have tried to account for the unusual form of *Ad Donatum*. The most powerful hypothesis, advanced over a century ago and never put to thorough discussion since then, is that *Ad Donatum* was actually meant to be a dialogue. Four extant manuscripts, including two closely related codices of early date (M = Munich, Staatsbibliothek, Clm 208, saec. IX; Q = Troyes, Bibliothèque Municipale, 581, saec. VIII/IX), contain a prefatory address, titled "Donatus Cypriano," in which Donatus invites Cyprian to converse with him.[11] First published in 1568 by Jacques de Pamele, who obtained the text through a now-lost manuscript that he had found at Cambrai,[12] the speech was rejected as spurious by most later editors, including Wilhelm Hartel, who cast doubt on the value of M and Q as witnesses to the text of Cyprian's treatises, in *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* 3.[13]

Three decades later, Karl Goetz advanced a new argument: that "Donatus Cypriano" was actually the elsewhere-lost opening to a dialogic *Ad Donatum*.[14] Goetz's hypothesis gained the support of prominent contemporary scholars, including Adolf Harnack and Hans Freiherr von Soden,[15] and, though his interpretation was rejected by the two most authoritative editions (*Corpus Christianorum Series Latina* 3A and *Sources chrétiennes* 291), no one has responded to its arguments in detail.[16] Thus Winterbottom, writing in 2007, could declare "Donatus Cypriano" to be "no doubt supposititious," while Lugaresi, in a work published the next year, stated that Goetz's hypothesis "seems worthy of attention even now."[17] The latest editor, G. F. Diercks, sums up decades of inconclusive scholarship thus: "I think one must conclude this little exposition with the words: adhuc sub iudice lis est."[18] Careful scrutiny reveals a less doubtful picture. "Donatus Cypriano" was not Cyprian's work, and most likely dates to the mid-fifth century or later.

Goetz's arguments were founded on literary prejudice: "an artful conversation" could not, he insisted, have begun with the abrupt "reply" with which *Ad Donatum* commences in most manuscripts.[19] "Donatus Cypriano" seemed to solve the literary difficulty, attesting to a dialogic form of the work at a relatively early point in the manuscript tradition. However, Goetz overestimated the strength of the manuscript support, disregarded countervailing evidence in the late antique reception of Cyprian, and could offer no satisfactory explanation for the un-Cyprianic wording of "Donatus Cypriano."

Let us begin with the first and most technical point. Goetz knew, by indirect report, only of M and Q, by far the earliest of the four manuscripts that contain "Donatus Cypriano."[20] He assumed that they presented "Donatus Cypriano" and the usual text of *Ad Donatum* as a seamless whole.[21] The assumption is erroneous. While only the two late manuscripts and de Pamele's lost

Codex Cambronensis treat "Donatus Cypriano" as a distinct work,[22] both M and Q separate the text from *Ad Donatum* proper. In Q, the break is explicit: the verb *sequitur* intervenes between the two texts.[23] M presents a more complicated situation. Its version of *Ad Donatum* begins with the standard text, which breaks off after a few paragraphs; "Donatus Cypriano" follows after a space of about three lines.[24] The standard text of *Ad Donatum* begins anew on the next page, where it is marked out as distinct from what precedes by beginning with a large majuscule B, such as the manuscript normally employs only at the beginning of works.[25] This implies that the second text of *Ad Donatum* is a work distinct from "Donatus Cypriano," but "Donatus Cypriano" lacks an entry in the index of works with which the manuscript begins, and there is only one *explicit* for the three texts, which suggests that they are to be taken as a unit.[26] *M* thus comes closest to providing the dialogic text that Goetz envisioned, but even it distinguishes "Donatus Cypriano" more sharply from the main body of *Ad Donatum* than he supposed. How the text was laid out in the manuscript from which both M and Q derive, and why the scribe of M changed his mind about including "Donatus Cypriano," we can only guess, but the two texts were most likely at least as distinct as in M.

The limited external evidence suggests, furthermore, that *Ad Donatum* did not have an introductory text in the form known to its fourth- and fifth-century readers. Our sole ancient commentator, Augustine, called *Ad Donatum* an *epistola* in *De doctrina christiana*.[27] On that designation I will say more in the next section, but it implies, in any case, that *Ad Donatum* did not appear to Augustine, a prolific writer of dialogues, to be an example of that genre. The fact that Augustine's contemporary Rufinus of Aquileia quoted the opening line of *Ad Donatum* 1 at the beginning of his preface to Origen's homilies on Numbers likewise suggests that the text began with that line in his manuscript.[28] We must either assume, therefore, that "Donatus

Cypriano" had already been lost from their texts, only to be preserved in a handful of later manuscripts, or that it had not yet been written and inserted into the tradition.

The latter is more likely, on stylistic grounds. "Donatus Cypriano" figures Cyprian not as Donatus's friend, as *Ad Donatum* does, but as a revered bishop. In all five manuscripts, "Donatus" addresses Cyprian as *sanctissime*. Though a couple of Cyprian's colleagues are attested as using *sanctissimus* as an episcopal honorific,[29] the word can hardly have come from the pen of Cyprian himself, who habitually uses expressions of humility such as the reference to his own *mediocritas* in *Ad Donatum* 2.[30] To evade the problem, Goetz suggested replacing the offending word with *carissime* or the like.[31] The *ad hoc* emendation is necessary to preserve his hypothesis, but interpolation is more plausible.

Other inconsistencies between the two texts point in the same direction. "Donatus Cypriano" runs as follows, in Diercks's edition (CCL 3C:635):

> *Credo te retinere, sanctissime Cypriane, quae nobis fuerit apud oratorem garrulitas, unus sensus, una cogitatio, indiuidua lectio. Quare non et in diuina lectione ita animis roboramur? Aut non ea semper nobis fuit cogitatio, sicut promittebas, ut simul crederemus* ***

Ad Donatum opens as follows (CCL 3A:3):

> *Bene admones, Donate carissime: nam et promisisse me memini, et reddendi tempestiuum prorsus hoc tempus est, quo indulgente uindemia solutus animus in quietem sollemnes ac statas anni fatigantis indutias sortiatur.*

The congruency between "Donatus Cypriano" and *Ad Donatum* is limited to the repeated word *promittere*.[32] Both texts discuss rhetoric and speak of *lectio* as a way of strengthening the soul, but the two themes are deployed differently in "Donatus Cypriano" than in *Ad Donatum*.

Thus, “Donatus” begins by referring to his schooldays *apud oratorem* with Cyprian, whereas Cyprian criticizes public oratory without a word about his own practice of rhetoric, despite the strongly autobiographical tenor of both “Donatus Cypriano” and the discussion of Cyprian’s conversion in *Ad Donatum* 3.[33] The reference to *diuina lectio* is likewise out of skew with Cyprian’s own concerns. “Donatus” seems to be asking Cyprian to expound the scriptures, which Cyprian does not actually do in the monologue. *Diuina lectio* must be parallel, therefore, to the education “on the divine precepts” that Cyprian promises in *Ad Donatum* 1, and would mean, as Goetz himself realized, something like “study of divine matters,” a sense that appears in authors of the fourth century and later.[34] However, this is not the sense that *lectio* bears in section fifteen, where it is paired with *oratio* and refers to the reading of scripture as a spiritual exercise by which God responds to the Christian’s prayers.[35] If Cyprian wrote “Donatus Cypriano,” he did so with little care, in stark contrast to his handling of the rest of the work.

“Donatus Cypriano,” far from solving the problem of *Ad Donatum*’s genre, is inconsistent with the main body of the work, absent from all but a few manuscripts, and, even in its earliest extant form, not clearly cast as a dialogic address. The text is most likely the invention of a post-Augustinian scribe who penned a question to which the “most holy Cyprian” could respond, and wove into it superficially plausible but poorly constructed homages to the work’s themes and vocabulary.[36] The title “Donatus Cypriano,” which Harnack explained as a list of *dramatis personae*, would thus implicitly acknowledge that these are not actually the words of the holy bishop and martyr.[37]

AD DONATUM NEITHER DIALOGUE NOR EPISTLE

Although *Ad Donatum* was not written as a dialogue, its form displays a clear debt to the dialogic genre, and scholars have often seen the frame scenes as an adaptation from an earlier dialogue,

most likely Minucius Felix's *Octavius.*[38] However, despite similarities of wording, themes, and place—both narrators, for example, refer to the pleasant autumn breeze, set their conversations in the autumn vintage vacation, and finish with references to the characters' joy—the situations that the frame scenes of the two works envision are as dissimilar as their syntax.[39] Minucius prefaces his opening scene with a prologue describing Octavius's character, an element that has no parallel in Cyprian's work; his conversation follows a long seaside walk and a game of stone-skipping that the friends watch, whereas Cyprian chooses a more traditional garden setting for his discourse;[40] and Minucius ends his work, in which he has taken the least significant speaking role, with Caecilius's conversion and the friends' departure, while Cyprian does all of the talking in *Ad Donatum* and finishes by referring to a meal that is to take place in the same garden in which he has been speaking. Cyprian may well have meant his readers to see the parallels with Minucius Felix, but he cannot simply have adapted his frame scenes from *Octavius*.

A number of other parallels have also been put forth, including Plato's *Phaedrus*,[41] Cicero's *Tusculanae Disputationes*,[42] and Philostratus's *Heroicus*.[43] None of these uses the same kind of present tense monologic form, however, any more than *Octavius* does. Winterbottom, one of the few to recognize the problem explicitly, has suggested a poetic source, the first *Eclogue* of Calpurnius Siculus.[44] He makes a plausible case that Cyprian's opening scene resembles bucolic poetry more than philosophical dialogue, but Calpurnius's dialogic poem presents at most a few parallels of language and imagery to Cyprian's prose monologue. It is no more a direct model than is the *Octavius*.

If *Ad Donatum* is not a dialogue, still less is it an epistle. Goetz explained the absence of "Donatus Cypriano" from most manuscripts as a pragmatic move. The aim was, he claims, to turn *Ad Donatum* into a letter, so that it could be more useful as a source for ecclesiastical law.[45]

This particular claim is empty speculation—Goetz did not provide any examples of the work's use in that capacity—but scholars unbound to his hypothesis have likewise seen *Ad Donatum* as a letter. Early editors, including Étienne Baluze and Prudent Maran, whose edition underlies the text in Jacques-Paul Migne's *Patrologia Latina*,[46] often classed *Ad Donatum* among the epistles, and the assignment of the work to the epistolary genre has found recent advocates in Jean-Claude Fredouille and Karin Schlapbach.[47]

However, if *Ad Donatum* were an epistle, it would be a strange one. It includes an opening address to Donatus, but lacks both an epistolary heading and any kind of epistolary conclusion.[48] The manuscript tradition, likewise, transmits it primarily among the treatises (*libelli*).[49] Augustine, as I have already noted, refers to the work as an *epistula*, but the term is in his usage equivocal, appearing in reference also to treatises such as *De lapsis* and *De catholicae ecclesiae unitate*, which Cyprian himself called *libelli*.[50] Nothing, therefore, licenses us to treat *Ad Donatum* either as a letter or as a dialogue: it is in fact a brief treatise of a singular kind, which presents itself throughout as a speech to a present, not an absent, hearer.[51]

MONOLOGIC STRUCTURE AND CHRISTIAN EXHORTATION IN *AD DONATUM*

Why did Cyprian write a scenic monologue? Unlike Minucius Felix, he is not inscribing his work within a well-established literary tradition, but adapting that tradition (represented by his nods to Minucius's dialogue) into something apparently new. What, then, do the frame scenes achieve in this, the most stylistically refined of Cyprian's treatises? As a sketch of the work's rhetoric suggests, the answer is simple, yet of profound importance to Cyprian's aims: the frame scenes help him to characterize the Christian life and, by producing the illusion that the reader is

overhearing Cyprian's speech to an intimate friend, they enable him to present his exhortation to Christian devotion with particular immediacy and clarity.

The opening scene runs thus:

> *You do well to remind me, dearest Donatus: for I remember that I promised and this time is certainly suitable for repaying my promise, so that, while the vintage vacation allows, the mind, relaxed into a restful state, may obtain the established and appointed truce from the tiring year. The place is also suitable for the day, and the pleasant appearance of the garden unites with the gentle breezes of the soothing autumn to soothe and caress the senses: here it is pleasant to spend the day in conversation and to educate the conscience of the breast on the divine precepts through zealous conversation. And, lest a profane eavesdropper obstruct our conversation or the intemperate din of a noisy household deafen it, let us seek this seat: the hidden places nearby provide a retreat, where, while the wandering boughs of the vine-shoots creep through the load-bearing reeds in twinings that hang down, the leafy roofs have made a viney portico. Well do we turn our attention here to the breezes, and, while we look into the trees and vines and delight our eyes with the pleasing prospect, at the same time, hearing instructs the soul and sight nourishes it: although now your only favor, your only care is for speech; you, having scorned the enticements of voluptuary vision, have fixed your eyes on me, and, with this face, with this frame of mind, you are entirely a listener—and with this love with which you love me.*[52]

The scene breaths an air of tranquil leisure. Cyprian describes a well-tended garden, the kind of place in which Cicero's gentlemen-philosophers held their dialogues, in which he and

Donatus are now finding time to relax, away from listeners and household bustle, and hold the conversation to which they had long been looking forward. The placement of the meeting on a holiday—appropriately for Cyprian, who had either been an orator or a teacher of rhetoric, the autumn school vacation—is also firmly traditional to the dialogue genre.[53]

However, there are hints of something deeper than philosophical *otium*. Cyprian's subject will be the "divine precepts," conveyed in *studentes fabulae*. The phrase is, perhaps, an allusion to Minucius Felix, who had set his own work at the *uindemia*, but had said that his interlocutors were engaged in *fabulae fallentes*, before they turned to their dialogue on true religion.[54] As the contrast with Minucius suggests, Cyprian is not going to waste any of his time on chitchat. Even before the frame scene has closed, the tone suddenly shifts, as Cyprian invites his reader to abandon the garden scene and become *totus auditor*. The gentle breeze and pleasing portico become the *uoluptariae uisionis illecebris*, and Cyprian himself the sole object of the reader-listener's eyes and ears.

The effect of this shift is two-fold. First, it establishes the distinctly visual imagery that will dominate the rhetoric of *Ad Donatum*. In his wide-ranging book on ancient Christian attitudes toward the theater, Leonardo Lugaresi has drawn attention to the role that the language of sight and of the spectacular plays in *Ad Donatum*. As he observes, the peacefulness of the garden stands in sharp contrast with the violent world of public spectacle and private vice depicted in sections six through ten; it is "an anti-spectacular chronotope that . . . transports the two characters, and the reader with them, into a spiritual region completely detached from the *illecebrae* of the world of spectacle."[55] Here, as Lugaresi hints, the tranquility of the garden points forward to "the one placid and faithful tranquility, the one solid and firm security," to be found in the "port of salvation" (another philosophical trope adapted to Christian purposes)[56]; in

turn, the visual *illecebrae* of the garden, though innocent in themselves, gesture toward the sinful sights of the *saeculum*.[57]

There is also a second and more basic function to Cyprian's shift away from the garden scenery. In the next paragraph, Cyprian disclaims the eloquence necessary to expound on divine grace. Instead, he credits his speech to the help of his subject—God himself—and declares that he will rely "not on the powers of eloquence to prove the faith, but on the facts (*rebus*)." He is presenting "not eloquent but strong things," marked not by "cultivated speech," but by "the unvarnished truth."[58] The pretense that Cyprian is simply conversing with Donatus, one man to another in leisurely, private conversation, helps to sustain the claim that his entire discourse, from his account of his spiritual errors before baptism (3), through his survey of the world's ills (6–13), to the final exhortation to Christian piety (14–15), offers nothing other than the straightforward facts of life in the world and in the Church. Cyprian does not present an argument for Christianity, because he can *show* its superiority instead, as he sits beside the reader in the garden, removed physically as spiritually from the corruptions of the world.

Not just a literary conceit, Cyprian's claim to be revealing the true nature of the world is rooted in the divine grace that is his main subject. In section three, he gives a profoundly personal account of his doubts before baptism, telling how he questioned the possibility that "anyone could be born anew" and "change the man in intent and mind."[59] The temptations that he describes lead to the vices of the wealthy and powerful, men like he had been: "gourmet dinners and abundant banquets," clothes of gold and purple, public office, the "troops of clients," the "tenacious enticements" that drive a man to pride, anger, cruelty, lust, and the rest. "So," he says, "I often thought to myself . . . But, after light poured itself into an expiated and pure breast . . . after a second nativity restored me into a new man . . . in a wondrous way doubtful things

forthwith became certain, closed things lay open, shadowy things grew bright."[60] For this, too, section 1 has prepared, by directing the attention of the reader, now *totus auditor*, entirely onto Cyprian himself.[61]

Just after his account of his baptism and description of the grace that will superabound to Donatus if he holds fast "the path of innocence,"[62] Cyprian uses the language of sight again, saying:

> *I will give you light for understanding. I will reveal the shadows of an age that is laid open, with the gloom of its evils wiped away. Imagine for a little while that you have been brought up onto the lofty peak of a steep mountain. Look down from there at the appearance of the things that lie beneath you and, having extended your eyes in different directions, gaze, yourself free from earthly contagions, at the whirlwinds of a billowing world.*[63]

Here, Cyprian combines the baptismal language of sight and blindness, light and dark, with the visual imagery developed in the opening frame scene. Empowered by the grace of God, he will put on display the evils of the world that he, purified and illuminated, can now see.

The mountaintop, another philosophical trope on which Cyprian puts a Christian stamp,[64] provides yet another physical metaphor, additional to the garden of the frame scene, for the separateness of the Christian life from the world,[65] whose sins Cyprian now describes. Lugaresi has sketched well the progression of Cyprian's attack on wars and robbery, gladiatorial combats, the theater, the private lusts practiced within households, the violence of the forum, and worldly ambition and wealth.[66] Throughout, Cyprian repeatedly turns the reader's gaze this way and that:[67]

(6, CCL 3A:6) “Descry (*cerne tu*) roads closed off by robbers, the seas besieged by pirates, wars spread out everywhere with the bloody horror of the camp.”

(7, CCL 3A:6) “If you would now turn your eyes and face to the cities themselves (*Iam si ad urbes ipsas oculos tuos atque ora conuertas*), you would stumble on a throng grimmer than any solitude”: the games.

(8, CCL 3A:7) “Turn your face hence to the no-less blameworthy contagions of a different spectacle (*Conuerte hinc uultus ad diuersi spectaculi non minus paenitenda contagia*): in the theaters you will also see that which will be a grief and a shame to you.”

(9, CCL 3A:8) “O, if you were also able, established in that lofty lookout, to insert your eyes into the secret places (*O si et possis in illa sublimi specula constitutus oculos tuos inserere secretis*), to open the drawn doors of the bedchambers and to lay open the hidden inner chambers to the knowledge of your eyes.”

(10, CCL 3A:9) “Perhaps the forum would seem immune . . . bend your gaze thither: many things you will find there to detest; you will rather turn your eyes away (*Illuc aciem tuam flecte: plura illic quae detesteris inuenies, magis oculos tuos inde deuertes*).”

(11, CCL 3A:9–10) “But perhaps we may seem to be choosing things of a worse kind and . . . to be leading your eyes through things whose grim and repugnant sight may offend the face and countenance of a better conscience (*Sed nos uideamur eligere fortasse peiora et . . . per ea oculos tuos ducere, quorum tristis adque auersandus aspectus ora et uultus conscientiae melioris offendat*). Now I will show

you those things which the ignorance of the age esteems good": office, honors, and the imperial court.

The last of Cyprian's criticisms, which builds directly on this discourse against political ambition, is aimed at wealth (12–13). Here, he omits the visual imagery that had played so prominent a role in the preceding sections, though he will soon take it back up again in the exhortation that follows (14). The choice is subtle. Cyprian is, after all, to be imagined as speaking in the garden of an estate, whose house, he suggests to Donatus, will seem less attractive, as he draws closer to God.[68] With this discussion of the endless lands and opulent houses of the rich, he brings his reader back down the mountain to the place in which he began his exposition, or rather, to a place that looks like it, yet with a sinister difference: true peace and security are utterly absent. "O, the blindness of their minds and the profound darkness (*caligo*) of their insane cupidity! When one could unburden himself . . . he continues to cling stubbornly to the heaps that are his punishment," giving nothing to anyone, "not even himself."[69]

Cyprian now directs his listener to turn his eyes one last time, away from earthly things to God above. The man who has fled to the "salutary port . . . lifts his eyes to heaven and . . . rejoices that whatever in human affairs seems sublime and great in others' judgment lies beneath his consciousness."[70] Rejecting the attractions of worldly wealth, office, and power, the Christian receives the free gift of God, and "after the soul, gazing up to heaven, recognizes her Maker, she begins, loftier and more sublime than all this earthly power, to be what she believes herself to be."[71] Cyprian follows this lofty spiritual assurance with more practical advice, bidding Donatus, the newly enrolled Christian soldier, to hold fast his "discipline" through prayer and the study of the scriptures, which will reinforce his conviction of the emptiness of the worldly wealth that, it

seems, he still held (that Cyprian himself donated his estates to the use of the local church is surely not irrelevant).[72] The concluding frame scene follows, and the work ends.

As even this quick sketch makes clear, the imagery of light and sight runs throughout *Ad Donatum*. The first frame scene thus does important rhetorical work, introducing the visual and conversational conceits, directing the reader's attention to Cyprian as if to a present interlocutor, and preparing for Cyprian's steady control of the reader's gaze throughout the central portion of the work. It also sets up, in subtler ways, for the programmatic contrast between the turbulent enticements of the world and the peace and rest of the life lived toward God.

What, then, of the closing frame scene? Its primary work is of this latter kind. Again, I quote in full:

> Take these as a brief statement for the moment, my dearest Donatus. For, although salutary hearing delights a patience made easy by goodness, a mind firmly fixed on God, and a secure faith, and nothing is so pleasing to your ears as what is pleasing to God, nevertheless we ought to limit the things to be said, we who have been joined together and are going to speak quite often; and, seeing that it is now a holiday rest and a time of leisure, let us spend the day—however much time remains now that the sun is turning toward evening—happy, and let not even the hour of the meal be devoid of heavenly grace. Let the psalm give sound to the sober meal: as your memory is tenacious, your voice melodious, approach this duty according to your custom. You will nourish your dearest friends all the more, if we may have something spiritual to listen to, if a religious pleasantness may entice our ears.[73]

Now, it is the language of hearing and not of sight that predominates, as Cyprian brings the conversation to a close. His discourse, like the dialogue of his Christian predecessor, Minucius Felix, will end because evening is setting in.[74] He, like Caecilius in the *Octavius*, makes it clear that further instruction will come; Cyprian and Donatus are to spend the day "happy" (*laeti*), even as Minucius and his friends left Ostia "happy and joyful" (*laeti hilaresque*).[75] Unlike in the *Octavius*, however, the ending of *Ad Donatum* leads neither to the friends' parting nor to silence. Instead, Donatus will now provide a further opportunity for *spiritalis auditio*. Cyprian has imparted spiritual nourishment to the reader through his mental sight, once he turned his eyes away from the *illecebrae* of the horticultural scenery and directed them, at long last, toward God; now it is time for Donatus, edified by Cyprian's discourse, to "nourish" not only Cyprian but also his other *carissimi* with his voice, whose "religious pleasantness" will be sweet to their ears.[76] Each friend edifies the other, therefore, according to his gifting: Cyprian by means of his God-given ability to describe the illumination that he has received in terms both "simple" and "strong," Donatus through his "tenacious memory" for the Psalms and his pleasant singing voice.

Ad Donatum ends, as it began, in the garden with Cyprian and Donatus relaxing during the vacation. Cyprian has now explained, however, the reason for the tranquility that they enjoy, and has shown the depth of their peace through his description of the worldly tempests that they have escaped.[77] The final scene thus enables Cyprian to draw his fictive speech to an artful close and to tie together many of the themes and images that he has developed in the course of the work. Even more importantly, it gives a vivid picture of the life of peace and tranquility that he and Donatus lead—and that other Christian readers may also lead—now that they have been liberated by God from the evils of the age.

ARBITER PROFANUS: THE AUDIENCE(S) OF *AD DONATUM*

Ad Donatum presents itself as a private, one-sided discourse from Cyprian to Donatus that is unfolding as the work proceeds. This conceit allows Cyprian not only to offer Christian instruction in the concluding sections, but also to paint a portrait of the Christian life in its spiritual and psychological tranquility. Just as Cyprian discloses the world's evils to his readers, he also makes visible the benefits of divine *gratia*, imparted in one decisive step through baptism and enlarged by the ongoing discipline of prayer and scripture reading. The peacefulness of the Christian life is mirrored in the garden scenes with which the work opens and closes, while the monologic form set up by those scenes enables Cyprian to present the "facts" of grace and of the world with particular immediacy.

The reader becomes (as Lugaresi has recognized) a watcher of the spectacles that Cyprian describes, but a watcher who is, unlike the pagan inhabitants of the *saeculum*, fully aware of their repugnancy. In a sense, the reader also becomes a spectator to Cyprian himself, watching and listening as he holds his discourse in the quiet leisure of Donatus's garden.[78] Although Cyprian's epistles, which refer to the distribution of some later treatises, do not mention *Ad Donatum*,[79] the work was read from an early point as an exhortation to new Christians—precisely the audience suggested by the address to Donatus, who is cast throughout as a Christian junior in spirituality and experience to Cyprian.[80] To the newly baptized reader, especially a man of sufficient education to manage Cyprian's elaborate style, his words would apply almost seamlessly. Like Donatus, such a man would need to be warned against the temptations of the forum, civic office, and wealth; he would also, in virtue of his education, be able to read the Bible as part of private spiritual exercises.[81] Only in the frame scenes do we have a reminder that

the work is aimed specifically at Donatus, whose name and personal characteristics are nowhere mentioned in sections 2 through 15.[82] From the moment that Cyprian directs the reader's attention to himself, to the moment he releases Donatus to their meal in the closing frame scene, the neophyte is hearing Cyprian's warning and exhortation to Donatus as a warning and an exhortation to himself also.

Neophytes are unlikely to have been the only early readers of *Ad Donatum*, however. When he wrote the work, Cyprian was either a new bishop or, more likely, soon to be ordained in the face of opposition from more experienced presbyters.[83] The ancient *vita* and comments by Lactantius and Jerome indicate that he had been a wealthy rhetorician or public orator before conversion;[84] as bishop, he was a figure of enough note to have the crowd in the arena call for his head during the Decian persecution and to be visited by influential pagan friends on the eve of his execution in 258.[85] A work that explained his choice to undergo baptism would have attracted attention both from his former peers and from longtime Christians. To the latter, *Ad Donatum* advances not just spiritual exhortation, but a particularly winsome portrait of Cyprian as zealous convert empowered by God to diagnose the ills of the world and spur other Christians on to faith and good works.

Pagan readers present a more complicated case. Scholars have sometimes called *Ad Donatum* an apology, or at least assumed that its protreptic purpose embraced pagans as well as Christians.[86] Some features could indeed have appealed to educated pagans: not just its refined style, undisturbed by quotation from scripture, whose diction offended pagans and embarrassed Christians,[87] but also its intense focus on the transformative power of divine grace, whose swift efficacy Cyprian contrasts with the slow progress of human learning.[88] Its nods to Minucius Felix would have resonated for those who had already read the small body of cultivated Christian

literature; and, as Augustine reminded the Carthaginian deacon Deogratias a century and a half later, educated enquirers could be expected to have done their reading.[89] *Ad Donatum* is not written so as to be rebarbative to a sincere pagan enquirer. Neither, however, is it calibrated to pagan interests.[90] Written in an exclusively Christian mode, it neither answers pagan objections nor presents a systematic critique of polytheistic religion. Either one is moved by Cyprian's interpretation of the facts that point *ad fidei argumenta*, or one is not; Cyprian's case rests solely on his own observation and experience of the world's evils and God's power.

Ad Donatum is not expressly aimed at pagans, therefore. Nevertheless, a curious phrase in the opening scene suggests that Cyprian might have had unbaptized readers in mind when he wrote it. Cyprian says to Donatus,

> Here it is pleasant to spend the day in conversation and to educate the conscience of the breast on the divine precepts through zealous conversation. And, lest a profane eavesdropper (*arbiter profanus*) hinder our conversation or the intemperate din of a noisy household deafen it, let us seek this seat: the hidden places nearby provide a retreat, where, while the wandering boughs of the vine-shoots creep through the load-bearing reeds in twinings that hang down, the leafy roofs have made a viney portico.[91]

The reference to the *arbiter profanus* may hold (I tentatively suggest) a double-meaning. On a rhetorical level, it reinforces the leisured privacy that pervades the opening scene, and underscores the separation of the Christian life from the "profanity" of secular spectacles and the "intemperance" of life in wealthy households. However, the ordinary reference of *profanus* in Cyprian is to pagans or heretics, those "profane" from the things of God.[92] Inasmuch as *Ad Donatum* is cast as a present tense conversation—and the reader, therefore, as one listening in on

Cyprian's speech—a pagan reader of the text would, quite literally, be a "profane eavesdropper" on what he is about to say. Just as the reference to the noisy household acknowledges the distractions of daily life for the wealthy neophyte-reader, the allusion to the *arbiter profanus* is (or at least can be read as) an unobtrusive acknowledgment of any pagan who should happen to pick up the work.

It also, in acknowledging the pagan, reminds him that he is an outsider to the life of peace that Cyprian and Donatus enjoy. The exclusion of the *arbiter profanus* might, in fact, tempt such a reader to keep on reading, in the hope of learning the secrets Cyprian will reveal to Donatus. As the discourse proceeds, that expectation is turned on its head. Cyprian mentions no controversial or esoteric doctrines; the only sacrament that he discusses is the first, baptism, on whose ritual he gives no details. Instead, he portrays the Christian life as one of ever-increasing moral uprightness, intellectual clarity, and spiritual power. Only when Cyprian turns his reader's gaze toward the world would he finally see secrets revealed, as Cyprian shows him a picture of his own society as it looks to the Christian liberated by grace from its iniquities. Cyprian does not simply tell what life in grace and in the world are like, however. Instead, he uses the garden scenes and the image of the mountain to give his readers a concrete picture of the life that he and Donatus now live, which contrasts sharply with his description of his own life before baptism and of the *saeculi tenebrae*. The Christians, unlike the pagans, live a life of contented leisure, rejoicing in their freedom from sin; they will, moreover, enjoy a "sober meal" far removed from the miserly discontentment of the pagan rich of *Ad Donatum* 12.

Any apologetic function that *Ad Donatum* has is thus based solely on Cyprian's presentation of the *res* of the Christian life and the secular world.[93] This sets it apart from the apologetic works of his Latin predecessors, Tertullian and Minucius Felix. It also means that the

work would likely have won over only those pagans already amenable to Christianity—people who doubted, like Cyprian before his baptism, that spiritual transformation was possible, not that Christian religion was the way to find it, if it could be found. Whether it was meant to be distributed to a pagan readership or not, *Ad Donatum* reflects much the same approach to worldly culture and polytheistic worship as Cyprian followed later in his career. In the apologetic *Ad Demetrianum*, written some years later, he complained that the Demetrianus had refused "to listen patiently" to his presentation of Christian doctrine.[94] In reply to Demetrianus's attacks, Cyprian held up the promise of divine judgment to come, citing the corruption of the natural and human worlds only in second place to scripture, which he, alone among the pre-Nicene Latin apologists, quotes at length.[95] For Cyprian, the present age must be understood through the facts of Christian belief and Christian experience, not Christianity in pagan terms.

CONCLUSION: PEACE AMID THE STORMS OF THE WORLD

Some fifty years after Cyprian's death, the rhetoric professor Lactantius, turned apologist in *Divine Institutes*, would object to his predecessor's reliance on scripture to convince pagans in *Ad Demetrianum*. *Ad Donatum*, which omits scripture, might have appealed to him more, yet it too, as Lactantius complains of Cyprian's works in general, was written from a position of Christian conviction, without concession to pagan readers.[96] Cyprian was, in the first instance, a bishop and not an apologist, and *Ad Demetrianum*, like *Ad Donatum*, closes with an exhortation to Christian devotion and a declaration of the security available to the Christian alone. "For neither," he says, "can one be anything but always happy and grateful, who, when he had been liable to death, has been made secure by immortality."[97]

Cyprian is referring to the everlasting death of the human being cast into hell, but his words bear an additional, immediate resonance. A few years before he wrote *Ad Demetrianum*, the churches in Carthage and throughout the Roman world had been subjected to intense official opposition by imperial agents. The emperor Decius had not, perhaps, meant to target Christians specifically when he commanded universal sacrifice,[98] but they were blamed, by Demetrianus's contemporaries as by pagans in Tertullian's day, for causing the empire's misfortunes through their departure from the worship of the many gods.[99] *Ad Donatum*, by contrast, envisions neither persecution nor pagan opposition. The Christian's peril is complacency, against which he must guard, "lest . . . the enemy sneak up" and take him at unawares.[100] Cyprian's attitude toward the pagan world had not changed in the years since he had written *Ad Donatum*. The position of Christianity had.

Ad Donatum is thus more than a bold literary experiment, an attempt to rework the tropes of the dialogic form to support a forceful Christian exhortation. It also shows how the Christian life could be envisioned by one of its foremost third-century exponents before the outbreak of the first empire-wide persecution. For Cyprian in the later *De bono patientiae*, the Christian who has escaped "from carnal madness and contention as if from the tempests of the sea and has now begun to be tranquil and gentle in the port of Christ" must endure not only the billows of worldly temptation but also "the persecutions of Jews or gentiles and heretics."[101] In *Ad Donatum*, by contrast, the Christian life offers a safe-haven for souls tossed about by the storms of the world, where they can sit, removed as if in a tranquil country garden from the bloodshed and vice of the contemporary Roman city. The work's literary form is not just an adjunct to its content; the frame scenes convey, on a literary level, the reality of the Christian life as it seemed to Cyprian

in the time between his baptism and the beginning of the persecution that would define his episcopal career.

Mattias Gassman is a British Academy Postdoctoral Fellow in the Faculty of Classics at the University of Oxford

* My thanks to Neil McLynn for his advice on (much) earlier drafts of what has become this article, to Oliver Nicholson and Timothy Whitmarsh for input on particular points, and to the anonymous *JECS* referees for their input. All mistakes remain my own.

[1] On the date and context of *Ad Donatum*, which is customarily placed in 246, but likely belongs closer to Cyprian's ordination in 248 or 249, see Mattias Gassman, "Cyprian's Early Career in the Church of Carthage," *JEH* 70 (2019): 1–17; in this article, I will assume throughout that the Cyprian of *Ad Donatum* was, though a new Christian, not the relatively naïve neophyte many readings of *Ad Donatum* have made him. The best biography remains Michael M. Sage, *Cyprian*, Patristic Monograph Series 1 (Philadelphia: The Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1975). I use the edition of M. Simonetti in CCL 3A:1–13; all translations, unless otherwise noted, are mine.

[2] Enough to garner Augustine's criticism for excessive floridity: *Doct. chr.* 4.14.31 (CCL 32:137–38), which has much influenced *Ad Donatum*'s reception. See further Mattias Gassman,

"The Conversion of Cyprian's Rhetoric? Towards a New Reading of *Ad Donatum*," *SP* 94 (2017): 247–57, at 250–2.

[3] On late Roman and Byzantine dialogues, see Alberto Rigolio, *Christians in Conversation: A Guide to Late Antique Dialogues in Greek and Syriac*, Oxford Studies in Late Antiquity (New York: Oxford University Press, 2019), Averil Cameron, *Dialoguing in Late Antiquity*, Hellenic Studies Series 65 (Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies, 2014); on Macrobius, especially Alan Cameron, *The Last Pagans of Rome* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 231–72; on Augustine's dialogues, e.g., Catherine Coneybeare, *The Irrational Augustine*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

[4] *Octavius* overlaps extensively with Tertullian, *Apol.*; for the widely accepted case that Tertullian is the earlier, see Carl Becker, *Der "Octavius" des Minucius Felix: Heidnische Philosophie und frühchristliche Apologetik*, Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse 1967/2 (Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1967), 74–97. Some still maintain an earlier date (e.g., Simon Price, "Latin Christian Apologetics: Minucius Felix, Tertullian, and Cyprian," in *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians*, ed. Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, and Simon Price, in association with Christopher Rowland [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999], 105–29, at 112).

[5] Minucius Felix, *Octavius* 1–4 (ed. Bernhard Kytzler, *M. Minucii Felicis Octavius*, Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana [Leipzig: Teubner, 1982], 1–3); Cicero, *Rep.* 1.1–14, *Leg.* 1.1–2 (ed. J. G. F. Powell, *M. Tulli Ciceronis: De re publica, De legibus, Cato Maior De senectute, Laelius De amicitia*, Oxford Classical Texts [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006], 3–11, 157–58), *N.D.* 1.1–6, 3.40 (ed. W. Ax, after O. Plasberg, *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta*

quae manserunt omnia, 45: *De natura deorum*, 2nd ed. reprinted, Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana [Stuttgart: Teubner, 1961 (1933)], 1–7, 160). Cf. Tacitus, *Dial.* 1.1–3 (ed. M. Winterbottom and R. M. Ogilvie, *Cornelii Taciti opera minora*, Oxford Classical Texts [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975], 65–66).

[6] Michael Winterbottom, "Cyprian's *Ad Donatum*," in *Severan Culture*, ed. Simon Swain, Stephen Harrison, and Jaś Elsner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 190–98, at 191. Cf. Jean-Claude Fredouille, "L'humanité vue d'en haut (Cyprien, *Ad Donatum*, 6-13)," *VC* 64 (2010): 445–55, at 453, "Ces pages de l'*Ad Donatum*, dont la littérature antérieure n'offre pas de véritable équivalent, ne paraissent guère avoir fait d'émules."

[7] Maria Veronese, "*Paulisper te crede subduci in montis ardui verticem celsiorem* (Cypr. *Ad Don.* 6): alle radici di un'immagine ciprianea," in *Africa Cristiana: Storia, religione, letteratura*, ed. Marcello Marin and Claudio Moreschini (Brescia: Morcelliana, 2002), 75–98, has recognized the problem of the work's form squarely. Other especially insightful contributions include Fredouille, "L'humanité," 445–55, Veronese, "*In proprias laudes odiosa iactatio* (Cypr., *Ad Don.* 4): l'accezione cristiana di una sentenza classica," in *Interpretare e comunicare: Tradizioni di scuola nella letteratura latina tra III e VI secolo*, Auctores Nostri: Studi e testi di letteratura cristiana antica 4 (Bari: Edipuglia, 2006), 181–91, and a series of three articles by Vinzenz Buchheit, "Cyprian – Seneca und die *laudes agricolarum* Vergils," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 122 (1979): 348–59, "*Non agnitione sed gratia* (Cypr. Don. 2)," *Hermes* 115 (1987): 318–34, "*Non homini sed deo* (Cypr. Don. 3-4)," *Hermes* 117 (1989): 210–26.

[8] Esp. Jean Molager, *Cyprien de Carthage: A Donat et La Vertu de patience*, Sources chrétiennes 291 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1982), 43–46, Jacques Fontaine, *Aspects et problèmes de la*

prose d'art latine au IIIe siècle: la genèse des styles latins chrétiens, Lezioni "Augusto Rostagni" 4 (Turin: Bottega d'Erasmo, 1968), 158–60.

[9] Winterbottom, "Cyprian's *Ad Donatum*," 190–98; see also Gassman, "Conversion," 247–57.

[10] Leonardo Lugaresi, *Il teatro di Dio: Il problema degli spettacoli nel cristianesimo antico (II-IV secolo),* Supplementi Adamantius 1 (Brescia: Morcelliana, 2008), 438–46.

[11] For a text and succinct account of the manuscripts and history of editions, see G. F. Diercks, CCL 3C:633–35. The other, much later manuscripts are Carpentras, Bibl. Inguimbertine 31, saec. XIV, and Pavia, Bibl. Universitaria 453, saec. XV.

[12] I have consulted the text in a later, emended printing, available online at https://archive.org/details/bub_gb_qlDTXzGrEw8C/page/n4: *D. Caecilii Cypriani Carthaginiensis Episcopi totius Africae Primatis et gloriossisimi Martyris opera* (Antwerp: Petrus Bellerus, 1589), 1.

[13] CSEL 3.3:xliv–v, rating M and Q more highly as witnesses to the text of the epistles. The assessment of Maurice Bévenot, *The Tradition of Manuscripts: A Study in the Transmission of St. Cyprian's Treatises* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961), 92n1, in a detailed study of the manuscripts of *De ecclesiae catholicae unitate*, is blunter: "the rare good reading is swamped by a mass of unintelligent and gratuitous readings which point to a predecessor both difficult to read and probably already hopelessly corrupt."

[14] Karl G. Goetz, *Der alte Anfang und die ursprüngliche Form von Cyprians Schrift Ad Donatum*, *TU* 19.1 (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1899).

[15] *Pro*: Harnack, *Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*, 2 vols. in 3 parts (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1893–1904), 2.2:338–39, von Soden, *Die Cyprianische Briefsammlung; Geschichte ihrer Entstehung und Überlieferung¸ TU* NS 10.3 (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1904), 225–

26. *Contra*: Otto Bardenhewer, *Geschischte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, 2nd ed., 2 vols. (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1913–14), 2:458, Paul Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne depuis les origines jusqu'à l'invasion arabe*, 7 vols. (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1901–24), 2:262n4.

[16] Molager, *Cyprien*, 35–37, and Pierre de Labriolle, *Histoire de la littérature latine chrétienne*, Collection d'Études Anciennes, 3rd ed. reviewed and expanded by Gustave Bardy, 2 vols. (Paris: Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1947), 1:227–28, object on literary grounds. Contrast Sage, *Cyprian*, 58–59, who accepts Goetz's case; thus also Josef Martin, "Der Eingang von Cyprians Schrift 'Ad Donatum,'" in *Παραδοσις: Studies in Memory of Edwin A. Quain*, ed. Harry G. Fletcher III and Mary B. Schulte (New York: Fordham University Press, 1976), 31–34, who stresses the parallels with Minucius Felix (on which further in the next section).

[17] Winterbottom, "Cyprian's *Ad Donatum*," 191; Lugaresi, *Teatro*, 440n187, "pare tuttora meritevole di attenzione."

[18] *CCL* 3C:633, "Je pense qu'il faut conclure ce petit exposé par les mots: adhuc sub iudice lis est."

[19] Goetz, *Anfang*, 6, "denn wer wird ein kunstvolles Gespräch mit einer Gegenrede beginnen, ohne den Inhalt der ersten Rede mit einem Wort zu erwähnen, oder wer wird es mit dem Eingehn auf ein Versprechen beginnen, ohne zu sagen, um was für ein Versprechen es sich handelt?"

[20] Goetz, *Anfang*, 5–6.

[21] Goetz, *Anfang*, 10, "Ebenso trennen sie den Text des erweiterten Anfanges, wie wieder oben zu sehen ist, nicht von dem der übrigen Schrift Ad Donatum als etwas Besonderes ab."

[22] De Pamele, *Opera*, 1: it was titled *Admonitio Donati ad Cyprianum* in the *codex Cambronensis*. "Donatus Cypriano" is explicitly classed as an *epistula* in the fourteenth-century

manuscript held at Carpentras, and implicitly in the fifteenth-century Pavia manuscript, which adds to *Donatus Cypriano* the words *suo salutem* (thus Diercks's apparatus, *CCL* 3C:635).

[23] Troyes, Bibliothèque Municipale, 581, fol. 1v. I thank Pascal Jacquinot and the Médiathèque du Grand Troyes for providing me with an electronic facsimile of this manuscript.

[24] Munich, Staatsbibliothek, Clm 208, fol. 3r, available on the website of the Bayerischer Staatsbibliothek, at http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/bsb00024365/image_1.

[25] Munich, Staatsbibliothek, Clm 208, fol. 3v. Exceptions are found in the *testimonia*-collections: in both *Q* and *M*, the list of prooftexts in each book of *Quir*. begins with a large majuscule, just as the book itself does (e.g., Troyes, Bibliothèque Municipale, 581, fol. 99v; Munich, Staatsbibliothek, Clm 208, fol. 92r); so also *Fort.* in *Q* (fol. 89r).

[26] Munich, Staatsbibliothek, Clm 208, fol. 1r, 7v. None of the three texts has an *incipit*.

[27] *Doct. chr.* 4.14.31 (CCL 32:137–8): *Est tale aliquid in epistola beatissimi Cypriani*.

[28] *Orig. Num.* (ed. W. A. Baehrens, *Origenes Werke*, 7: *Homilien zum Hexateuch in Rufins Übersetzung*, part 2: *Die Homilien zu Numeri, Josua und Judices*, Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte [Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1921], 1): *Ut verbis tibi, frater, beati Martyris loquar, bene admones, Donate carissime*.

[29] A. A. R. Bastiaensen, *Le Cérémonial épistolaire des chrétiens latins: Origine et premiers développements*, Graecitas et Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva, Supplementa 2.1 (Nijmegen: Dekker and van de Vegt, 1964), 1–45, at 28, "*Sanctus* (*sanctissimus*) n'est pas du vocabulaire de Cyprien"; he notes a few instances, not from Cyprian, in his corpus. The most relevant appear in the record of the Council of Carthage of 256 (*Sent.* 8, 26; CCL 3E:27, 47), where Crescens of Cirta begins a speech with the words, *In tanto coetu sanctissimorum consacerdotum lectis litteris*

Cypriani dilectissimi nostri, and Felix of Uthina addresses the assembled bishops as *sanctissimi consacerdotes*.

[30] Cf., e.g., *Ad Quirin.* 1.praef., 3.praef., *Ad Fort.* 1 (CCL 3:3–4, 73, 183), *Mort.* 1 (CCL 3A:17).

[31] Goetz, *Anfang*, 14.

[32] Stressed by Goetz, *Anfang*, 12, "Das früher inhaltslose 'nam et promisisse me memini' gewinnt seinen guten Sinn durch das 'sicut promittebas.'"

[33] *Ad Don.* 2 (CCL 3A:3–4), *In iudiciis, in contione, pro rostris opulenta facundia uolubili ambitione iactetur*.

[34] *TLL* s.v. *lectio*, 1084.24-41, *usu dilatato ponitur fere pro ipsis studiis, quae maxime legendo exercentur*, gives Jerome, *Ep.* 29.7.2 as its earliest citation; the usage in "Donatus Cypriano" is especially close to that of Cassiodorus, *Inst.* 2. praef.1 (*Cassiodori Senatoris Institutiones*, corrected reprint, ed. R. A. B. Mynors [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963], 89), which contrasts *saeculares lectiones* to *lectiones diuinae*. In Cyprian's genuine works, *diuina lectio* signifies "Holy Scripture" or the reading of it (e.g., *Zel. et liu.* 16, CCL 3A:84: *Sit in manibus diuina lectio, in sensibus dominica cogitatio, oratio iugis omnino non cesset, salutaris operatio perseueret*); see further Michael Andrew Fahey, *Cyprian and the Bible: A Study in Third-Century Exegesis*, Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Hermeneutik 9 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1971), 32–34. Goetz, *Anfang*, 11, translates *in diuina lectione* as "beim göttlichen Studium."

[35] *Ad Don.* 15 (CCL 3A:12): *Sit tibi uel oratio adsidua uel lectio. Nunc cum Deo loquere, nunc Deus tecum. Ille te praeceptis suis instruat, ille disponat*.

[36] This would hardly be unprecedented: there is a vast range of pseudo-Cyprianic material, including sermons, treatises, letters, prayers, and poems, which date from the third century to the Renaissance (overview in *CSEL* 3.3:lviii–lxviii).

[37] Harnack, *Chronologie*, 2.2:339; cf. Goetz, *Anfang*, 13.

[38] Thus most baldly Eberhard Heck, *Μη θεομαχειν, oder: Die Bestrafung des Gottesverächters*, Studien zur klassischen Philologie (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1987), 153, "ein durch Halbieren des minucianischen 'Octavius' gewonnener szenischer Monolog"; cf. Sage, *Cyprian*, 111, Becker, *Minucius Felix*, 95n70, Molager, *Cyprien*, 29–30, and Michele Pellegrino, *Studi su l'antica apologetica* (Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1947), 111–13, noting however, at 114, that "l'*Ad Donatum* rivela un carattere tutto proprio." *Pace* George L. Carver, "Minucius Felix and Cyprian: The Question of Priority," *TAPA* 108 (1978): 21–34, Minucius Felix is almost certainly earlier than Cyprian (discussion in Sage, *Cyprian*, 60–73).

[39] Molager, *Cyprien*, 29–30, lays out the parallels.

[40] Minucius's choice of a seaside setting is unusual (Mark Edwards, "*Locus Horridus* and *Locus Amoenus*," in *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble*, ed. Michael Whitby, Philip Hardy, and Mary Whitby [Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1987], 267–76, esp. 272), though it has a respectable precedent in the dialogue of Favorinus described by Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* 18.1 (ed. P. K. Marshall, *A. Gellii: Noctes Atticae*, 2 vols., Oxford Classical Texts [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990], 2:537–39), as Jean Beaujeu, *Minucius Felix: Octavius*, Collection des universités de France (Paris: Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1964), xx–xxiii, points out.

[41] Antonio Quacquarelli, *La Retorica antica al bivio (L'*Ad Nigrinum *e l'*Ad Donatum*)* (Rome: Edizioni scientifiche romane, 1956), 122–23.

[42] E.g., Edward White Benson, *Cyprian: His Life, His Times, His Work* (London: MacMillan, 1897), 13.

[43] Marian Szarmach, "'Ad Donatum' des heiligen Cyprian als rhetorischer Protreptik," *Eos* 77 (1989): 289–97, at 296.

[44] Winterbottom, "Cyprian's *Ad Donatum*," 191–95.

[45] Goetz, *Anfang*, 15–16.

[46] *Sancti Caecilii Cypriani episcopi Carthaginiensis et martyris opera* (Paris: Typographia Regia, 1726), 1, *PL* 4:191–92.

[47] Karin Schlapbach, "The Pleasance, Solitude and Literary Production: The transformation of the *locus amoenus* in Late Antiquity," *JbAC* 50 (2007): 34–50, at 47–48; Fredouille, "L'humanité," 454–55.

[48] Contrast, for example, *Ep.* 1, which is put before the outbreak of persecution by Sage, *Cyprian*, 365–66, and so might date fairly close in time to *Ad Donatum* (but see G. W. Clarke in CCL 3D:691–92 for a more cautious dating). The letter is addressed, *Cyprianus presbyteris et diaconibus et plebi Furnis consistentibus s.*, and concludes, *Opto uos, fratres carissimi, sempere bene ualere* (CCL 3B:1, 5).

[49] Von Soden, *Cyprianische Briefsammlung*, 196–203.

[50] Contrast *Parm.* 1.4.6 (CSEL 51:26), *quales martyr Cyprianus in epistula de lapsis gemit*, and *Cresc.* 2.33.42 (CSEL 52:401), *Cyprianus . . . ex epistula quam de unitate conscripsit*, to Cyprian, *Ep.* 54.4 (CCL 3B:255), *lectis libellis quos hic nuper legeram . . . ubi lapsis nec censura deest . . . et catholicae ecclesae unitatem quantum potuit expressit nostra mediocritas*, *Ep.* 73.26.2 (CCL 3C:562), *libellum . . . de bono patientiae*. The situation is complicated by the absence of *Ad Donatum* from the catalogue of Cyprian's works in Augustine, *Serm.* 313C.2 (=

Serm. Guelferbytanus 26.2), in *Sancti Augustini Sermones post Maurinos reperti*, Miscellanea Agostiniana 1, ed. Germain Morin (Rome: Tipografia Poliglotta Vaticana, 1930), 530–31, which refers, correctly, to *De lapsis* as a *libellus*. Pierre Courcelle, *Les Confessions de Saint Augustin dans la tradition littéraire: Antécédents et postérité* (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1963), 120–21n5, argues that "Augustin considère l'*Ad Donatum* comme une *epistula*, non un *libellus*," but suggests nonetheless that there is an allusion to *Ad Donatum* before the catalogue. Be that as it may, the systematic distinction between *epistulae* and *libelli* is Courcelle's, not Augustine's: Almut Mutzenbecher, "Bemerkungen zum *Indiculum* des Possidius: Eine Rezension," *REAug* 33 (1987): 128–33, at 130, suggests that Augustine did not consistently divide his own *libri* from *epistulae* before he surveyed his literary output in *Retractationes*.

[51] *Pace* Schlapbach, "Pleasance," 48.

[52] *Ad Don.* 1 (CCL 3A:3): *Bene admones, Donate carissime: nam et promisisse me memini, et reddendi tempestiuum prorsus hoc tempus est, quo indulgente uindemia solutus animus in quietem sollemnes ac statas anni fatigantis indutias sortiatur. Locus etiam cum die conuenit, et mulcendis sensibus ac fouendis ad lenes auras blandientis autumni hortorum facies amoena consentit: hic iocundum sermonibus diem ducere et studentibus fabulis in diuina praecepta conscientiam pectoris erudire. Ac ne eloquium nostrum arbiter profanus impediat aut clamor intemperans familiae strepentis obtundat, petamus hanc sedem: dant secessum uicina secreta, ubi dum erratici palmitum lapsus nexibus pendulis per harundines baiulas repunt, uiteam porticum frondea tecta fecerunt. Bene hic studia in aures damus, et dum in arbores et in uites uidemus, oblectante prospectu oculos amoenamus, animam simul et auditus instruit et pascit obtutus: quamquam tibi sola nunc gratia, sola cura sermonis est, contemptis uoluptariae uisionis*

inlecebris in me oculos tuos fixus es, qua ore, qua mente totus auditor es et hoc amore quo diligis.

[53] Minucius Felix, *Octavius* 2.3–4 (Kytzler, *M. Minuci Felicis Octavius*, 1–2); cf., e.g., Cicero, *Rep.* 1.14 (Powell, *Ciceronis: De re publica*, 11), *N.D.* 1.6.15 (Ax and Plasberg, *Ciceronis: De natura deorum*, 7), and *De oratore* 1.7.24 (ed. Kazimierz F. Kumaniecki, *M. Tulli Ciceronis, scripta quae manserunt omnia*, 3: *De oratore*, Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana [Leipzig: Teubner, 1969], 11). On Cyprian's career before baptism, see n. 84, below.

[54] *Octavius* 3.4 (Kytzler, *M. Minuci Felicis Octavius*, 2); cf. Molager, *Cyprien*, 29.

[55] Lugaresi 2011: 440, "un cronotopo anti-spettacolare che . . . trasporta i due personagge, e il lettore con loro, in una regione spirituale completamente avulsa dalle *illecebrae* del mondo dello spettacolo."

[56] *Ad Don.* 14 (CCL 3A:11); Fredouille, "L'humanité," 448n15, cites parallels from Cicero to Augustine. For the parallel between setting and the theme of salvation, cf. Quacquarelli, *Retorica*, 123–26, and Winterbottom, "Cyprian's *Ad Donatum*," 194–95.

[57] *Ad Don.* 6–13 (CCL 3A:6–11).

[58] *Ad Don.* 2 (CCL 3A:3–4). Cyprian adapts a trope widespread in ancient rhetoric: see Tore Janson, *Latin Prose Prefaces: Studies in Literary Conventions*, Studia Latina Stockholmiensia 13 (Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1964), 128–30, with the discussion of Cyprian's aims in Gassman, "Conversion," 253–56.

[59] *Ad Don.* 3 (CCL 3A:4).

[60] *Ad Don.* 4 (CCL 3A:4–5).

[61] Cf. Lugaresi, *Teatro*, 440, “il concentrarsi di tutta l’attenzione del discepolo nell’insegnamento che il maestro gli impartisce.”

[62] *Ad Don.* 5 (CCL 3A:5–6).

[63] *Ad Don.* 6 (CCL 3A:6): *. . . lucem tibi ad cognitionem dabo, malorum caligine abstersa operti saeculi tenebras reuelabo. Paulisper te crede subduci in montis ardui uerticem celsiorem, speculare inde rerum infra te iacentium facies et oculis in diuersa porrectis ipse a terrenis contactibus liber fluctuantis mundi turbines intuere*.

[64] Fredouille, “L’humanité,” 445–55, Veronese, “*Paulisper*,” 75–98.

[65] Cf. Lugaresi, *Teatro*, 442. In *Ad Don.* 5 (CCL 3A:6), the Christian is said *ipsum esse subtractum perniciosis contactibus mundi*; in *Ad Don.* 6 (CCL 3A:6), Donatus is *ipse a terrenis contactibus liber*.

[66] Lugaresi, *Teatro*, 442–46.

[67] Lugaresi, *Teatro*, 442 compares Cyprian's technique to a movie director’s (“‘regia cinematografica’”).

[68] *Ad Don.* 15 (CCL 3A:12): *Iam tibi auro distincta laquearia et pretiosi marmori crustis uestita domicilia sordebunt, cum scieris . . . domum tibi hanc esse potiorem, quam Dominus insedit temple uice, in qua Spiritus sanctus coepit habitare*.

[69] *Ad Don.* 12 (CCL 3A:11).

[70] *Ad Don.* 14 (CCL 3A:11–12): *. . . ad caelum oculos tollit a terris et ad Domini munus admissus ac Deo suo mente iam proximus, quicquid apud ceteros in rebus humanis sublime ac magnum uidetur, intra suam iacere conscientiam gloriatur.*

[71] *Ad Don.* 14 (CCL 3A:12): *Postquam auctorem suum caelum intuens anima cognouit, sole altior et hac omni terrena potestate sublimior id esse incipit, quod esse se credit*.

[72] *Ad Don.* 15 (CCL 3A:12). The ancient *Life* of Cyprian attributed by Jerome to the deacon Pontius asserts that Cyprian gave up his wealth after his conversion (*V. Cypr.* 2.7, ed. A. A. R. Bastiaensen, *Vita Cipriano, Vita di Ambrogio, Vita di Agostino*, with an introduction by Christine Mohrmann and translations by Luca Canali and Carlo Carena, 3rd ed., Vita di Santi 3 [Milan: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, 1983], 8; Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 68, ed. Aldo Ceresa-Gastaldo, *Gerolamo: Gli uomini illustri: De viris illustribus*, Biblioteca Patristica [Florence: Nardini, 1988], 172). See further Geoffrey D. Dunn, "The White Crown of Works: Cyprian's Early Pastoral Ministry of Almsgiving in Carthage," *Church History* 73 (2004), 715–40, and Charles Bobertz's Yale PhD dissertation, "Cyprian of Carthage as patron: A social historical study of the role of bishop in the ancient Christian community of North Africa" (1989), 50–129.

[73] *Ad Don.* 16 (CCL 3A:13): *Haec interim breuibus, Donate carissime. Nam etsi facilem de bonitate patientiam, mentem in Deum solidam, fidem tutam salutaris auditus oblectat, nihilque tam tuis auribus gratum est, quam quod in Deum gratum est, moderari tamen dicenda debemus simul iuncti et saepius locuturi, et quoniam feriata nunc quies ac tempus est otiosum, quicquid inclinante iam sole in uesperam dies superest, ducamus hunc diem laeti nec sit uel hora conuiuii gratiae caelestis inmunis. Sonet psalmus conuiuium sobrium: ut tibi tenax memoria est, uox canora, adgredere hoc munus ex more. Magis carissimos pascis, si sit nobis spiritalis auditio, prolectet aures religiosa mulcedo*.

[74] *Octavius* 40.2 (Kytzler, *M. Minuci Felicis Octavius*, 37).

[75] *Octavius* 40.2, 4 (Kytzler, *M. Minuci Felicis Octavius*, 37). Cf. Becker, *Minucius Felix*, 95n70, who is groundlessly dismissive: "das *laeti*-Motiv bildet auch hier den Schluß (c. 16) – im Unterschied zum *Octavius* ohne eine Funktion."

[76] Cf. Winterbottom, "Cyprian's *Ad Donatum*," 191, "The soul is now to be fed not by pleasant surroundings but by Christian observance."

[77] Winterbottom, "Cyprian's *Ad Donatum*," 194–95, "In the light of such a vision, the serenity of the closing chapter strikes (as we have seen) a deeper note than that of the opening one . . . Cyprian's exposition has given a foundation for peace and confidence." Cf. Elisabeth Fink-Dendorfer, *Conversio: Motive und Motivierung zur Bekehrung in der Alten Kirche*, Regensburger Studien zur Theologie 33 (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1986), 107–8.

[78] Cf. Lugaresi, *Teatro*, 440.

[79] Quotations in n. 50, above.

[80] Pontius, *V. Cypr.* 7.3 (Bastiaensen, *Vita Cipriano*, 18; one of a string of rhetorical questions describing Cyprian's treatises): . . . *quis emolumentum gratiae per fidem proficientis ostenderet?* Cf. Veronese, "*Paulisper*," 97–98, on the work's protreptic purpose.

[81] This was a matter of particular interest to Cyprian: in the prologue to its first book (CCL 3:3–4), Cyprian casts the wide-ranging biblical compendium *Ad Quirinum* both as material for later writers and as an introduction to scripture for the edification of neophytes. On its possible relationship with the roughly contemporaneous *Ad Donatum*, see Gassman, "Cyprian's Early Career," 9–15, and cf., on the later scriptural compendium *Ad Fortunatum*, Jean Peyras, "Exercices spirituels et christianisme latin: l'*Ad Fortunatum* de Saint Cyprien," in *Des formes et des mots chez les Anciens: Mélanges offerts à Danièle Conso*, ed. Claude Brunet, Collection de l'Institut des Sciences et Techniques de l'Antiquité 1120 (Besançon: Institut des Sciences et Techniques de l'Antiquité, 2008), 337–58.

[82] Cf. Sage, *Cyprian*, 58, "Donatus almost disappears, and all pretense of a dialogue disappears with him."

[83] On the struggles that attended Cyprian's ordination, see Pontius, *V. Cypr.* 5.6 (Bastiaensen, *Vita Cipriano*, 16) and Cyprian, *Ep.* 43.1.2–3 (CCL 3B:200–1). For the issues discussed in this paragraph, Gassman, "Cyprian's Early Career," esp. 15–17.

[84] Pontius, *V. Cypr.* 2.7 (Bastiaensen, *Vita Cipriano*, 8), Lactantius, 5.1.24 (ed. Eberhard Heck and Antonie Wlosok, *L. Caelius Firmianus Lactantius Diuinarum Institutionum libri septem*, 3: *Libri V et VI*, Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana [Berlin: De Gruyter, 2009], 440), Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 67 (Ceresa-Gastaldo, *Gerolamo: Gli uomini illustri*, 170–71), *Chron.* 257 *post Christum* (ed. Rudolf Helm, *Eusebius Werke*, 7: *Die Chronik des Hieronymus. Hieronymi Chronicon*, 2nd ed., reprinted with a foreword by Ursula Treu, Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte [Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1984], 220), *Ion.* 3.6–9 (CCL 76:409). Discussion in G. W. Clarke, "The Secular Profession of St. Cyprian of Carthage," *Latomus* 24 (1965): 633–38, and Sage, *Cyprian*, 95–132.

[85] Cyprian, *Ep.* 59.6.1 (CCL 3C:346–47); Pontius, *V. Cypr.* 14.3 (Bastiaensen, *Vita Cipriano*, 38).

[86] E.g., Molager, *Cyprien*, 10, "il se proposait vraisemblablement d'atteindre des catéchumenès peu presses de recevoir le baptême, et sans doute des païens encore adonnés au culte des idoles et aux vices de la société dont il fait une peinture si attristante," Veronese, "*Paulisper*," 80, Quacquarelli, *Retorica*, 130, Pellegrino, *Studi*, 107–19.

[87] Lactantius, *Inst.* 5.1.24–28, 5.4.3–8 (Heck and Wlosok, *Lactantius Diuinarum Institutionum* 3, 440–1, 451–2).

[88] See further Buchheit, "Non agnitione," 330–33.

[89] Augustine, *Catech.* 8.12 (CCL 46:133–34).

[90] Price, "Latin Christian Apologetics," 105–6, and Jean-Claude Fredouille, "L'apologétique latine pré-constantinienne (Tertullien, Minucius Felix, Cyprien). Essai de typologie," in *L'Apologétique chrétienne gréco-latine à l'époque prénicénienne*, ed. Antonie Wlosok and François Paschoud, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique 51 (Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 2004), 39–60, at 59.

[91] *Ad Don.* 1 (CCL 3A:3).

[92] Cyprian uses *profanus* especially of persons or things that he perceives as standing outside the Church; thus it can refer both to pagans (e.g., *Ad Demetr.* 22, CCL 3A:48: *Succendi et cremari alienigenas praecanit dominus, id est alienos a diuino genere et profanos, spiritaliter non renatos nec Dei filios factos*) and to heretics (e.g., *Ep*. 3.3.2, CCL 3B:15, *Sic de ecclesia receditur, sic altare profanum foris conlocatur, sic contra pacem Christi et ordinationem atque unitatem dei rebellatur*; the ordinary usage, so Edward William Watson, "The Style and Language of St. Cyprian," *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica* 4 [1896]: 189–324, at 288).

[93] Cf. Pellegrino, *Studi*, 109–10.

[94] *Ad Demetr.* 1 (CCL 3A:35): *. . . et clamosis uocibus personans malles tua inpudenter ingerere quam nostra patienter audire*.

[95] See further Jean-Claude Fredouille, *Cyprien de Carthage: A Démétrien*, Sources chrétiennes 467 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2003), 38–44.

[96] As n. 87, above.

[97] *Ad Demetr.* 26 (CCL 3A:51): *Neque enim poterit nisi et laetus esse semper et gratus qui cum morti fuisset obnoxius, factus est immortalitate securus*.

[98] J. B. Rives, "The Decree of Decius and the Religion of Empire," *JRS* 89 (1999): 135–54, at 141–42.

[99] *Ad Demetr.* 2 (CCL 3A:35–36); cf. Tertullian, *Apol.* 40.1–2 (CCL 1:153).

[100] *Ad Don.* 5 (CCL 3A: 6).

[101] *Pat*. 16 (CCL 3A:128): *Si enim christianus a furore et contentione carnali tamquam de maris turbinibus excessit et tranquillus ac lenis in portu Christi esse iam coepit*; 21 (CCL 3A: 130): . . . *in istis fluctuantis mundi turbinibus et Iudaeorum siue gentilium et haereticorum quoque persecutionibus constituti*.