

# **Cui bono? Cicero's reasons for publication**

by  
Chris Rudolf Coetzee

*Thesis presented in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Arts in Classical Literature in the Faculty of  
Arts & Social Sciences at Stellenbosch University*



Supervisor: Dr. Sjarlene Thom

December 2017

## **Declaration**

By submitting this thesis electronically, I declare that the entirety of the work contained therein is my own, original work, that I am the sole author thereof (save to the extent explicitly otherwise stated), that reproduction and publication thereof by Stellenbosch University will not infringe any third party rights and that I have not previously in its entirety or in part submitted it for obtaining any qualification.

December 2017

Copyright © 2017 Stellenbosch University

All rights reserved

## Abstract

This study investigates the question whether Cicero published to serve his own glory, or whether he published to serve the commonwealth, in other words, to whose benefit (*cui bono*) was publication? After exploring the context in which Cicero published, the study considers eight reasons for publication, namely publication to add to his personal glory, to elicit literary favours, to promote his own works, to reply to his critics, to promote a political agenda, to educate society, to promote Latin literature, and to pay compliments. While the study considered all surviving works, I argue that the conference at Luca in 56 BCE and Cicero's subsequent retirement from politics constituted a watershed, after which his publication habits changed. Therefore, the study focused primarily on the works concerning oratory and philosophy. Important additional information concerning the circumstances of composition and publication were sought in the letters. After considering these various reasons for publication, I come to the conclusion that Cicero's decision to publish was motivated by his quest for personal glory, mostly as a form of rehabilitation after his exile from 58 to 57 BCE. Publishing to serve the commonwealth in the end seems only of secondary concern.

## Opsomming

Hierdie studie ondersoek Cicero se redes vir publikasie en probeer vasstel of hy publiseer tot voordeel van sy eie roem of tot voordeel van die gemeenskap, met ander woorde, tot wie se voordeel (*cui bono*) was publikasie? Na 'n oorsig van die omstandighede en omgewing waarin Cicero publiseer, identifiseer hierdie studie agt redes vir publikasie, naamlik publikasie ter uitbreiding van sy eie roem, tot ontlokking van literêre gunste, ter bevordering van sy eie werke, tot weerlegging van kritici, tot bevordering van politieke doelwitte, tot opvoeding van die gemeenskap, tot bevordering van die Latynse letterkunde, en om te komplimenteer. Alhoewel hierdie studie alle oorblywende werke oorweeg het, argumenteer die studie dat die konferensie by Luca in 56 v.C. en Cicero se daaropvolgende politieke aftrede 'n merkwaardige verandering in sy publikasiegewoontes tot gevolg gehad het. Hierdie studie fokus dus hoofsaaklik op Cicero se retoriese en filosofiese werke. Die briewe is ook ondersoek om belangrike addisionele informasie aan die lig te bring aangaande die omstandighede waaronder hy geskryf en gepubliseer het. Na oorweging van verskeie redes vir publikasie, kom die studie tot die gevolgtrekking dat Cicero se besluit om te publiseer gemotiveer is deur sy behoefte aan persoonlike roem, meestal om die eer wat geskend was tydens sy ballingskap van 58 tot 57 v.C te herstel. Publikasie tot voordeel van die gemeenskap blyk telkens 'n sekondêre motivering te wees.

## **Acknowledgements**

This work would not have been possible without the tremendous support and patience of the Department of Ancient Studies at Stellenbosch University and most particularly my supervisor, Dr. Sjarlene Thom. I would also like to thank Dr. Charla Schutte for her endless encouragement and support, as well as my various teachers and students, all of whom have benefited my developing scholarship.

I dedicate this work to my parents and their parents.

## Table of Contents

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| 1. Introduction                               | 1   |
| 1.1 The context of the research problem       | 1   |
| 1.2 Approach                                  | 5   |
| 1.3 Relevant research                         | 7   |
| 2. Cicero's literary context                  | 9   |
| 3. Cicero's reasons for publication           | 27  |
| 3.1 Publication to add to his personal glory  | 27  |
| 3.2 Publication to elicit literary favours    | 37  |
| 3.3 Publication to promote his own works      | 47  |
| 3.4 Publication to reply to his critics       | 50  |
| 3.5 Publication to promote a political agenda | 57  |
| 3.6 Publication to educate society            | 67  |
| 3.7 Publication to promote Latin literature   | 78  |
| 3.8 Publication to pay compliments            | 88  |
| 4. Conclusion                                 | 100 |
| Reference List                                | 103 |

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 The context of the research problem

*haec<sup>1</sup> sunt illae fibrae stirpium, quas initio dixi, perseguendae et omnes eligendae, ne unquam ulla possit existere. magnum opus et difficile, quis negat? quid autem praeclarum non idem arduum?*

*Tusculanae Disputationes III.xxxiv.84<sup>2</sup>*

*These, however, are the filaments of the roots of which I spoke at the onset, and are to be followed up and picked out, so that none of them need ever be found again. A great undertaking and a hard one, who denies it? But what noble undertaking is not also hard?<sup>3</sup>*

Much as the young and inexperienced mycologist might see the lone mushroom sprouting on the forest floor and think that he knows his subject, that its nature is discernible, his delineations accurate, yet he is completely ignorant of the network of filaments underground that extend in all directions, a magnificent organism as large as the forest, so the inexperienced researcher may look upon his ideas concerning Cicero.

This research began with a fairly simple proposition: that Cicero had an educational philosophy and that this philosophy could be known. Apart from forming an elegant intersection of my own twin passions for Cicero and education, it seemed worth investigating Cicero as an educator, since most studies traditionally focus on his more celebrated roles as statesman, orator, lawyer, and philosopher. I hoped that Cicero's educational goals could represent a corrective to the thoughtless experimentation and 'reform' that has so destabilized education in our own challenging times. As a highly educated Roman moving in very literate circles, it could be expected that Cicero would have much to say on education and would treat the topic with his usual thoroughness.

---

<sup>1</sup> Capitalization is avoided except in the case of proper nouns.

<sup>2</sup> Primary textual references follow the numbering in the Loeb editions of the relevant works.

<sup>3</sup> Translations generally follow the Loeb editions or are paraphrased to facilitate reading.

But just like Atticus in *De Legibus* (III.xiii.30) and Tubero in *De Re Publica* (II.xxxvii.64), the reader eagerly anticipates a full discussion on Cicero's educational goals, only to find himself disappointed. This does not mean that Cicero committed little or no educational opinions to paper, but much seems to have been planned but either remained unwritten or was lost in transmission. What remains is scattered throughout his substantial output. As a result, we have no complete statement of his educational philosophy. The original aim of the research was to comb through all the surviving works of Cicero and isolate those instances that concern education, thereby identifying and synthesizing some of Cicero's educational goals. After the initial collection of material these goals could be summarized as follows: concerning the individual, to develop and maintain the honour of oneself and one's family; concerning society, to train 'good men' who can serve and benefit the commonwealth.

However, as research progressed and the various filaments were followed up, it became apparent that any educational aspects were inextricably linked to Cicero's political philosophy, making it increasingly difficult to delineate the topic in purely educational terms. Eight years were spent following up these filaments, resulting in over 12,000 primary references and seventy-five topics, only one of which is presented here. The topic that has been selected for this thesis is Cicero's reasons for publication. Although these reasons fall on a spectrum between serving Cicero's personal glory and serving the state, they can be identified more specifically as individual motivations for publication and will be discussed under eight headings.

The research question to be answered then is whether Cicero published to serve his own glory (personal honour), or whether he published to serve the commonwealth (social responsibility). The specific aspects under consideration include: publication to add to his personal glory; publication to elicit literary favours; publication to promote his own works; publication to reply to his critics; publication to promote a political agenda; publication to educate society; publication to promote Latin literature; and publication to pay compliments. In order to contextualize these purposes, there will also be an initial discussion of Cicero's literary context and methods of publication.

This research problem was chosen not only for its interest, but also because it encapsulates aspects gleaned from a much broader context. As a consequence, the context for this study began by reflecting most directly on purely educational aspects, such as Cicero's own childhood education, his teachers and opinions on teaching, study techniques and practice, his attitude towards the value of intelligence, and his own role as a teacher. This naturally led to a study of parenting, Cicero's care for his own son and nephew, the way in which he supported talented young men and admonished their

dissolute brethren, as well as his opinions on how much to indulge youth, respect fathers, value experience, and observe generational distinction. This in turn led to a broader assessment of the ways in which upper-class male Romans interacted with one another, focusing on aspects such as inheriting associations, building up new associations, and observing obligations. But at this point, it became clear that all these issues were tending towards a certain political agenda, namely to train young men to serve the commonwealth.

It can rightly be argued that almost everything Cicero wrote, excepting some of the letters, had some political purpose – even if only drawing attention to the degradation of political life. A full understanding of Cicero’s educational philosophy would therefore have been incomplete without considering his political philosophy. The present study therefore focused on the importance of preserving talented and honourable young men to serve the commonwealth, how they could be attracted towards public service, which incentives were necessary, and how the dishonourable could be purged from the state. Cicero’s views on the value of the tranquil state, as well as his opinions on good and bad governance, were considered. The importance of following the example of the ancestors, setting good precedents and avoiding setting bad ones, creating role models for the young to emulate, and serving the state before oneself all received attention. However, the most important issue seemed to be the important role of honour in preserving the state.

The context of the study also required an in-depth understanding of Cicero’s definitions of honour and virtue, followed by their subdivisions, including personal honour, family honour, and military honour. Various adjacent topics had to be considered, including the building of good and bad reputations, living a public life rather than one of tranquil retirement from public affairs, the role of ambition, and guarding against rumour. The development of character had to be taken into account, including positive and negative characterization, nature versus nurture, how the times breed the man, and judging men by their habits, past actions, and their associations. Once the context of Cicero’s political philosophy had been considered, education once more became the focus in that matters of working method and curriculum had to be reviewed. Cicero’s opinions on working hard, being prepared, and the triumph of talent over heritage were considered. This was followed by a study of his views on learning across a broad range of disciplines, being a lifelong learner, the importance of studying oratory, speeches, laws, history, and literature, and the immense value of Greek and Latin bilingualism.

All of these topics could be part of a much larger study, but Cicero's reasons for publication, and more specifically the tension between honour as a motivation and social responsibility, is the focus for this Master's thesis. The tension between serving oneself (honour) and serving society (social responsibility) is a tension that is perennial. In Cicero, we see this tension running as a *Leitmotif* throughout his works.

## 1.2 Approach

It is a source both of magnificent satisfaction and terrific regret that so many of Cicero's works have survived. As a result, the Cicero scholar who intends to survey the corpus functions within certain constraints when compared to the scholar of other ancient writers – with perhaps the exception of Aristotle – in that he has more than enough primary sources, and even more besides, to consult. The Loeb edition of Cicero includes 30 volumes and runs to well over 6,000 pages of Latin text. Therefore, it was never the purpose of this study to master what others have written about Cicero, equally voluminous, but rather what Cicero himself wrote. I certainly did not ignore the academic discourse concerning Cicero's reasons for publication. A section has been included below, giving a brief overview of secondary research related to this specific aspect of Cicero's work and why this study differs in several respects. Secondary commentary has also been included as footnotes throughout this study where appropriate. However, in order to address the question of honour or social responsibility as a motivation for publication, this study focuses on primary sources. The conclusions being drawn are therefore based on these.

After his exile from 58 to 57<sup>4</sup> and being forced to abandon politics for the first time after the conference at Luca in 56, Cicero's compositional activity changes and begins to focus on rehabilitating and securing his position<sup>5</sup>, as well as promoting his glory for posterity. His publishing activity also becomes much more purposeful. Therefore, this study mostly focuses on and refers to the works written after 56. The speeches, however, are problematic. The context and dates of publication and dissemination – not necessarily composition – determine many of the conclusions being drawn in this study. Since most of the surviving speeches were composed before 56, and since publication did not necessarily follow composition and delivery directly<sup>6</sup>, the decision was made to focus primarily on the theoretical works on statecraft and oratory<sup>7</sup>, including *De Oratore* (55), *De Re Publica* (51), *De Legibus* (after 52), *Partitiones Oratoriae* (54–44), *Brutus* (46), *De Optimo Genere Oratorum* (46), and *Orator* (46), as well as the philosophical works, including *Paradoxa Stoicorum*

---

<sup>4</sup> All dates are BCE.

<sup>5</sup> For a very helpful summary of Cicero's actions to facilitate his political realignment after Luca, see Dolganov (2007:29).

<sup>6</sup> Berry (2004:80) makes the point that, since many of the speeches were published much later than their actual delivery, the editorial process prior to publication led to stylistic and content changes that more clearly reflected the circumstances of publication rather than original delivery. This view is shared by Harrison (2008:98). While this is certainly a useful insight with regards to dating, it makes drawing conclusions based on publication date far more difficult for the speeches than in the case of the oratorical and philosophical works, where publication generally followed composition.

<sup>7</sup> These are generally referred to as the 'theoretical works' in this study.

(46), *Academica*<sup>8</sup> (45), *De Finibus* (45), *Tusculanae Disputationes* (45), *De Natura Deorum* (45), *De Divinatione* (44), *De Senectute* (44), *Topica* (44), *De Amicitia* (44), *De Fato* (44), and *De Officiis* (44). Therefore, references to the speeches are made only where the content is highly relevant to the argument.

The *Epistulae ad Atticum* also functions as an essential text for this study, since Atticus was not only Cicero's publisher and literary agent, but also the one who encouraged him most frequently towards composition. The letters contain a wealth of detail concerning topics for composition, editorial revisions, and strategies for publication and dissemination<sup>9</sup>, making it highly relevant to the topic of Cicero's reasons for publication. This study also references the *Epistulae ad Quintum* and the *Epistulae ad Familiares* where appropriate. As a final consideration, the sheer volume of Cicero's corpus means that there are many potential examples to illustrate various arguments. Bearing in mind the limitations of a master's study, the best examples were chosen to make the point, while an exhaustive catalogue of all related material has generally been avoided.

---

<sup>8</sup> This title is used to refer to both *Academica* and *Lucullus*, which are the two versions of the same text.

<sup>9</sup> Starr (1987) offers a useful general summary of the process of dissemination in the Roman world.

### 1.3 Relevant research

The most fundamental difference between this study and most of the academic literature related to this topic is that it focuses on the purposes of publication, not composition. While these are of course related, there is a difference between the decision to write for oneself and the decision to publish and disseminate. Since the works have survived, many scholars take the act of publication for granted and focus their efforts on compositional dating and the influences on content. Most related secondary literature, when considering matters of purpose in writing and publishing, also often focus on individual works rather than considering these aspects across the Ciceronian corpus, making them less useful in the attempt to offer a broad statement on Cicero's reasons for publication. There are only two major studies on Cicero's publishing activity, namely Sommer (1926:389–422), and Carcopino (1947), but neither is recent. They build on earlier work, mostly by German scholars such as Birt (1882) and Dziatzko (1894:559–576), and are followed by Kleberg (1967), but all these tend to focus on ancient publication in general, rather than on Cicero in particular.

For the purposes of this study, there are three more recent articles in English that consider matters of publication in Cicero specifically, namely Phillips (1986), Murphy (1998), and Gurd (2007), but all of these generally focus on some aspect *other* than Cicero's reasons for publication. Nevertheless, they are worth including here in brief outline. Phillips (1986:227) considers the role Atticus played in publishing Cicero's works and begins by exploring the ambiguity of the evidence in the letters, explaining how such ambiguity leads to widely differing conclusions in Sommer and Carcopino, the former concluding that Atticus only published private editions, while the latter concludes that Atticus was responsible for the flourishing of publication in the late Republic. Whatever the case may be, Phillips (1986:237) weighs the evidence and concludes that we can only say with confidence that Atticus published *Orator* and *De Finibus*, and perhaps published *De Oratore*, *Academica*, and *Pro Ligario*. For the other works, we can only speculate about Atticus' role. The study does not, however, consider Cicero's aims, but has been useful in clarifying earlier research and summarizing the conclusions of Dziatzko and Kleberg concerning Atticus' importance as a publisher.

Murphy (1998:492) explores Cicero's choice of early readers, deduces the political grounds on which Cicero selected them, and comments on how this selection throws light on Cicero's agenda for promoting Latin as a philosophical language, a point I discuss below in 3.7. He also explores dissemination in the provinces as opposed to Rome (1998:496-501), concluding that Cicero chose influential residents of Rome, specifically those urban politicians in the circle of Caesar, rather than

educated provincials or philhellenic intellectuals, many of whom Cicero considered as opponents to his compositional program. Murphy (1998:505) concludes that Cicero's readership was 'at the apex of the social pyramid, among men he considered his equals, and his ideas were disseminated to those who would magnify his reputation by accepting them', a conclusion I draw as well.

Gurd (2007:49) specifically explores Cicero's practice of submitting his texts to others for comment, as this mutual reading and editorialization constituted an important social function in the forging and maintenance of social ties, a matter I consider in several sections below. By focusing specifically on matters of textual incompleteness in *Brutus*, Gurd (2007:58-68) also argues that this activity allowed Cicero and his contemporaries to forge a new literary politics as a way of critiquing the solitary, antisocial, and implicitly autocratic theories of style promoted by the Caesarians and Atticists.

In addition to these specific studies, Kenney (1982), Starr (1987), and Habinek (1998) have all produced useful research concerning matters of publication in a broader context and are referred to below. All other secondary research in the bibliography concern specific or minor points and are referred to as necessary.

## 2. Cicero's literary context

Before evaluating Cicero's reasons for publication, it is helpful to consider such evidence in Cicero's work that sketches an outline of the environment in which he published<sup>10</sup>. For this we must refer almost exclusively to his correspondence. Although we do not need to go very far back in history to find a time when owning books, let alone a library, was considered a great luxury, our own era of mass publication technology may have rendered us insensible to the great effort such activity constituted on the part of writers and bibliophiles in the ancient world<sup>11</sup>. Apart from books being written, collected, edited and continuously updated, dissemination ran the gamut, from the trialling of works before select audiences and wide circulation<sup>12</sup>, to suppression, accidental publication, deletion, and even deliberate destruction. Furthermore, in a time when the business of words was often left to slaves<sup>13</sup> – readers, copyists, and secretaries – the integrity and security of any publishing enterprise was inherently insecure and fluid.

Concerning the collection of books and the maintaining of libraries, two episodes from Cicero's correspondence are instructive. The first concerns a runaway slave named Dionysius. Towards the end of October 46, Cicero writes a letter to Publius Sulpicius Rufus, then governor of Illyricum, to inform him that he had voted in favour of his *supplicatio* in the senate, and to recommend a friend,

---

<sup>10</sup> The danger always exists that we may draw conclusions based on texts that have been inherently unstable since their production. Gurd (2007:51) challenges the over-allegiance on mimetic models of the relationship between literature and life, arguing that the variability of texts, especially in the early stages of dissemination, complicate such a model. I broadly agree with this assessment, but would add that we have so much of Cicero that a careful reading of the public and private works allows us to make certain broad assumptions concerning Cicero's context, methods, and purposes. Gurd's two definitions of "text" are useful here: 'First, a text is a single version: if it has been revised by more than one hand it embodies the interests of more than one person. Second, we understand a text to be the complete system of variants, that is, a set of versions united by a certain identity of content' (51).

<sup>11</sup> Kenney (1982:3) offers a very useful summary of the dangers of anachronism when considering Roman publication. He goes on to explain that 'in antiquity there were no copyright laws and no legal safeguards against unauthorized copying and circulation of books: therefore there was no such thing as publication in anything like its modern sense. In practice it was often possible for an author to confine the circulation of his work in the first instance to a limited number of friends; but sooner or later the decision would have to be taken, if it had not already been taken by events, to authorize or at least acquiesce in general circulation. Publication in this sense was less a matter of formal release to the public than a recognition by the author that his work was now, so to speak, on its own in the world ... a work, once relinquished by its author, was public property, and in that sense published, whether or not a bookseller was employed to copy and put it into circulation. What mattered was the author's intention' (1982:19).

<sup>12</sup> Murphy (1998:495) explains that 'the path that a book followed from its author's hand to its wider readership was to a large extent regulated by the ties of friendship and social obligation. Noble Romans obtained most of their books through social connections rather than from booksellers.' Starr (1987:221) calls the book trade 'an ancillary system of circulation beside the private channels that probably supplied the vast majority of literary texts.'

<sup>13</sup> 'Many well-to-do Romans must have had in their possession one or two slaves trained as clerks, who could be used as copyists of books when not otherwise employed and so build up the libraries of their employers and on occasion their employers' friends. This was how Atticus assisted Cicero; and his further services in copying and disseminating Cicero's own writings represent an extension of the same activity' (Kenney 1982:20).

M. Bolanus, to be admitted to his circle. However, the real reason for the letter comes towards the end, where Cicero requests his help to capture and return Dionysius:

*praeterea a te peto in maiorem modum pro nostra amicitia et pro tuo perpetuo in me studio ut in hac re etiam elaborēs: Dionysius, servus meus, qui meam bibliothecam multorum nummorum tractavit, cum multos libros surripuisset nec se impune laturum putaret, aufugit. is est in provincia tua ... hunc tu si mihi restituendum curaris, non possum dicere quam mihi gratum futurum sit. res ipsa parva, sed animi mei dolor magnus est ... ego, si hominem per te recipero, summo me a te beneficio adfectum arbitrabor.*

*Epistulae ad Familiares 212.3*

*There is another matter in which I would earnestly request you to put yourself to some trouble, by virtue of our friendship and your unfailing readiness to serve me. My library, worth a considerable sum, was in the charge of a slave of mine called Dionysius. Having pilfered a large number of books and anticipating a day of reckoning, he ran away. He's now in your province ... If you see to it that he is returned to me, I cannot tell you how much it will oblige me. In itself it is no great matter, but I am intensely vexed ... If I recover the fellow thanks to you, I shall regard you as having done me a very great favour.*

Despite Cicero assessing the situation as *res ipsa parva*, the wording of the request, as well as the *animi mei dolor magnus*, reveals that it was probably no small matter to a man of letters. This letter was written roughly one year after Caesar's return to Rome after having defeated Pompey at Pharsalus, effectively ending Cicero's political career. As a result, 46 saw an explosion of literary activity, including the composition of several works on oratory, including the *Brutus*, *De Optimo Genere Oratorum*, *Orator*, and the beginning of the *De Partitione Oratoria*, the speeches *Pro Marcello* and *Pro Ligario*, and the first attempt in 'pure' philosophy, the *Paradoxa Stoicorum*. One can just imagine Cicero, in the heat of composition, wishing to consult a reference work<sup>14</sup>, only to find several books missing from his shelves. The cost, quality, and rarity of the books in Cicero's library must have made these volumes valuable targets for an unscrupulous slave, who could easily

<sup>14</sup> An interesting example of this process is explored in the article by Summers (1997), concerning Cicero's request in August 45 for Atticus' copies of books by Phaedrus, the Epicurean, while he was writing *De Natura Deorum*.

have sold them during Cicero's absences from Rome. That this was an important matter to Cicero is further supported by three more letters<sup>15</sup> between himself and his old adversary-turned-client, Publius Vatinius, concerning the same issue.

The second incident involves a request from Cicero's brother Quintus, detailed in two replies written in October and November 54, while Quintus was serving as legate to Caesar during his second expedition to Britain. These letters reveal the value of the rarefied books preferred by the brothers Tulli, and the trouble they had to take to acquire them. After apprising Quintus of the political situation, including his decision to defend Aulus Gabinius in the *repetundae* charge for fear of offending Pompey, Cicero writes in the first letter:

*de bibliotheca tua Graeca supplenda, libris commutandis, Latinis comparandis, valde velim ista confici, praesertim cum ad meum quoque usum spectent. sed ego mihi ipsi ista per quem agam non habeo. neque enim venalia sunt, quae quidem placeant, et confici nisi per hominem et peritum et diligentem non possunt. Crysippo tamen imperabo et cum Tyrannione loquar.*

*Epistulae ad Quintum 24.5*

*As regards filling the gaps in your Greek library and exchanging books and acquiring Latin ones, I should very much like all this done, especially as I too stand to benefit. But I have nobody I can employ on such business, not even for myself. Books, at least such as one would like to have, are not on the market and they can't be obtained except through an expert who is willing to take the trouble. However, I'll give an order to Chrysippus and talk to Tyrannio.*

---

<sup>15</sup> *Epistulae ad Familiares* 255.2, written in July 45 from Narona, in which Vatinius offers to find Dionysius 'by land and sea' (*ego tamen terra marique ut conquireretur praemandavi et profecto tibi illum reperiam, nisi si in Dalmatiam aufugerit; et inde tamen aliquando eruam*); 257.3, Cicero's reply, probably written from Rome in December 45, in which he asks Vatinius to 'settle the affair' and offers Dionysius as captive in Vatinius' triumph (*de Dionysio, si me amas, confice. quamcumque ei fidem dederis, praestabo; si vero improbus fuerit, ut est, duces eum captivum in triumpho*); and 259.1, Vatinius' update, written in January 44, in which winter has interrupted the search (*de Dionysio tuo adhuc nihil extrico, et eo minus quod me frigus Dalmaticum, quod illinc eiecit, etiam hic refrigeravit. sed tamen non desistam quin illum aliquando eruam*).

This was followed by a second letter a week later, in which little progress seems to have been made:

*de libris Tyrannio est cessator. Chrysippo dicam. sed res operosa est et hominis per diligentis. sentio ipse, qui in summo studio nihil adsequor. de Latinis vero quo me vertam nescio. ita mendose et scribuntur et veneunt. sed tamen, quod fieri poterit, non neglegam.*

*Epistulae ad Quintum 25.6*

*As for the books, Tyrannio is a dawdler. I shall speak to Chrysippus. But it is a laborious business and needs somebody who will take a lot of trouble. I know that from my own experience of trying very hard and making no headway. As for the Latin ones, I don't know where to turn, the copies are made and sold so full of errors. Nonetheless, I shall not neglect to do what can be done.*

The focus on books and libraries at this time is not surprising. Cicero was still replacing what had been destroyed or stolen during his exile<sup>16</sup>. Having been forced to abandon politics after the conference at Luca in 56, and the recent death of Julia in August not yet revealing the rift between Caesar and Pompey<sup>17</sup>, Cicero was planning for a quiet retirement in the company of his preferred studies – both as reader and writer. But apart from *De Oratore* of the previous year, his output at this time still focused primarily on forensic oratory, although we learn in the same letter that Cicero's brother had encouraged him to literary composition to flatter Caesar, something for which Cicero shows little initial enthusiasm. Nevertheless, these examples shed light on the inherent value of high-quality books and help us to understand the context in which books were written, edited, disseminated, and even surreptitiously copied.

---

<sup>16</sup> The effect that the destruction of his house on the Palatine had on Cicero is significant. Hales (2000:46) explains that 'as much as the house was the shelter for his family, it transcended its basic function as family home and was also, to outsiders, a monument to Cicero. If the house is destroyed, the memory is erased.' Seeing the physical manifestation of his social and political achievements erased motivated the many efforts to restore his dignity, which included publication – a way to memorialize and immortalize which was not as easy to destroy as a building.

<sup>17</sup> For Cicero's miscalculation of Caesar and Pompey's relationship, specifically concerning his political actions before the conference at Luca and his subsequent retirement, see Mitchell (1969:298-300).

Even though Cicero's literary output waxed and waned according to his political circumstances, he and his circle were active as one another's editors<sup>18</sup>. In letter 36.1 to Atticus, for example, written from Formiae at the end of April 59, after replying with shock to news about the *ager Campanus* provision in Caesar's *lex Iulia*, Cicero mentions that Quintus had asked him to correct and publish the latter's history (*me rogat ut annalis suos emendem et edam*). As Cicero's chief publisher, Atticus also frequently gives editorial feedback to Cicero. One example is letter 152, written shortly after Caesar had crossed the Rubicon. In this letter we learn that Cicero had written a short and friendly letter to Caesar<sup>19</sup> (*brevis sed benevolentiam significantis*), in which he urged settlement between the parties (*illum ad concordiam hortabar*). Cicero apparently included with his own letter the letter he had written to Caesar, which had also been sent to third parties, saying that he thinks Atticus will find nothing to censure (*nihil arbitror fore quod reprehendas*), but nevertheless asking advice to avoid criticism<sup>20</sup> (*doce me quo modo μέμψιν effugere possim*). The 'answer', imagined by Cicero, advises to write nothing at all (*nihil...omnino scripseris*), followed by an exasperated question: 'How will that help me to escape people who are willing to fabricate?' (*qui magis effugiam eos qui volent fingere*)<sup>21</sup>. In a world where political danger necessitated preemptive publication such as in this case, the role of editor-cum-strategist<sup>22</sup> assumes genuine importance.

Of course, not all editing took place in the cauldron of civil war or for the purpose of avoiding political assassination or censure. In letter 420.1, written on 5 November 44, mostly devoted to editorial matters but including some patronizing remarks concerning Octavian, Cicero thanks Atticus for his good opinion on some of Cicero's favourite passages in the *Philippica Secunda* and then jokingly proclaims his fear of Atticus' 'little red wafers' (*cerulas enim tuas miniatulas illas extimescebam*), also mentioned in letter 402.4, written on 28 June 44. These reveal not only the

---

<sup>18</sup> Gurd (2007:51) explains that Cicero's writing 'shows a self-reflexive awareness' and that he 'acknowledges that collectively revised texts express the authority of the community; he knew that the system of variants made a text the site of a plural and open social assemblage.' As we will see in sections 3.4, 3.5, and 3.8 below, Cicero works hard to overcome his various critics and to use certain noble Romans, both alive and dead, to bolster his own authority and glory. For an interesting treatment of this issue in the speeches, see Dufallo (2001:135), who describes the use of *personae* as 'repositioning Cicero and his opponents within the matrix of Roman power relations.'

<sup>19</sup> For an overview of the extant letters between Cicero and Caesar, as well as what these reveal about their relationship, see Pauli (1958).

<sup>20</sup> Starr (1987:213) makes the useful point that 'although authors wanted honest criticism, they did not seek impersonal criticism. The ancient sources do not preserve a single case of an author requesting comments from a stranger. Rhetoricians, for example, did not ask for the opinions of other experts unless they were friends. The restricted sphere in which comments were sought and given encouraged insularity, since the author's friends shared his background and therefore his attitudes toward such things as what was appropriate and the standards by which a work of literature should be judged.'

<sup>21</sup> Publication was an obvious way to either combat or aid rumour. For a more general summary on the uses of rumour in Roman politics, see Laurence (1994). For rumour as private and parallel political discourse, see O'Neill (2003).

<sup>22</sup> For an exploration of Atticus as a 'behind-the-scenes' politician, see Welch (1996).

materials involved in the editorial process, but also the pains taken by Atticus to support his (by then) ex-brother-in-law, correcting various factual errors and offering advice on matters of inclusion and exclusion of material for political and social expediency<sup>23</sup>. Cicero accepts all these editorial corrections with good grace, saying he is pleased to do so, since the fault-finding is done ‘with good sense and good will’ (*cum in reprehensione sit prudentia cum εὐμενείᾳ*).

Atticus’ editorial care also extended to the collection and probably posthumous publication of Cicero’s letters<sup>24</sup>, many of which include deletions to preserve the honour of Cicero and his family. In fact, Cicero himself intended to be involved in the process, as we learn from a letter written on 9 July 44. Answering a query by his editor, Cicero writes:

*mearum epistularum nulla est συναγωγή; sed habet Tiro<sup>25</sup> instar septuaginta, et quidem sunt a te quaedam sumendae. eas ego oportet perspiciam, corrigam; tum denique edentur.*

*Epistulae ad Atticum 410.5*

*There is no recueil of my letters, but Tiro has about seventy and I shall have to get some from you. I must examine and correct them. Then and only then will they be published.*

That so many letters were available for collection, editing, and publication should not surprise us. Letters were routinely sent with copies being made and kept to ensure against loss or fabrication. Recipients would also save letters as they saw fit. Examples of these can be found in *Epistulae ad Familiares* 261.1 and 96.2. In the first letter, written to M. Fabius Gallus in August 45, Cicero tells him not to distress himself about a letter Gallus had torn up, as Cicero had the copy safely at home

<sup>23</sup> Of course, as the strongest of the speeches against Anthony, it is unlikely that this second speech would have been published or allowed to circulate too widely until after the death of both men concerned.

<sup>24</sup> For some of the issues concerning modern editorialization and reordering of these letters, motivated by ‘the desire to release their historiographical or biographical potential,’ see Gibson (2012). Gunderson (2007:43) makes a useful case for reading the letters as literature, summarizing that ‘the Cicero that comes to us from such a process will not be a Cicero we always already knew. Instead this is the Cicero that the letters produce, not the one that they reveal.’ I would add that their artistic quality results perhaps as replacement for and a reflection of the higher expectations for conversation among Cicero and his correspondents, not to mention the dangers to one’s dignity if a poorly-crafted letter became public.

<sup>25</sup> I remain unconvinced by Gurd’s (2007:53) assessment of Tiro as a close collaborator concerning content. When Cicero ‘shares’ his work’s authority with Tiro, writing that ‘my texts – or rather yours’, he is simply referring to Tiro’s role as secretary and scribe. I would also add Kenney’s (1982:12) discussion of the role of dictation in the composition process, allowing the author (or perhaps speaker) to test the sonorousness of a work destined for performance rather than mere reading.

and that he could ask for it any time he liked (*salva est; domo petes cum libebit*). In the second letter, written to Caelius Rufus at the beginning of August 50 and discussing the character flaws of his new son-in-law Dolabella, Cicero mentions that he knows which of Rufus' saved letters to read (*scio cui tuae epistulae respondeant*), should he wish to be reminded of said character flaws. Cicero even encourages Rufus jokingly to read a letter he had written to Appius Claudius Pulcher in response to Rufus' original (*quid si meam legas quam ego tum ex tuis litteris misi ad Appium*). These two examples hint at an environment in which letters were routinely archived and in which they could easily be collected for publication, although the relative dearth of examples suggests that few people were willing to do so.

Another aspect worth noting is that published works could often exist in multiple versions simultaneously<sup>26</sup>, depending on the circumstances of publication, and that definitive versions seem a result rarely achieved, probably causing several complications in textual stemmata in addition to the lapses of medieval scriptoria. Various letters to Atticus attest to this phenomenon. In letter 243.1, probably written in October 46, Cicero asks Atticus to substitute the name of an author, not only in his own copies but in other people's as well (*non modo in tuis libris sed etiam in aliorum per libraros tuos Aristophanem reposueris pro Eupoli*). In letter 328.2, dated early July 45, Cicero rejects suggestions made by Atticus, stating that he cannot add anything to his speech defending Ligarius, as it was already being widely circulated (*est enim pervulgata*). In letter 336.3, dated 14 July 45 and concerning the same speech, Cicero lets Atticus know that Brutus had pointed out a naming error, which he admits is a *lapsus memoriae* (*μνημονικὸν ἀμάρτημα*), and asks Atticus to instruct his agents to delete the name in all their copies (*ut id nomen ex omnibus libris tollatur*), although it can be assumed that these changes could not possibly be applied to all copies<sup>27</sup> of a work that had already achieved wide circulation.

---

<sup>26</sup> The most useful discussion on this process is undertaken by Gurd (2007:50), who points out that the system of editing and corrections could often not keep pace with the speed of textual dissemination. He also creates a very useful taxonomy for the revision process: '(1) a phase of "authorial revision," in which the author reads and corrects his own drafts; (2) a phase of "editorial revision," in which the text is submitted to the judgment of other readers, whose advice the author welcomes; and (3) a final phase of "cultural revision," in which the work, now beyond the control of the author, is appropriated and reformed in adumbrations, imitations, and re-inscriptions.' Gurd (2007:51) goes on to remind us that we 'often speak of ancient texts as though they were single objects, stable semiotic systems that, like modern mass-produced books, remain largely unchanged in form. This was manifestly not the case in antiquity, as generations of textual critics have known. Ancient texts are variable systems (or systems of variants), and formal and verbal divergence is the norm.'

<sup>27</sup> Starr (1987:214) points out that it was 'only when the author sent copies to a wider group of friends that the written form of the text attained any great significance in its circulation.'

These alterations and corrections often served some purpose, such as gratifying intended recipients or avoiding embarrassment – purposes magnified in the act of publication itself. So, for example, we see in letter 345.2 that Cicero rushes the corrections of his eulogy of Porcia, Cato’s sister, before sending the corrected versions either to her son Domitius or Brutus, asking Atticus to pay special attention to the matter<sup>28</sup> (*laudationem Porciae tibi misi correctam. eo properavi ut, si forte aut Domitio filio aut Bruto mitteretur, haec mitteretur. id, si tibi erit commodum, magno opera cures velim*). Cicero would also take great pains to avoid advertising his own ignorance. We see in letter 351.3 that, upon learning the correct use of a nautical term which he had used incorrectly to translate a Greek philosophical term, Cicero asks Atticus to change his copy of the *Academica* back to a term used in an earlier version and to ask Varro, the dedicatee<sup>29</sup>, to do the same in case he had already made the original alteration (*qua re facies ut ita sit in libro quem ad modum fuit. dices hoc idem Varroni, si forte mutavit*).

Changes to published works could also be necessitated because of simple carelessness. A very interesting episode is described in a letter dated 25 July 44, in which we learn much about Cicero’s writing methods and editorial corrections:

*nunc negligentiam meam cognosce. de Gloria librum ad te misi, et in eo prohoemium id quod est in Academico tertio. id evenit ob eam rem quod habeo volumen prohoemiorum. ex eo eligere soleo cum aliquod σύγγραμμα institui. itaque iam in Tusculano, qui non meminissem me abusum isto prohoemio, conieci id in eum librum quem tibi misi. cum autem in navi legerem Academicos, agnovi erratum meum. itaque statim novum prohoemium exaravi et tibi misi. tu illud desecabis, hoc adglutinabis.*

*Epistulae ad Atticum 414.4*

*Now I have to own up to a piece of carelessness. I sent the book ‘On Glory’ to you and in it a preface which is in Book III of the ‘Academics.’ This happened because I have a*

<sup>28</sup> Phillips (1986:236) concludes that this did not constitute a major publication effort and that few people would have been interested in the work. The fact that Cicero insisted on corrections argues for wider dissemination as a possible goal. In 3.8 below, I argue that Cicero paid special attention in complimentary publication aimed at Cato’s family, which required being known as a complimenter of Cato’s family, thereby necessitating dissemination.

<sup>29</sup> Starr (1987:215) points out that, in ‘most cases, the sending of author’s gift copies of a finished text meant the effective release of the work from the author’s control. It then became possible for people unknown to the author to acquire a text by making a copy from a friend’s copy.’

*volume of prefaces from which I am in the habit of selecting when I have put a work in hand. And so back at Tusculum I pushed this preface into the book which I have sent you, forgetting that I had used it up already. But in reading the 'Academics' on shipboard<sup>30</sup> I noticed my mistake. So I scribbled out a new preface straight away, and sent it herewith. Please cut the other off and glue this one on.*

Alterations to the same work also come up in letter 413.1, written one week earlier, in which Cicero says that he is sending the same treatise in a more 'corrected' form (presumably still including the incorrect preface), or rather the 'original' with numerous interlinings and alterations (*sed tamen idem σύνταγμα misi ad te retractatius, et quidem ἀρχέτυπον ipsum crebris locis inculcatum et reffectum*), after which he asks Atticus to transfer the new version to folio paper (*macrocollum*) and to read it privately to his dinner guests<sup>31</sup>, with the injunction that they be in a cheerful state of mind (*lege arcano convivis tuis sed, si me amas, hilaris et bene acceptis*). The use of the word *arcano* is intriguing, as it suggests that the lost work<sup>32</sup> may have contained content limiting wider circulation.

The trialling of works before a select audience, or limited dissemination based on the discretion of the publisher, can also be seen in letter 416.1, written on 25 October 44, in which Cicero asks Atticus to keep back the second speech against Anthony and to put it out at his discretion, lamenting whether there would ever come a day when it could be published more widely (*orationem tibi misi. eius custodiendae et proferendae arbitrium tuum. sed quando illum diem cum tu edendam putes*). Publication and dissemination could also be the result of popular demand, as seen in letter 21.11 to his brother, written in September 54, in which Cicero mentions that he had completed writing out the speeches for Scaurus and Plancius 'according to demand'<sup>33</sup> (*orationes efflagitatas pro Scauro et pro Plancio absolvi*).

<sup>30</sup> Cicero was on his way to Athens to visit his son.

<sup>31</sup> Murphy (1998:495) explains that 'sending a book to be read aloud at a friend's dinner, dedication of a book to a friend with connections to particular social circles, giving one person permission to copy while denying it to another [were all] decisions that could significantly affect the composition of a book's later audience', going on to say that 'since literary circulation at this time depended so much on the relations between individuals, and since Cicero's letters are full of the names of those he thought of as potential dedicatees, those to whom he gave his books, and those from whom he wanted them withheld, [make it] possible to form some idea of the social circles in which he wished his books to be read.' Kenney (1982:11) explains that 'books or portions of books were read aloud to a small audience of friends, who were invited to criticize freely what they heard' and that the 'origins of this custom go back at least to Hellenistic Alexandria.'

<sup>32</sup> A loss I profoundly regret, as it would certainly have been helpful in answering the research question. *Sic vivitur*.

<sup>33</sup> Apart from satisfying such a demand, Bell (1997:1) describes the written version of political speeches, such as *De Lege Agraria*, as 'a partial record of a complex dynamic between actor and audience, neither of whom had the power to take legislative action independently of the other. Each needed the other, moreover, simply to have dignity.' The act of writing out a speech aimed at influencing what the record of events would be, as discussed in section 3.5 below.

What makes this specific letter particularly interesting, however, is that it includes an example of how Cicero intended to manipulate the dissemination of another writer's work by simply doing nothing at all. In the letter, Cicero replies to a suggestion by Quintus that he write a rejoinder to a speech by L. Calpurnius Piso, who had evidently published a rejoinder himself to the speech originally made against him by Cicero. Being very much aware of who the more famous writer is, as well as the effect a second rejoinder would have, Cicero argues:

*quod scribis tibi placere me ad eam rescribere, miror, praesertim cum illam nemo lecturus sit si ego nihil rescripsero, meam in illum pueri omnes tamquam dictata perdiscant.*

*Epistulae ad Quintum 21.11*

*I am surprised that you think I should write a rejoinder to that, especially as nobody will read it if I don't reply, whereas all the schoolchildren learn mine against him by heart as though it was part of their lessons.*

One can expect Quintus to have been offended by the contents of Piso's rejoinder, as it probably included much that was unflattering to the prestige of the family. Cicero, being the more astute politician, however, understood that his name would only draw attention to the work and be counterproductive. This understanding of the effect of a person's prestige on dissemination would naturally also influence content and style. A good example of this issue comes to light in a comment in *Orator*, written in the form of an extended letter, in which Cicero, speaking to and complimenting Brutus, writes:

*nihil nos praecipiendi causa esse dicturos atque ita potius acturos ut existimatores videamur loqui, non magistri. in quo tamen longius saepe progredimur, quod videmus non te haec solum esse lecturum, qui ea multo quam nos qui quasi docere videmur habeas notiora, sed hunc librum etiamsi minus nostra commendatione tuo tamen nomine divulgari necesse est.*

*Orator xxxi.112*

*We shall not speak to instruct, and shall conduct ourselves so as to seem critics rather than teachers. Though in this we often go farther because we know that you will not be*

*the only reader of these words; you know those principles much better than I do who seem to be giving instruction; but this book must of necessity obtain a wide circulation, more through your name than from any worth of mine.*

This brings us to a basic principle for dissemination with Cicero: the wide circulation of that which tends to his glory, and the suppression of that which does not. One of the most important examples of this comes from a series of letters concerning Cicero's lost eulogy of Cato Minor<sup>34</sup>, written after the latter's suicide in April 46. Although Cicero managed to produce something without giving offence to Caesar, the work could not have put the dictator in a flattering light. As Caesar was preparing to publish an 'Anti-Cato' as rejoinder, Cicero writes to Atticus from Astura on 9 May 45, commenting on a similar pamphlet by Aulus Hirtius:

*qualis futura sit Caesaris vituperatio contra laudationem meam perspexi ex eo libro quem Hirtius ad me misit; in quo colligit vitia Catonis, sed cum maximis laudibus meis. itaque misi librum ad Muscam ut tuis librariis daret. volo enim eum divulgari, quoque facilius fiat imperabis tuis.*

*Epistulae ad Atticum 281.1*

*From the pamphlet which Hirtius has sent to me, I perceive what Caesar's denunciation in answer to my eulogy is going to be like. Hirtius makes a collection of Cato's faults, but sings my praises loudly at the same time. So I have sent the piece to Musca for him to give your clerks. I want it to have a wide circulation, and to facilitate that please give instructions to your people.*

While this request was probably intended to counter the growing criticism of Cicero's grief over the recent death of his daughter mentioned in the same letter, it is clear that the wide circulation of Hirtius' piece was calculated to benefit Cicero's and Cato's prestige at the expense of Hirtius and Caesar's. Cicero states as much in letter 285.1, written four days later, in which he writes that his reason for seeking wide circulation is that these people's abuse may win Cato greater eulogy (*illius librum quem ad me misit de Catone propterea volo divulgari a tuis ut ex istorum vituperatione sit illius maior laudatio*), with the added benefit of spreading the praise of Cicero. In letter 289.1, written shortly afterwards, Cicero once again encourages Atticus to continue publishing this work

---

<sup>34</sup> For an attempt at reconstruction, see Jones (1970).

(*Hirti librum, ut facis, divulga*). In letter 290.2, written on the same day, Cicero encourages Atticus yet again to keep publishing, agreeing sarcastically that, while Caesar's literary talent should be recognized, his theme, abusing Cato, should only excite derision (*tu vero pervulga Hirtium. id enim putaram quod scribis, ut cum ingenium amici nostri probaretur, ὑπόθεσις vituperandi Catonis irrideretur*).

Alternatively, when dissemination, whether planned or unplanned, had the potential to embarrass, suppression of works seems routine. Our best evidence for this messy process comes from a letter written to Atticus from Arpinum at the very end of July 45, which is being quoted at length, as it contains several issues worth our consideration:

*dic mihi, placetne tibi primum edere iniussu meo? hoc ne Hermodorus quidem faciebat, is qui Platonis libros solitus est divulgare, ex quo 'λόγοισιν Ἑρμόδωρος.' quid illud? rectumne existimas cuiquam ante quam Bruto, cui te auctore προσφώνῳ? scripsit enim Balbus ad me se a te quintum de finibus librum descripsisse; in quo non sane multa mutavi, sed tamen quaedam. tu autem commode feceris si reliquos continueris, ne et ἀδιόρθωτα habeat Balbus et ἔωλα Brutus. sed haec hactenus, ne videar περὶ μικρὰ σπουδάζειν. etsi nunc quidem maxima mihi sunt haec. quid est enim aliud? Varroni quidem quae scripsi te auctore ita propero mittere ut iam Romam miserim describenda. ea si voles, statim habebis. scripsi enim ad librarios ut fieret tuis, si tu velles, describendi potestas. ea vero continebis quoad ipse te videam; quod diligentissime facere soles cum a me tibi dictum est. quo modo autem fugit me tibi dicere? mirifice Caerellia studio videlicet philisophiae flagrans describit a tuis: istos ipsos de finibus habet. ego autem tibi confirmo (possum falli ut homo) a meis eam non habere; numquam enim ab oculis meis afuerunt. tantum porro aberat ut binos scriberent, vix singulos confecerunt. tuorum tamen ego nullum delictum arbitror idemque te volo existimare; a me enim praetermissum est ut dicerem me eos exire nondum velle. hui, quam diu de nugis! de re enim nihil habeo quod loquar.*

*Epistulae ad Atticum 327.1–2*

*Come now, in the first place do you approve of publishing without my instructions? Even Hermodorus didn't do that, the man who used to broadcast Plato's books, whence 'Hermodorus trades in tracts.' And another thing: do you think it was right to give the book to anyone before Brutus, to whom at your suggestion I address it? Balbus writes to*

*me that he has copied 'On the Limits,' Book V, from your manuscript, a book in which I have made changes, not many to be sure, but still some. You will oblige me by keeping the others back so that Balbus does not get them unrevised or Brutus stale. But enough of this, or you will think I am making mountains out of molehills – though these are my mountains nowadays, for what else is there? I am in such a hurry to send Varro what I have written<sup>35</sup>, as you suggested, that I have already sent it to Rome for copying. You shall have it at once if you like. I wrote to the clerks to let your people take a copy if you wished. Please keep it to yourself till I see you, as you are always most careful to do when I have asked you. But how did it slip my mind to tell you? Caerellia, in her amazing ardour for philosophy no doubt, is copying from your people. She has this very work 'On the Limits.' Now I assure you (being human I may be wrong) that she did not get it from my men – it has never been out of my sight. Moreover, so far from making two copies they had difficulty in finishing one. However I do not hold your people to blame and I don't want you to do so. The oversight was mine, in omitting to say that I did not want it to get into circulation yet. Dear, dear, what a time I have spent on trifles! You see, on serious matters I have nothing to say.*

Firstly, although spoken in a mixture of jest and exasperated resignation, the *περὶ μικρὰ σπουδάζειν* and *quam diu de nugis* show that Cicero considered publication to take second place to actively serving the state as politician<sup>36</sup>. This sentiment is expressed often in his later works, which is not surprising, as many of them are the result of his forced retirement(s) from politics. Written less than 8 months before Caesar's assassination, when the dictator's grip on power seemed absolute, Cicero threw himself into writing and publication as distraction from his political impotence<sup>37</sup>. However, it

<sup>35</sup> This refers to the *Academica*. What Cicero expected in return will be discussed in detail under section 2.2.

<sup>36</sup> This activity needed to take place in public. Being debarred from making political speeches robbed Cicero of his primary path to glory. This fact would certainly have been brought home to Cicero during his exile. As Bell (1997:1) explains, to 'be in Rome meant to have opportunities for his person and activities to be illumined for the attention of fellow-citizens, fortunate outsiders and visitors, and even for the edification of posterity. He needed to be seen in the city. Rome indeed was the stage of the world, where no man of worldly ambition could shun the crowds. In any polity where citizens or subjects have some aesthetic contact with the comportment of their leaders, those leaders will find that some of their power is dependent upon the spectators' view of them; even the power of autocrats may be weakened if there is jeering not cheering in the streets.' It is therefore not surprising that Cicero, a consummate political performer, would have seen publication as a second-rate vehicle for his glory.

<sup>37</sup> Gurd (2007:52) argues that Cicero's editorial process and the association of revision with republicanism 'became more pressing in the years of Caesar's ascendancy, when Cicero sought to develop a purely literary republic in the wake of what he saw as the demise of the political sphere.' Bearing in mind Murphy's (1998:503) point that Cicero 'circulated his texts by bringing them to the attention of political insiders', meaning the Caesarian party, we are left with the impression that Cicero was working at cross-purposes. I contend that the letters argue more for distraction and the pursuit of personal glory and less for an organized literary republicanism, since this would imply that Cicero hoped for some kind of political success through publication, a position clearly contradicted by many of the letters.

is clear that Cicero considered it poor form to disseminate a work before the ‘best’ version had been given to the dedicatee<sup>38</sup>, an opinion repeated in letter 329.3 on the same subject, written a few days later.

However, the unsanctioned dissemination described in this letter paints an intriguing picture of an environment in which the integrity and security of the written word could hardly be guaranteed. The *scripsi enim ad librarios* reveals that works sent to Rome for copying by the public clerks included instructions on who were allowed to avail themselves of those copies. However, one can easily imagine this rudimentary form of security being bypassed by wealthy aristocratic ladies, fired with an enthusiasm for philosophy, browbeating or bribing a cupidinous copyist into submission. As for the private secretaries mentioned, it is not inconceivable that they would see no reason to withhold a volume for copying from their master’s aristocratic friends, especially if no instructions to the contrary had been given.

Such ‘accidental’ publication even extends to instances in which the authors and publishers were genuinely unable to do anything about it. Cicero, in letter 60.3 written from his exile, mentions a speech<sup>39</sup> which had become public property, exclaiming that he had no idea how this had happened (*quae unde sit prolata nescio*). This problem seems so widespread that it even crops up in fiction. In *De Oratore* (I.xxi.94), Cicero’s historical character Marcus Antonius Orator<sup>40</sup> mentions his little pamphlet on oratory which had slipped abroad without his knowledge or consent and got into the hands of the public (*libello, qui me imprudente et invito excidit, et pervenit in manus hominum*), perhaps mirroring the circumstances of Cicero’s own ‘crude and unfinished’ essay *De Inventione*, which had ‘slipped from his notebooks’ (*quae pueris aut adolescentulis nobis ex commentariolis nostris inchoata ac rudia exciderunt – De Oratore I.ii.5*).

One could even expect to have one’s words taken down in a public assembly and subsequently circulated<sup>41</sup>, as Cicero mentions in letter 40.3–4 to Atticus, written ten months before his exile, when

---

<sup>38</sup> I think that Phillips (1986:234), in discussing how an author could lose control of the process of authorial revision once too many incorrect copies were in circulation, overemphasizes Cicero’s concern of this issue and the potential slight against Brutus, as the *quam diu de nugis* should make clear. Similarly, Murphy’s assessment (1998:501) that this instance of accidental publication would have been ‘disastrous’ for Cicero seems strained, given the tone and content of the letter itself.

<sup>39</sup> We do not know what speech this is, but the wording suggests that it contained material unhelpful to Cicero’s restitution.

<sup>40</sup> The grandfather of Mark Antony the triumvir.

<sup>41</sup> One example of this is probably the unauthorized ‘first version’ of Pro Milone, discussed by Melchior (2008:238). See also Melchior’s note 16 on p.285.

the political mood had become dangerous and his own position increasingly precarious. In the letter, he describes how Bibulus was inveighing against popular politicians and that his edicts and speeches were ‘being taken down and read’ (*edicta eius et contiones describunt et legunt*), prompting in the same letter the necessity for coded speech. Cicero goes on to say that he is terrified for fear that the very paper may betray them<sup>42</sup> and that he would henceforth obscure his meaning with code terms<sup>43</sup> (*iam enim charta ipsa ne nos prodat pertimesco. itaque posthac, si erunt mihi plura ad te scribenda, ἀλληγορίαις obscurabo*).

This insecurity of speech and writing could have very dangerous consequences to the author and his family, which is why we see several examples of suppression that include omission and the deliberate destruction of writing. These examples come mostly from Cicero’s *Epistulae ad Quintum*. Cicero states in letter 2.2 that ‘the success and security of us all in public life rests not only on the truth but also public report’ (*sed cum ratio salusque omnium nostrum qui ad rem publicam accedimus non veritate solum sed etiam fama niteretur*), with the implication that the truth lay in what had been written down. So he goes on to mention a letter supposedly written to a C. Fabius by Quintus as a joke, even qualifying this with ‘if you really wrote it’ (*si modo sunt tuae*), before mentioning that when people read the letter, the ferocity of the wording raises a prejudice against Quintus (*cum leguntur, invidiosam atrocitatem verborum habent* – 2.6). Being prone to fits of temper, Quintus is often reminded by his older brother to be careful what he writes<sup>44</sup>.

With the political landscape being in constant flux, especially because of the disorders in the late Republic, even potentially embarrassing material, written in confidence to a friend, could become

---

<sup>42</sup> For an interesting and detailed study of the delivery of Cicero’s letters and the inherent insecurity of such communication, as well as the various methods for increasing security and confidentiality undertaken by Cicero, see Nicholson (1994).

<sup>43</sup> One example of this is using the name ‘Sampsiceramus’ as a code name for Pompey in letters 34.1, 36.2, 37.1–2, and 43.2–3. As for the use of Greek and literary references as coded speech in Cicero, the examples are legion and could warrant two doctoral dissertations. See also Steele (1900:390-391) for a summary of the Greek in Cicero’s correspondence and an initial exploration of the reasons for using the language.

<sup>44</sup> In letter 21.21, Cicero writes that if there was anything he wanted to convey to Quintus with extra care he would give the letter to Hippodamus, going on to say that in the letters sent the ordinary way, he ‘writes practically nothing that would be awkward if it fell into the wrong hands’ (*si quid esset quod ad te diligentius perferri vellem, illi darem, quod mehercule hisce litteris quas vulgo ad te mitto nihil fere scribo quod, si in alicuius manus inciderit, moleste ferendum sit*). The same thought is expressed in letter 26.2, in which Cicero warns his brother not to trust anything to a letter that might embarrass them if it became public, and that there were many things he would sooner be ignorant of than informed, if the information carried risk (*etiam illud te admoneo, ne quid ullis litteris committas quod, si prolatum sit, moleste feramus. multa sunt quae ego nescire malo quam cum aliquo periculo fieri certior*). This admonition is repeated in letter 27.3.

public knowledge – if friendship had changed to enmity, although this seems rare. We see a good example of this in *Philippica Secunda*:

*at etiam litteras, quas me sibi misisse diceret, recitavit homo et humanitatis expers et vitae communis ignarus. quis enim umquam, qui paulum modo bonorum consuetudinem nosset, litteras ad se ab amico missas offensione aliqua interposita in medium protulit palamque recitavit?*

*Philippica Secunda IV.7*

*But he even quoted a letter which he said I had written him – this fellow devoid of good breeding, and ignorant of the usages of life! For what man, having only slight knowledge of the customs of gentlemen, because of some offence in the meantime, ever produced in public a letter written to him by a friend and openly quoted it?*

To avoid embarrassment or danger, a last resort was to delete sections or destroy writing in its entirety. As already mentioned, deletions are apparent in several of the letters, mostly to safeguard the honour of Cicero and his family. An interesting example is the lacuna in letter 317.1 to Atticus. Concerning his nephew, Cicero writes that he ‘heard much that is too bad for utterance or narration, and one thing of such a kind that if the whole army did not know of it’ he should not dare to put it on paper himself, let alone dictate to Tiro \* \* \* but enough (*ventum est tamen ad Quintum. multa ἄφρατα, ἀδιήγητα, sed unum eius modi quod, nisi exercitus sciret, non modo Tironi dictare sed ne ipse quidem auderem scribere \* \* \* sed haec hactenus*). Since the event was common knowledge at the time, Cicero does commit it to paper, but the comment is interesting as it shows that even a trusted freedman secretary like Tiro could potentially divulge sensitive information. It is worth bearing in mind that, as Quintus’ other uncle, Atticus had just as much reason as Cicero to wish the details of Quintus’ indiscretions to be lost to posterity, hence the deletion.

As for the destruction of entire works, usually letters, there is an illuminating episode in another letter, where Cicero scolds and advises his brother, then propraetor in Asia:

*in litteris mittendis (saepe ad te scripsi) nimium te exorabilem praebuisti. tolle omnis, si potes, iniquas, tolle inusitatas, tolle contrarias. Staius mihi narravit scriptas ad te solere adferri, a se legi, et si iniquae sint fieri te certiolem; ante quam vero ipse ad te venisset,*

*nullum delectum litterarum fuisse, ex eo esse volumina selectarum epistularum quae reprehendi solerent. hoc de genere nihil te nunc quidem moneo (sero est enim, ac scire potes multa me varie diligenterque monuisse); illud tamen quod Theopompo mandavi cum essem admonitus ab ipso, vide per homines amantis tui, quod est facile, ut haec genera tollantur epistularum: primum iniquarum, deinde contrariarum, tum absurde et inusitate scriptarum, postremo in aliquem contumeliosarum.*

*Epistulae ad Quintum 2.8*

*In sending out official letters (I have often written to you about this) you have been too ready to accommodate. Destroy, if you can, any that are inequitable or contrary to usage or contradictory. Statius has told me that they used to be brought to you already drafted, and that he would read them and inform you if they were inequitable, but that before he joined you letters were dispatched indiscriminately. And so, he said, there are collections of selected letters and these are adversely criticized. I am not going to warn you about this now. It is too late for that, and you are in a position to know how many warnings I have given on various occasions and with no lack of particularity. But as I asked Theopompus to tell you at his own suggestion, do see to it through friendly agents (it is easy enough) that the following categories are destroyed: first, inequitable letters; second, contradictory letters; third, letters drafted inappropriately and contrary to accepted usage; and finally, letters insulting to any person.*

Written as the political storm clouds were gathering six months prior to his exile, Cicero can perhaps be excused for being overcautious. But the letter gives a fascinating insight into the way in which official letters were sent, how they became part of the public record, and that there were ways to destroy those that had been sent already<sup>45</sup>. Whether this happened with the permission or without the knowledge of the recipient is impossible to determine, however.

To conclude on matters concerning the context of publication, written works could also be destroyed unintentionally, mostly as a result of insecure transport. So, for example, Cicero writes letter 27.6 in

---

<sup>45</sup> Phillips (1986:232) disputes Sommer concerning this process, believing it very unlikely that Atticus would have sent his agents or scribes to the individual houses of recipients of *Orator*, for example, to correct these copies, unless very few destinations were involved. I side with Sommer in this case, because (1) Cicero describes the process as *facile*, (2) Atticus presumably had greater resources to draw upon than Cicero's brother, and (3) because Cicero consistently asks Atticus to pay special attention to these matters.

December 54 to his brother, then serving Caesar in Gaul, in which he mentions that he has finished the epic poem<sup>46</sup> to Caesar, which Quintus had urged him to write. Cicero was looking for a trustworthy courier, fearing that the final version of the poem would share the same fate as Quintus' Latinized version of Sophocles' *Erigona*, which had apparently been lost on the road, the 'only traveller from Gaul under Caesar's government who found the road unsafe' (*quod me hortaris ut absolvam, habeo absolutum suave, mihi quidem uti videtur, ἔπος ad Caesarem; sed quaero locupletem tabellarium, ne accidat quod Erigonae tuae, cui soli Caesare imperatore iter ex Gallia tutum non fuit*).

---

<sup>46</sup> This work has been lost, but seems to have taken Caesar's invasion of Britain as its theme. Caesar had already reacted approvingly to an initial part of the work, as mentioned in letter 18.2, and Cicero requests details about Britain to include in the final version.

### 3. Cicero's reasons for publication

#### 3.1 Publication to add to his personal glory

This study attempts to determine whether Cicero published to serve his own glory (personal honour), or whether he published to serve the commonwealth (social responsibility). From the literary context for publication, discussed briefly in the previous section, it is clear that Cicero was well aware that publication had consequences. Enhancing his personal glory was probably one of the most fundamental reasons Cicero had for publication. Despite the loss of the *De Gloria*, aspects concerning personal glory abound in Cicero's surviving works. However, when considering personal glory as it applies specifically to Cicero and his publishing activity<sup>47</sup>, we only begin to see a shift in focus after his exile<sup>48</sup> in 58. This experience, followed by periods of enforced political inactivity, confronted Cicero with the limits to glory that could be achieved through direct political action and forensic oratory. Based on the nature and dates of the surviving works from September 57 onwards, certain patterns become clear which show the relationship between composition and political inactivity. After his return from exile, we see a flurry of oratorical activity aimed at restoring his property and social position, supporting those who had facilitated his return, as well as those whom it was politically expedient to support. These include the speeches *De Domo Sua*, *Post Reditum in Senatu*, and *Post Reditum ad Quirites* in 57, followed by the speeches *Pro Balbo*, *Pro Caelio*, *Pro Sestio*, *In Vatinius*, *De Haruspicum Responsis*, and *De Prinvinciis Consularibus* in 56.

---

<sup>47</sup> The term 'publication' should not be understood in the modern sense, but is used here to refer to works that had achieved some form of circulation, whether wide or limited. The term 'composition' is used to refer to situations in which a work was written, but had not been published or circulated beyond Atticus. The term 'publishing activity' is used to refer to both aspects simultaneously, as it is not always possible to clearly delineate between composition and circulation, as made clear in the previous section. Phillips (1986:228) describes the process as 'highly variable and chaotic'. He goes on to say that a book could be considered 'published when one or more copies were issued by the author or someone acting at his request, or even without permission; it might or might not be distributed through the commercial channels of the book trade. Once issued, the book was said to be *editus*, "published" in the sense that it had been put into general circulation. There being no copyright protection, a book had a life of its own once it left the author's hands. It might appear in as many editions as there were booksellers who cared to copy it. Thus, when we speak of Cicero or Atticus publishing something, we mean that they prepared one or more copies for distribution and perhaps sale, thereby setting in motion a process of dissemination which they could not hope to control.' Murphy (1998:495) explains that 'publication normally meant giving the book to its dedicatee with permission to copy, then to other friends, and perhaps depositing a copy with a library or bookdealer.' The dates used in this study reflect this difficulty, but usually refer to the year in which academic consensus places the work as having been 'published' in some form. For further clarification concerning the dating of individual works and the difficulties involved, the introductory sections in the various Loeb editions can be consulted.

<sup>48</sup> A large part of my argument rests on the profound psychological effect the shock of his exile had on Cicero, a point also made by Robinson (1994:475). I make the argument that most of Cicero's publication after his exile serves as a form of rehabilitation, which necessitated a focus on his glory. Robinson also points out that Cicero purposefully avoids referring to his banishment as 'exile' because of the shame associated with the institution.

Following the conference at Luca in the same year, which precipitated Cicero's first retirement from politics, we see a relative hiatus in this type of composition, apart from the speech against Piso in 55. What makes 55 significant, however, is that we see the first mature attempt at theoretical work in *De Oratore*, where Cicero begins to experiment with alternative paths, in this case through publication, to promote his personal glory. The next three years see very little published apart from the speeches *Pro Plancio*, *Pro Rabirio Postumo*, *Pro Scauro*, and *Pro Milone*. The decisive move away from forensic oratory occurs in 51, while Cicero served as proconsul of Cilicia. The practical experience gained from this assignment seems to have consolidated his commitment to pursue alternative paths to glory, including Cicero's failed supplication for a military triumph and, most importantly, the publication of his theoretical works on statecraft, *De Re Publica* and *De Legibus*<sup>49</sup>.

These works were well received<sup>50</sup> and would have constituted the beginning of Cicero's renewed attempt to achieve personal glory through composition and publication, were it not for the interruption of all such activity by the outbreak of the Civil War between Caesar and Pompey in January 49. As a result, little serious composition<sup>51</sup> or publication takes place in the next three years. After Caesar's triumphant return to Rome in September 47, Cicero finally abandoned politics to focus on his writing. Initially, his compositional focus builds on the earlier *De Oratore*, resulting in the publication of four theoretical works on oratory in 46, namely the *Brutus*, *De Optimo Genere Oratorum*, *Orator*, and *Partitiones Oratoriae*. The positive reception of these works encouraged Cicero to shift focus once again, resulting in the composition and publication of his first overtly philosophical work, the *Paradoxa Stoicorum*, in the same year.

The focus on philosophy continued in 45, probably influenced by the death of his daughter and grandson in February, resulting in the composition of *Academica*, *De Finibus*, *Tusculanae Disputationes*, and the lost *Consolatio*. This philosophical composition and publication accelerated into the following year, including the works *De Senectute*, *De Amicitia*, *De Natura Deorum*, *De Divinatione*, *De Fato*, *Topica*, the lost *De Gloria*, and *De Officiis*. Despite Caesar's assassination in March, Cicero's focus on philosophy culminates in the decision to join his son in Athens in July 44.

---

<sup>49</sup> Dolganov (2007:29) makes the important point that these two works, as well as the preceding *De Oratore*, were political in nature, but 'approach political subject matter by way of rhetorical theory (defining the role of the orator in the ideal state in *De Oratore*) and political philosophy (establishing a practical ideology for the state and its laws in *De Re Publica* and *De Legibus*). Because these genres had no established tradition in Latin, Cicero was in each case able to forge his own literary framework, which enabled him to articulate his political stance with full authorial control.'

<sup>50</sup> See *Epistulae Ad Familiares* 77.4.

<sup>51</sup> This obviously does not apply to the letters, but there is a lacuna in the correspondence with Atticus, which makes it difficult to determine the extent of composition during this time. Robinson (1951:137-138) points out this difficulty in his article on the dating of *Brutus*.

However, Cicero turns back in August and abandons philosophical composition and retirement for the political contest with Anthony. This results in the composition and limited publication of the *Philippicae*, beginning in September 44, ultimately resulting in Cicero's assassination on 7 December 43 near his villa at Formia.

Even preceding the prolific year of 44, by the time of the composition of *De Finibus* in 45, Cicero was very much aware that his publishing activity constituted a major achievement. Answering the criticism for focusing on philosophy<sup>52</sup>, and taking those to task who would discriminate against their own language, Cicero states in the prologue that those who would prefer him 'to write upon other subjects may fairly be indulgent to one who has written much already – in fact no one of our nation more – and who perhaps will write still more if his life be prolonged' (*qui autem alia malunt scribi a nobis, aequi esse debent, quod et scripta multa sunt, sic ut plura nemini e nostris, et scribentur fortasse plura si vita suppetet* – *De Finibus* I.iv.11). We see the same sentiment expressed with rather more Ciceronian fire in letter 281.2, written to Atticus on 9 May 45. Answering the criticism of his continued mourning for the death of his daughter<sup>53</sup>, Cicero rages that 'these happy folk who take me to task cannot read as many pages as I have written' (*legere isti laeti qui me reprehendunt tam multa non possunt quam ego scripsi*). Cicero's growing reputation as a writer is also clear in *Epistulae Ad Familiares* 251.1, written by L. Luceius on the same day, in which Cicero's mind is described as 'a well-instructed one, ever creating something to delight others and shed lustre on yourself' (*animo ... vel eruditio, qui semper aliquid ex se promat quod alios delectet, ipsum laudibus illustret*).

Writing much would naturally increase the chances of Cicero's name surviving the ages, a preoccupation for many writers, both ancient and modern. One of the most charming moments in literature – a moment that perhaps brings us closest to understanding publication aimed at ensuring the eternal glory of the writer – occurs at the beginning of *De Legibus*. The work opens with a fictional Atticus and Quintus Cicero roaming about the countryside around Arpinum. Upon seeing a grove and oak tree, Atticus asks whether it is the same oak as the one in Cicero's poem praising Gaius Marius, written in or before 59. The answer, followed by a second question and answer, is instructive, as it shows that Cicero was by this time – like many ancient writers – keenly aware of the power of composition and publication to immortalize:

---

<sup>52</sup> Goodwin (2001:45) goes so far as to include 'an interest in philosophy' as a form of insult, which also included sexual impropriety, public drunkenness, and dancing.

<sup>53</sup> This issue is analysed by Wilcox (2005), who explores the excuses Cicero makes for his antisocial behavior, one of which includes his focus on writing.

*Q: manet vero, Attice noster, et semper manebit; sata est enim ingenio. nullius autem agricolae cultu stirps tam diuturna quam poetae versu seminari potest. A: quo tandem modo, Quinte, aut quale est istuc, quod poetae serunt? mihi enim videris fratrem laudando suffragari tibi. Q: sit ita sane; verum tamen, dum Latinae loquentur litterae, quercus huic loco non deerit, quae Mariana dicatur, eaque, ut ait Scaevola de fratris mei Mario “canescet saeculis innumerabilibus.”*

*De Legibus I.i.1*

*Q: That oak lives indeed, my dear Atticus, and will live forever; for it was planted by the imagination. No tree nourished by a farmer's care can be so long-lived as one planted by a poet's verses. A: How is that, Quintus? What sort of planting is it that poets do? It seems to me that while praising your brother you are putting in a word for yourself as well. Q: You may be right; but for all that, as long as Latin literature shall live, there will not fail to be an oak tree on this spot, called the “Marian Oak”, which, as Scaevola says of my brother's ‘Marius,’ will “through countless ages come to hoary old age.”*

What makes this exchange particularly delightful, not least because of its shameless and convoluted egocentricity<sup>54</sup>, is that Cicero not only engineers a literary compliment towards himself via the characters of his brother and brother-in-law, but manages also to compliment them, first by their inclusion as characters in the work itself<sup>55</sup>, and then by referring to Quintus' own work as a writer,

<sup>54</sup> This indirectness stems from the habit among Cicero and his contemporaries of not writing directly about themselves for fear of censure. Allen (1954:126) points out that it ‘was expected also that one would introduce with an apology remarks which had to be made about oneself’ and continues that ‘Cicero was, so far as we can judge, even more careful than his contemporaries in the matter of consistency with accepted mores (1954:128)’ Explaining Cicero's increasing references to himself over time, however, he concludes that Cicero ‘would not have been guilty of so gross a *faux pas* as to express greater pride in his achievements than his contemporaries would have thought proper. The task of an orator is to establish rapport with his auditors, not to alienate them.’ I would argue that Cicero nevertheless does push the boundaries of self-praise to further his glory. While it is impossible to generalize concerning primary purpose, I nevertheless disagree with Benario (1973:17) who, in his effort to rehabilitate Cicero from the criticism of scholars such as Syme (1939), overlooks the very many efforts at self-aggrandisement in the writings.

<sup>55</sup> As his philosophical oeuvre expands, we not only see more examples of including himself and his intimates as characters in the works, but even biographical details of which he was rather proud, such as his discovery of Archimedes' grave during his quaestorship in Sicily (*Tusculanae Disputationes* V.xxiii.64-66), as well as his governorship of Cilicia (*De Divinatione* I.xxviii.58). Concerning the grave, Jaeger (2002:54-56) makes the case that Cicero not only hoped to create a more permanent memorial through writing, but also goes out of his way to emphasize his own role. Gurd (2007:70) gives as reasons for including living friends as characters the following: ‘First, it served immediate social purposes: the *Brutus* is a form of payment in kind, to Atticus for the *Liber Annalis*, and to Brutus for the *De virtute*. Second, the display of benevolent debate helped model a private version of the republican solidarity no longer possible in public. Showing Romans argue complex questions allowed him to dramatize the ethics of friendship and mutual correction he would propose in the *Laelius* as a new republican ethics. Finally, this friendly debate also models *literary* relationships ... the very representation of debate implies and invites another form of literary activity, one that extends beyond solitary, inward looking study.’

before quoting yet another compliment to himself by a leading statesman<sup>56</sup>, put in the mouth of his fictional brother! Quintus continues the point by stating that ‘many objects in many places live on in men’s thoughts for a longer time than nature could have kept in existence’ (*multaque alia multis locis diutius commemoratione manent quam natura stare potuerunt*) and ends with the opinion that when ‘time and age shall have destroyed this tree, still there would be an oak tree on this spot which men will call the “Marian Oak”’ (*sed eum eam tempestas vetustasve consumpserit, tamen erit his in locis quercus, quam “Marianam quercum” vocabunt – De Legibus I.i.2*). Cicero would naturally have been delighted to know that all of them, including his “Marian Oak” would survive the millennia, as it serves as the ultimate vindication of his project to promote his own glory through publication.

This is but one example that demonstrates the powerful incentives towards composition and publication to promote personal glory. However, Cicero did not initially focus on glorifying himself, but rather on coaxing others to do it for him. This is a preoccupation that is already apparent twelve years earlier, in the *Pro Archia* speech of 62. Cicero’s main argument in this speech is that the poet Archias had shed lustre on the Roman State through his literary activity and should therefore be conserved for the State that he may continue to do so. In one example, also concerning Gaius Marius, Cicero mentions an early work by Archias that had won the great general’s approbation, despite him being considered insensible to such refinements (*qui durior ad haec studia videbatur, iucundus fuit – Pro Archia xi.19*). Cicero goes on to observe dryly that there is ‘no man to whom the Muses are so distasteful that he will not be glad to entrust to poetry the eternal emblazonment of his achievements’ (*neque enim quisquam est tam aversus a Musis qui non mandari versibus aeternum suorum laborum facile praeconium patiatur – Pro Archia ix.20*). How much more so a man not at all insensible to such refinements.

Several instances of Archias’ role in praising Roman statesmen follow, leading to a general digression on the role of poets in the immortalization of men, culminating in the opinion that, had the *Iliad* never existed, the same mound which covered Achilles’ bones would also have overwhelmed

---

<sup>56</sup> These of course aim to bolster Cicero’s authority. What follows this initial section is a systematic rejection of requests by Atticus and Quintus to write on pure philosophy, historiography, or jurisprudence. Dolganov (2008:24-25) argues that in doing so, Cicero is ‘signalling the vocabulary that his audience needs to activate in order to understand his meaning. Considering that Cicero’s subject is Roman constitutional law, and that any literary work by a senior statesman necessarily had political ramifications, his literary originality and intellectual independence translate into a statement of political authority.’ Krebs (2009:92) adds that, with ‘the help of these semantic layers, Cicero opens an associative latitude that allows for these various shifts.’

his memory (*nam nisi Ilias illa exstitisset, idem tumulus, qui corpus eius contexerat, nomen etiam obruisset* – *Pro Archia* x.24). All of this builds up to the actual point, which is that Cicero wishes to preserve his client for the Roman State, praising him for working on a poem in which he praises Cicero. In a moment of pure self-indulgence<sup>57</sup>, in which the purpose of a public life, magnified in writing, becomes apparent, Cicero writes:

*iam me vobis, iudices, indicabo, et de meo quodam amore gloriae, nimis acri fortasse verum tamen honesto vobis confitebor. nam quas res nos in consulatu nostro vobiscum simul pro salute huius urbis atque imperii et pro vita civium proque universa re publica gessimus, attigit hic versibus atque inchoavit: quibus auditis, quod mihi magna res et iucunda visa est, hunc ad perficiendum adhortatus sum. nullam enim virtus aliam mercedem laborum periculorumque desiderat, praeter hanc laudis et gloriae: qua quidem detracta, iudices, quid est quod in hoc tam exiguo vitae curriculo et tam brevi tantis nos in laboribus exerceamus? certe si nihil animus praesentiret in posterum et si quibus regionibus vitae spatium circumscriptum est, eisdem omnes cogitationes terminaret suas, nec tantis se laboribus frangeret, neque tot curis vigiliisque angeretur, nec totiens de ipsa vita dimicaret. nunc insidet quaedam in optimo quoque virtus quae noctes ac dies animum gloriae stimulis concitat atque admonet non cum vitae tempore esse dimetiendam commemorationem nominis nostri, sed cum omni posteritate adaequandam.*

*Pro Archia* xi.28-29

*I will now proceed, gentlemen, to open to you my heart, and confess to you my own passion, if I may so describe it, for fame, a passion over-keen perhaps, but assuredly honourable. The measures which I, jointly with you, undertook in my consulship for the safety of the empire, the lives of our citizens, and the common weal of the state, have been taken by my client as the subject of a poem which he has begun; he read this to me, and the work struck me as at once so forcible and so interesting that I encouraged him to complete it. For magnanimity looks for no other recognition of its toils and dangers save praise and glory; once rob it of that, gentlemen, and in this brief and transitory*

---

<sup>57</sup> It is worth pointing out here that, whether or not it was Cicero's brother presiding over this tribunal, as is traditionally believed, Cicero's indulgence of this rather 'irregular' theme within a forensic speech probably derives from the confidence he had after subduing the Catilinarian conspiracy in the previous year, but before the danger to his position that his participation in the *Bona Dea* case of 62 caused, became apparent.

*pilgrimage of life what further incentive have we to high endeavour? If the soul were haunted by no presage of futurity, if the scope of her imaginings were bounded by the limits set to human existence, surely never then would she break herself by bitter toil, rack herself with sleepless solicitude, or struggle so often for very life itself. But deep in every noble heart dwells a power which plies night and day the goad of glory, and bids us see to it that the remembrance of our names should not pass away with life, but should endure coeval with all the ages of the future.*

The point, which Cicero continues, is that immortality, though achievable through a variety of means, such as statues and portraits, is best achieved through writing<sup>58</sup>, in which ‘we bequeath an effigy of our minds and characters, wrought and elaborated by supreme talent’ (*consiliorum relinquere ac virtutem nostrarum effigiem ... summis ingeniis expressam et politam – Pro Archia xii.30*). Cicero won his case, but the work he hoped for has either been lost or remained unwritten<sup>59</sup>, the latter being more likely, as suggested by letter 16.15, written to Atticus at the beginning of July the following year, in which Cicero states that Archias had written nothing (*Archias nihil de me scripserit*), before continuing in a rather peevish tone that he had been distracted by works commissioned by his Luculli patrons (*ac vereor ne, Lucullis quoniam Graecum poema condidit, nunc ad Caecilianam fabulam spectet*).

This did not stop Cicero from continuing to elicit works from others to catapult his achievements into posterity. Perhaps the most overt example occurs in *Epistulae Ad Familiares 22*<sup>60</sup>, written in April 55 to L. Lucceius. Having been forced to abandon politics by the first triumvirate, Cicero can be seen expending his energies on reclaiming his former glory by encouraging Lucceius to include his

<sup>58</sup> We also see this sentiment expressed in *Pro Sestio* lxi.129 and *Tusculanae Disputationes* I.xv.34.

<sup>59</sup> This did not stop Cicero from making up the shortfall through the composition of his self-congratulatory poem, *De Consulatu Suo*, written some time between 60 and 55, leading to widespread mocking by contemporaries and later writers. The line *cedant arma togae, concedat laurea laudi*, which Cicero was rather proud of, became proverbial for the dangers of self-praise. However, Allen (1954:121-122) makes several important observations concerning this issue. He begins by questioning the extent to which self-esteem was socially acceptable in Rome, and whether Cicero exceeded the bounds of propriety in self-laudation. He concludes that ‘it must be taken as a basic principle, however, that in the autobiographical remarks in all his works Cicero did not intend to be offensive and that he did wish to conform to the usual standard of manners.’ He goes on to argue that Cicero’s ‘conception of *gloria* was influenced both by Hellenistic philosophy and by Roman society, and his concept of the significance of *gloria* deepened into nearly the modern notion of the desire for immortality as Cicero was matured by his various vicissitudes of fortune.’

<sup>60</sup> Hall (1998) offers a useful analysis of this letter, which Cicero himself refers to as ‘*valde bella*’ in *Epistulae Ad Atticum* 83.4, pointing out its function as a formal request rather than as an example of unrestrained egotism. I would add that Cicero’s estimation of the letter had less to do with its artistic quality than his ability to navigate the complex social expectations of such a request, which we see repeated in the letter to Varro in 3.2 below.

consulship in the history<sup>61</sup> he was writing. The letter opens with an apology as to the contents, but Cicero nevertheless adds that ‘letters do not blush’ (*epistula enim non erubescit*). He continues:

*ardeo cupiditate incredibili neque, ut ego arbitror, reprehendenda nomen ut nostrum scriptis illustretur et celebretur tuis. quod etsi mihi saepe ostendisti te esse facturum, tamen ignoscas velim huic festinationi meae. genus enim scriptorum tuorum, etsi erat semper a me vehementer expectatum, tamen vicit opinionem meam meque ita vel cepit vel incendit ut cuperem quam celerrime res nostras monumentis commendari tuis. neque enim me solum commemoratio posteritatis ac spes quaedam immortalitatis rapit sed etiam illa cupiditas ut vel auctoritate testimoni tui vel indicio benevolentiae vel suavitate ingeni vivi perfruamur.*

*Epistulae ad Familiares 22.1*

*I have a burning desire, of a strength you will hardly credit but ought not, I think, to blame, that my name should gain lustre and celebrity through your works. You have often promised me, it is true, that you will comply with my wish; but I ask you to forgive my impatience. The quality of your literary performances, eagerly as I have always awaited them, has surpassed my expectation. I am captivated and enkindled. I want to see my achievements enshrined in your compositions with the minimum of delay. The thought that posterity will talk of me and the hope, one might say, of immortality hurries me on, but so too does the desire to enjoy in my lifetime the support of your weighty testimony, the evidence of your good will, and the charm of your literary talent.*

Cicero continues to be apologetic, pointing out the effrontery of the request (*impudenter faciam*), but then goes on to suggest the entire literary programme, most specifically suggesting that rather than weaving the Ciceronian episode into the larger narrative, the material would benefit from following Greek examples that would treat it separately. He goes on to say that if Luceius’ whole mind were directed upon a single theme and a single figure, he could already envisage the great gain in general richness and splendour (*si uno in argumento unaque in persona mens tua tota versabitur, cerno iam*

---

<sup>61</sup> That Cicero did not write any history himself is significant. Dolganov (2008:28) states that Cicero did not write history in the 50s as it did not offer him ‘sufficient political utility.’ He goes on to explain that this may have been because ‘historiography was laden with literary conventions and political connotations more than any other genre, and did not provide a built-in means for discussing one’s own achievements. Cicero clearly found poetry and *commentarii* more congenial for self-commemoration.’

*animo quanto omnia uberiora atque ornatioa futura sint – Ad Familiares 22.2*). The additional glory to Cicero in such an arrangement goes without saying. Cicero even goes so far as to request Luceius to ‘waive the laws of history for this once. Do not scorn personal bias, if it urge you strongly in my favour ... Concede to the affection between us just a little more even than the truth will license’ (*in eo leges historiae negligas gratiamque illam de qua suavissime ... si me tibi vehementius commendabit, ne aspernere amorique nostro plusculum etiam quam concedet veritas largiare – Ad Familiares 22.3*). This may seem strange to our own understanding of history, but given that Cicero was trying to rehabilitate his honour and political position after his exile, a flattering historical portrayal would certainly fit such a programme<sup>62</sup>.

After praising the attractiveness of the material, flattering Luceius’ talent, offering to help him in every detail, and reminding Luceius of the mutually beneficial relationship that exists between famous men and their chroniclers, benefiting both in their search for glory<sup>63</sup>, Cicero finally admits why he is pressing Luceius so forcefully:

*quod si a te non impetro, hoc est, si quae te res impedierit (neque enim fas esse arbitror quicquam me rogantem abs te non impetrare), cogar fortasse facere quod non nulli saepe reprehendunt: scribam ipse de me, multorum tamen exemplo et clarorum virorum. sed, quod te non fugit, haec sunt in hoc genere vitia: et verecundius ipsi de sese scribant necesse est si quid est laudandum et praetereant si quid reprehendendum est. accedit etiam ut minor sit fides, minor auctoritas, multi denique reprehendant et dicant verecundiores esse praecones ludorum gymniorum, qui, cum ceteris coronas imposuerint victoribus eorumque nomina magna voce pronuntiarint, cum ipsi ante ludorum missionem corona donentur, alium praeconem adhibeant, ne sua voce se ipsi victores esse praedicent. haec nos vitare cupimus et, si recipis causam nostram, vitabimus idque ut facias rogamus.*

*Epistulae ad Familiares 22 (V.12.viii)*

*Suppose, however, I am refused; that is to say, suppose something hinders you (for I feel it would be against nature for you to refuse any request of mine), I shall perhaps be driven to a course often censured by some, namely to write about myself – and yet I shall*

<sup>62</sup> Murphy (1998:496) also takes this view, explaining this instance as an exercise in self-promotion rather than an attempt to expand Latin literature.

<sup>63</sup> This argument would probably have annoyed Luceius – a man who had failed to secure the consulship in 60 and had subsequently retired from politics.

*have many illustrious precedents. But I need not point out to you that this genre has certain disadvantages. An autobiographer must needs write over-modestly where praise is due and pass over anything that calls for censure. Moreover, his credit and authority are less, and many will blame him and say that heralds at athletic contests show more delicacy, in that after placing garlands on the heads of the winners and loudly proclaiming their names, they call in another herald when it is their turn to be crowned at the end of the games, in order to avoid announcing their own victory with their own lips. I am anxious to escape these drawbacks, as I shall, if you take my case. I beg you so to do.*

No such work by Lucceius has come down to us, and since the matter is not mentioned again, we must assume that Cicero's request was either refused or delicately declined. Our knowledge of Cicero's lost poem *De Consulatu Suo*, written earlier in 60, as well as the lost *De Temporibus Suis*, written during roughly the same period as the request, seems to suggest that Cicero took matters into his own hands when disappointed by other writers<sup>64</sup>. Whatever the truth of the matter, we see in these examples that Cicero was very active in pursuing publication to promote his own glory.

---

<sup>64</sup> This view is supported by Harrison (1990:455), who offers a useful analysis of the evidence for the content and purpose of the second work, which has been lost in its entirety.

### 3.2 Publication to elicit literary favours

The apparent futility of direct requests was not the only motivation for publication. The social context of publication also played an important role, allowing Cicero to promote his glory in more subtle ways. After being disappointed in his hopes by both Archias and Luceius, we see Cicero changing strategy, rather focusing on eliciting dedications and honourable mentions through reciprocal literary favours to other writers. The most detailed example of this comes from several letters in which Cicero hesitates about dedicating his *Academica* to Marcus Terentius Varro, the famous and prolific writer and his contemporary. It is a fascinatingly detailed episode, showing the lengths to which Cicero would go to have a work dedicated to him. That Cicero was keen to be in Varro's good books, as it were, can already be seen in letter 45.1 to Atticus, probably written in September 59, which opens with the request that if Cicero praises any mutual friend to Atticus, it was necessary that Atticus make the friend aware of the praise (*cum aliquem apud te laudaro tuorum familiarium, volam illum scire ex te me id fecisse*), before going on to suggest that Atticus write to Varro that Cicero was 'well content with him, not that this was so but that this might become so' (*sed ego mallet ad ipsum scripsisses mihi illum satis facere, non quo faceret sed ut faceret*), before admitting that Varro was a strange person, even using two partial literary quotes from Euripides as coded speech to suggest his deviousness and arrogance.

Nevertheless, we see Varro assiduously courted. In letter 53.3, written on 29 May 58, Cicero agrees to follow Atticus' suggestion to thank Varro for an undisclosed service during his exile – probably interceding with Pompey on Cicero's behalf, which is suggested in letters 60.1 and 63.1. Back in Rome and writing in October 57, we see the relationship having developed, as Cicero describes Varro as a friend to both Atticus and himself (*Varronis tui nostrique – Ad Atticum 74.5*). In mid-May 54, Cicero asks Atticus in letter 88.1 to write to his home in Rome, telling them to give Cicero free access to use Atticus' library as if he himself were there<sup>65</sup>, including Varro's books among the rest (*velim domum ad te scribas ut mihi tui libri pateant non secus ac si ipse adesses, cum ceteri tum Varronis*). Cicero was doing research for his *De Re Publica* at the time, but mentioning Varro's books specifically suggests that access to these works may have been restricted. It also suggests that Cicero was probably familiarizing himself with Varro's works to facilitate their growing friendship.

---

<sup>65</sup> Concerning the lending of books, Starr (1987:216) describes the 'channels of circulation' as running 'from one friend to another, never between strangers. A Roman did not ask someone he did not already know to send a book, even about a subject in which both were interested.' Permission to loan also often included permission to copy. Starr (1987:217) goes on to point out that when 'one friend loaned a book to another, the recipient would make a copy at his own expense if he wished.'

About six weeks later, we see Cicero replying in letter 89.2 that he intends to follow Atticus' suggestion by including Varro as a character in *De Re Publica*, provided there was a place to do so (*Varro ... includetur in aliquem locum, si modo erit locus*), but making several excuses explaining why this may not work. He does, however, suggest creating an occasion to address Varro directly in one of the prefaces<sup>66</sup>, following Aristotle's example (*itaque cogitabam, quoniam in singulis libris utor prohoemiis ut Aristoteles in iis quos ἐξωτερικὸς vocat, aliquid efficere ut non sine causa istum appellarem*).

It seems, however, that Cicero held off on including Varro in any of his works for several years, as the issue comes up again in letters written nine years later. In letter 294.3, written on 21 May 45, we find a cryptic reference to Varro's work *De Lingua Latina* in which Cicero tells Atticus to set his mind at rest on the matter (*de lingua Latina securi es animi*). Atticus' agitation may have derived from the fact that, two years after promising to dedicate the work to Cicero, Varro still had not finished it. This seems to be suggested by the contents of letter 320.3, written about a month later. After thanking Atticus for praising the written version of his speech *Pro Ligario*, Cicero once again makes the excuse that his former works did not really offer a place for Varro to be included (*scis me antea orationes aut aliquid id genus solitum scribere ut Varronem nusquam possem intexere*). What follows reveals Cicero's solution to Atticus' much earlier suggestion:

*postea autem quam haec coepi φιλολογότερα, iam Varro mihi denuntiaverat magnam sane et gravem προσφώνησιν. biennium praeteriit cum ille Καλλιπίδης adsiduo cursu cubitum nullum processerit. ego autem me parabam ad id quod ille mihi misisset ut 'ἀπὸ τῷ μέτρῳ καὶ λόγῳ,' si modo potuissem; nam hoc etiam Hesiodus ascribit, 'αἶ κε δύνηαι.' nunc illam 'περὶ Τελῶν' σύνταξιν sane mihi probatam Bruto, ut tibi placuit, despondimus, idque tu eum non nolle mihi scripsisti. ergo illam Ἀκαδημικήν, in qua homines nobiles illi quidem sed nullo modo philologi nimis acute loquuntur, ad Varronem transferamus. etenim sunt Antiochia, quae iste valde probat. Catulo et Lucullo alibi reponemus, ita tamen si tu hoc probas; deque eo mihi rescribas velim.*

*Epistulae ad Atticum 320.3*

---

<sup>66</sup> This was not done.

*Then, when I began these more erudite compositions, Varro had already announced his intention of making me a really fine, weighty dedication. Two years have gone by during which, slowcoach that he is, he has been running hard without advancing a foot. I for my part was making ready to pay him for his offering ‘in measure like, and better too’ – that is, if I could, for even Hesiod adds ‘if you can.’ As things stand, I have pledged my work ‘On the Limits’, of which I have a tolerably good opinion, to Brutus, and you tell me that he is not averse. So let us transfer the Academical treatise, in which aristocratic but by no means learned personages talk above their own heads, to Varro. The standpoint is that of Antiochus, of which he highly approves. I’ll make it up to Catulus and Lucullus elsewhere, that is if you approve the idea; and would you kindly write back to me about it?*

This extract is interesting for several reasons. As Cicero and Atticus were quite comfortable sharing a joke or sensitive information in Greek, the preponderance of Greek in this letter is significant. Cicero’s irritation with Varro at this point is clear, although it is not bad-tempered. The *φιλολογότερα* is self-effacing, given indications elsewhere<sup>67</sup> that Cicero was rather proud of his philosophical compositions. The tone in *magnam sane et gravem προσφώνησιν* is mock-serious, suggesting that Cicero considered this promised ‘weighty dedication’ from Varro to be not entirely sincere. This leads to the Hesiod quote<sup>68</sup>, which is apt, as it concerns reciprocity in dealing with neighbours – the neighbours in this case sharing the compositional landscape. The implication is that Cicero intended to ‘extort’ the ‘weighty dedication’ from Varro by one-upmanship, dedicating the *Academica* to him and even including him as a character. Cicero decides to give him the part of Antiochus, the condescending *quae iste valde probat* perhaps even suggesting that Cicero considered the position inferior.

<sup>67</sup> This is suggested in *Epistulae Ad Atticum* 410.5.

<sup>68</sup> Taken from the *Works and Days*, 11.247-251, the section reads: *πῆμα κακὸς γείτων, ὅσσόν τ’ ἀγαθὸς μέγ’ ὄνειρα ἔμμορέ τοι τιμῆς, ὅς τ’ ἔμμορε γείτονος ἐσθλοῦ οὐδ’ ἂν βοῦς ἀπόλοιτ’, εἰ μὴ γείτων κακὸς εἴη. εὖ μὲν μετρεῖσθαι παρὰ γείτονος, εὖ δ’ ἀποδοῦναι, αὐτῷ τῷ μέτρῳ, καὶ λῶιον, αἶ κε δύνηαι, ὡς ἂν χρηζῶν καὶ ἐς ὕστερον ἄρκιον εὖρης* (A bad neighbor is a woe, just as much as a good one is a great boon: whoever has a share in a fine neighbor has a share in good value; not even a cow would be lost, if the neighbor were not bad. Measure out well from your neighbor, and pay him back well, with the very same measure, and better if you can, so that if you are in need again you will find him reliable later too).

This is followed by an update in letter 321.1, written the next day. Acting on another letter from Atticus, Cicero writes that he had taken the dialogue from highly aristocratic personages and transferred it to Varro<sup>69</sup> (*ab hominibus nobilissimis abstuli, transtuli ad nostrum sodalem*), enquiring from Atticus whether Varro approved of the new plan (*tu autem mihi pervelim scribas qui intellexeris illum velle*), but then asking of whom Varro was jealous, referring to the dedication of the *De Finibus* to Brutus<sup>70</sup>, exclaiming in exasperation that this was the last straw (*illud vero utique scire cupio, quem intellexeris ab eo ζηλοτυπειῖσθαι, nisi forte Brutum. id hercle restabat! sed tamen scire pervelim*). Cicero was rather proud of this version and considered it the best thing written in the genre, even compared to the Greek works (*libri quidem ita exierunt, nisi forte me communis φιλαυτία decipit, ut in tali genere ne apud Graecos quidem simile quicquam*), and asks Atticus to be philosophical about the labour already expended by his copyists on the previous version, as he considered this one to be far superior (*tu illam iacturam feres aequo animo quod illa quae habes de Academicis frustra descripta sunt. multo tamen haec erunt splendidiora, breviora, meliora*).

Letter 322.1, written the next day, shows Cicero's nervousness, in which he asks Atticus to reflect again and yet again on whether he is in favour of sending Varro what Cicero had written – though Atticus too had a stake in the matter now, as Cicero had included him in the dialogue as third speaker (*illud etiam atque etiam consideres velim, placeatne tibi mitti ad Varronem quod scripsimus. etsi etiam ad te aliquid pertinet; nam scito te ei dialogo adiunctum esse tertium*). Cicero's indecision is clear in the next sentence, where he writes that reflection is called for and that the names are already in the work, but that they could be cancelled or altered (*opinor igitur consideremus etsi nomina iam facta sunt; sed vel induci vel mutari possunt*).

Cicero writes yet another letter the next day, not yet having received a reply to the previous one, in which the entire matter is once more summarized:

*illam Ἀκαδημικὴν σύνταξιν totam ad Varronem traduximus. primo fuit Catuli, Luculli, Hortensi; deinde παρὰ τὸ πρέπον videbatur, quod erat hominibus nota non illa quidem*

<sup>69</sup> For a summary of the differences between the two partial versions of the *Academica* that have come down to us and the different characters in each version, cf. pp. 400-403 in the Loeb, Volume XIX. Phillips (1986:233) offers an explanation for the survival of two versions, explaining that Cicero and Atticus probably 'retained copies of the first version in their libraries, and by means of these copies both versions eventually became known without either one surviving intact to the present day.'

<sup>70</sup> Murphy (1998:498) explains that when Cicero dedicated works outside of his family circle, such as to Varro, Trebatius, and Brutus, he chose men of 'established literary or scholarly reputations whose readership must have been a great aid in introducing his books to intellectual circles.' I would add that apart from the benefits to circulation, there were benefits to Cicero's glory in having his books read by such eminent persons and their friends.

*ἀπαιδευσία sed in his rebus ἀτριψία simul ac veni ad villam eosdem illos sermones ad Catonem Brutumque transtuli. ecce tuae litterae de Varrone. nemini visa est aptior Antiochia ratio. sed tamen velim scribas ad me, primum placeatne tibi aliquid ad illum, deinde, si placebit, hocne potissimum.*

*Epistulae ad Atticum 323.1–2*

*I have transferred the entire Academic treatise to Varro. To begin with it was assigned to Catulus, Lucullus, and Hortensius. Then it seemed inappropriate, as their – I won't say illiteracy, but lack of expertise in such matters – was notorious; so as soon as I got to the farm I transferred these same discussions to Cato and Brutus. Then came your letter about Varro, who seemed just the right mouthpiece for Antiochus' views. But would you let me know all the same (a) whether you favour my addressing something to him and (b) if so, whether this in particular?*

Cicero's anxiety on this matter seems extraordinary, but needs to be taken at face value, given that so many letters have come down to us detailing his indecision. Yet another letter discusses the matter, written two days later on 28 June 45. Cicero begins by jokingly suggesting that he and Atticus purchase a property in the suburbs to be closer to each other (to speed up correspondence) and then continues:

*ego interea admonitu tuo perfeci sane argutulos libros ad Varronem, sed tamen exspecto quid ad ea quae scripsi ad te: primum qui intellexeris eum desiderare a me, cum ipse homo πολυγρότατος numquam me lacessisset; deinde quem ζηλοτυπεῖν intellexeris. quod si non Brutum, multo Hortensium minus aut eos qui de re publica loquuntur. plane hoc mihi explices velim in primis, maneasne in sententia ut mittam ad eum quae scripsi an nihil necesse putes.*

*Epistulae ad Atticum 325.1*

*Meanwhile I have taken your hint and finished off some neat little volumes addressed to Varro. Nonetheless I am awaiting your answer to my questions: (a) how you gathered that he coveted a dedication from me, when he himself, extremely prolific author as he is, has never taken the initiative, and (b) whom you gathered him to be jealous of; if it's not Brutus, much less can it be Hortensius or the speakers on the Republic. The point above*

*all which I should really be glad if you would make clear to me is whether you hold to your opinion that I should address my work to him or whether you see no need.*

At this point, it seems as if Atticus had become as indecisive as Cicero. The peevish tone in *homo πολυγρότατος numquam me lacessisset* suggests that Cicero was considering changing the dedication, only to change his mind again in letter 326.3, written the next day, in which he says that Atticus' opinion that Cicero may seem like a 'tuft hunter' does not sway him (*in Varrone ista causa me non moveret, ne viderer φιλένδοξος*). Cicero explains further that, despite following the rule not to include living persons in his previous works (*sic enim constitueram, neminem includere in dialogos eorum qui viverent*), except in mute parts (*κωφὸν πρόσωπον*), he seizes on Atticus' suggestion to include Varro (*itaque ut legi tuas de Varrone, tamquam ἔρμαιοιον adripui*), as he seemed more suited to the content of the *Academica*. Countering Varro's apparent jealousy concerning his role compared to the roles given to others in previous works, Cicero explains that he follows Aristotle's pattern in his recent works, in which the roles of others are subordinate to the author's own (*quae autem his temporibus scripsi Ἀριστοτέλειον morem habent, in quo ita sermo inducitur ceterorum ut penes ipsum sit principatus*), but adding that Varro's role in the work had been written in such a way that it did not seem inferior to Cicero's (*aeque partes ut non sim consecutus ut superior mea causa videatur*).

This entire episode seems to sketch a picture of a remarkably touchy celebrity that Cicero was nevertheless intent on humouring – all for the sake of a dedication! But he ends the letter by asking once again whether Atticus thinks *Academica* should be dedicated to Varro, as certain objections occur to him (*sed tu dandosne putes hos libros Varroni etiam atque etiam videbis. mihi quaedam occurrunt*), a point repeated in letter 329.1–3. The book seems almost finished, apart from correcting copyists' errors, about ten days later, when Cicero writes in letter 331.2 that he had his doubts about the dedication, but that it was now Atticus' responsibility and decision (*libri ad Varronem non morabuntur. sunt enim adfecti, ut vidisti; tantum librariorum menda tolluntur. de quibus libris scis me dubitasse, sed tu videris*). He repeats the sentiment a day later in letter 332.1, adding that he is more worried about what Varro may think of it rather than about the general talk (*quid tibi ego de Varrone rescribam; quattuor διφθέραι sunt in tua potestate. quod egeris id probabo. nec tamen αἰδέομαι Τρῶας.* *quid enim? sed ipsi quam res illa probaretur magis verebar. sed quoniam tu suscipis, in alteram aurem*). But Atticus was apparently a little loath to take on this responsibility, as seems clear from the teasing which follows in Cicero's reply the next day:

*sed quid est tandem quod perhorrescas quia tuo periculo iubeam libros dari Varroni? etiam nunc, si dubitas, fac ut sciamus. nihil est enim illis elegantius. volo Varronem, praesertim cum ille desideret; sed est, ut scis, 'δεινὸς ἀνὴρ. τάχα κεν καὶ ἀναίτιον αἰτιόωτο.'* ita mihi saepe occurrit vultus eius querentis fortasse vel hoc, meas partis in iis libris copiosius defensas esse quam suas, quod mehercule non esse intelleges ... sed tamen ego non despero probatum iri Varroni et id, quoniam impensam fecimus in macrocolla, facile patior teneri. sed etiam atque etiam dico, tuo periculo fiet. qua re si addubitas, ad Brutum transeamus; est enim is quoque Antiochius. o Academiam volaticam et sui similem! modo huc, modo illuc. sed, quaeso, epistula mea ad Varronem valdene tibi placuit? male mi sit si umquam quicquam tam enitar. ergo at ego ne Tironi quidem dictavi, qui totas περιοχὰς persequi solet, sed Spintharo syllabatim.

*Epistulae ad Atticum 333.3*

*Now why, I wonder, do you shake in your shoes when I tell you that the book is to be given to Varro at your risk? If you have any misgivings even at this stage, let me know, for it's a really choice piece of work. I want Varro, especially as he desires it. But as you know, he's 'One to be fear'd. E'en blameless folk he'd blame.' So I often seem to see the countenance of him, complaining it may be that my case is more amply argued in this work than his, which you will certainly find to be untrue ... However I don't despair of Varro's approval, and since we have spent money on folio, I'm not sorry to stick to my plan. But I say yet again, it will be at your risk. Therefore if you feel any misgivings let us transfer to Brutus, as he too follows Antiochus. A fickle creature Academe, and true to character – chops and changes all the time! But pray, didn't you like my letter to Varro more than a little? Hang me if I spend so many pains on anything ever again. For that reason I did not dictate it even to Tiro, who is by way of taking down whole periods together, but syllable by syllable to Spintharus.*

Even at this late stage, Cicero is ready to alter the plan, should there be anything which Atticus should deem in the slightest bit offensive. However, the money spent on presentation paper indicates Cicero's resolve in finally sending the work on, together with the dedication letter. This is confirmed the next day in letter 334.2, which reveals that Atticus intended to present the work to Varro as soon as he arrived at his house. Cicero adds the joke that the matter was done and that Atticus could now burn the boats, lamenting sardonically that Atticus did not seem to realize the danger he was in

*(Varroni scribis te, simul ac venerit. dati igitur iam sunt nec tibi integrum est: hui, si scias quanto periculo tuo!), wondering whether the last letter had held him back, and dying to know how the matter stands (aut fortasse litterae meae te retardarunt, si eas nondum legeras cum has proximas scripsisti. scire igitur aveo quo modo res se habeat).* We learn in letter 336.2, much to everyone's relief, that Atticus finally dared to hand the work over, with Cicero wondering what Varro will think and when he would have time to read it through (*tu tamen ausus es Varroni dare! exspecto quid iudicet. quando autem perleget?*).

As to the letter accompanying the *Academica*, we see Cicero at his most circumspect, going out of his way to make Varro's excuses for him, concerning the late dedication, and even shifting blame onto the four books of the *Academica* itself:

*etsi munus flagitare, quamvis quis ostenderit, ne populus quidem solet nisi concitatus, tamen ego exspectatione promissi tui moveor ut admoneam te, non ut flagitem. misi autem ad te quattuor admonitores non nimis verecundos; nosti enim profecto os huius adolescentioris Academiae. ex ea igitur media excitatos misi; qui metuo ne te forte flagitent, ego autem mandavi ut rogarent. exspectabam omnino iam diu meque sustinebam ne ad te prius ipse quid scriberem quam aliquid accepissem, ut possem te remunerari quam simillimo munere. sed cum tu tardius faceres, id est, ut ego interpretor, diligentius, teneri non potui quin coniunctionem studiorum amorisque nostri, quo possem litterarum genere, declararem. feci igitur sermonem inter nos habitum in Cumano, cum esset una Pomponius. tibi dedi partis Antiochinas, quas a te probari intellexisse mihi videbar, mihi sumpsi Philonis. puto fore ut, cum legeris, mirere nos id locutos esse inter nos quod numquam locuti sumus, sed nosti morem dialogorum.*

Epistulae ad Familiares 254.1

*To dun a man for a present, though promised, is in poor taste – even the crowd does not demand a show unless stirred up to it. Nonetheless my impatience for the fulfilment of your promise impels me – not to dun, but to remind you. And I am sending you four monitors not of the most bashful. I am sure you know how assertive this younger Academy can be; well, the quartet I am sending you has been summoned from its headquarters. I am afraid they may dun you, but I have charged them to request. To be sure, I have been waiting quite a while and holding back, so as not to address a piece to*

*you before I received one and thus repay you as nearly as possible in your own coin. But since you are proceeding rather slowly (and that is to say, as I interpret, carefully), I could not refrain from advertising the bond of common pursuits and affection between us by such a form of composition as lay within my powers. Accordingly, I have staged a conversation between us at Cumae, Pomponius also being present. I have assigned the exposition of Antiochus' tenets (being under the impression that you approve of them) to your role, that of Philo's to my own. I dare say you will be surprised when you read to find that you and I have discussed a subject which in fact we have never discussed; but you know the conventions of Dialogue.*

The letter contains no Greek, perhaps suggesting that it was meant to be circulated more widely along with the work itself, since several other letters<sup>71</sup> to Varro do include Greek. That Cicero wished to publicize Varro's promise to him, thereby adding pressure to the fulfilment of a promise long overdue, is shown when he expresses the same circumspect sentiments in the introduction to the *Academica* itself:

*tum Atticus "omitte ista, quae nec percontari nec audire sine molestia possumus, quaeso," inquit, "et quaere potius ecquid ipse novi; silent enim diutius Musae Varronis quam solebant, nec tamen istum cessare sed celare quae scribat existimo." "minime vero," inquit ille, "intemperantis enim arbitror esse scribere quod occultari velit; sed habeo opus magnum in manibus, idque iam pridem; ad hunc enim ipsum" – me autem dicebat – "quaedam institui, quae et sunt magna sane et limantur a me politius." et ego "ista quidem" inquam "Varro, iam diu exspectans non audeo tamen flagitare; audivi enim e Libone nostro (cuius nosti studium) – nihil enim eum eius modi celare possumus – non te ea intermittere sed accuratius tractare nec de manibus umquam deponere."*

*Academica* I.ii-iii

*Then Atticus said, "Do pray drop those subjects, about which we can neither ask questions nor hear the answers without distress; inquire of [Varro] instead whether he himself has done anything new. For Varro's Muses have kept silent for a longer time than they used, but all the same my belief is that your friend is not taking a holiday but is*

<sup>71</sup> *Epistulae ad Familiares* 176, 177, 178, and 180

*hiding what he writes.” “Oh no, certainly not,” said Varro, “for I think that to put in writing what one wants to be kept hidden is sheer recklessness; but I have got a big task in hand, and have had for a long time; I have begun on a work dedicated to our friend here himself” – meaning me – “which is a big thing I can assure you, and which is getting a good deal of touching up and polishing at my hands.” At this I said, “As to that work of yours, Varro, I have been waiting for it a long time now, but all the same I don't venture to demand it; for I have heard (since we cannot hide anything of that kind) from our friend Libo, an enthusiastic student as you know, that you are not leaving it off, but are giving it increased attention, and never lay it out of your hands.”*

This may well be considered the most magnificent example of public literary blackmail in the ancient world. Perhaps fearing that Varro would change his mind, Cicero uses his own work to dedicate Varro's work to himself pre-emptively! One cannot help but feel what must have been Varro's irritation at being so publicly reminded of his debt<sup>72</sup>. The last we hear on the matter seems to be in letter 416.3, written to Atticus several months later on 25 October 44, in which Cicero mentions in passing that he is expecting Varro's dialogue (*Varronis διάλογον exspecto*). However, we see Cicero still waiting for it on 5 November 44 in letter 420.3, when he mentions that he still has not gotten the work out of him (*a quo adhuc Ἡρακλείδειον illud non abstuli*), laughing at a joke made about the situation by Atticus in letter 421.1 the next day (*de Ἡρακλειδείῳ Varronis negotia salsa. me quidem nihil umquam sic delectavit*). Varro's *De Lingua Latina* was finally published in 43, before Cicero's death, but only books five to ten of the original twenty-five survive. It would be nice to think that this work, for which so much energy had been expended by Cicero, included a fulsome dedication to him, but all that remains is the *te* in the phrase ‘*in his ad te scribam*’ at the beginning of book five. It seems that Cicero did not get what he wanted, but the entire episode reveals to what extraordinary lengths Cicero would go to use publication to elicit literary favours that would promote his personal glory. It also shows the extraordinary importance of publication in a social context. An author had a responsibility not only to enhance his personal glory through publication, but also to contribute to the intellectual debate of his time. For this contribution an author could not depend solely on his own efforts. The broader social context had to endorse the results of his labour. In this way, Cicero had a social responsibility to publish so that his peers could become aware of and acknowledge his literary contributions.

---

<sup>72</sup> Gurd (2007:73) argues that this was an invitation to Varro to ‘release’ the work for collaborative review, but given all the evidence in the letters, I would argue that this aspect was not Cicero's primary motivation for including what he did in the dedication letter and introduction.

### 3.3 Publication to promote his own works

It therefore made sense that an author had a personal as well as a social responsibility to publish and promote his own works. As a result, part of the project of ensuring one's glory through publication was to make sure people *knew* you were the author of the work. Cicero already jokes about this in 62 in his speech *Pro Archia* (xi.26), exclaiming that 'upon the very books in which they bid us scorn ambition philosophers inscribe their names! They seek advertisement and publicity for themselves on the very page whereon they pour contempt upon advertisement and publicity' (*ipsi illi philosophi etiam illis libellis, quos de contemnenda gloria scribunt, nomen suum inscribunt: in eo ipso, in quo praedicationem nobilitateque despiciunt, praedicari de se ac nominari volunt*). The reason that we know so much about Cicero's works – especially those works that have not survived – is because Cicero mentions them himself, usually in the later compositions. These references can be divided into roughly four categories: referring to earlier speeches that have been published and circulated in order to illustrate a rhetorical point in the theoretical works on oratory, mostly in the *Orator*; bringing to public attention works of which he was particularly proud; replying to issues that concerned previous works; and referring readers to other works when a full treatment of the topic brought up had already been given.

Generally speaking, whenever Cicero mentions one of his speeches in another speech, it is usually only because the opposition had quoted something from it. One such example can be seen in *Pro Cluentio* (l.138), in which Cicero responds to a quote from his *In Verrem* speech, saying that an opinion had been ascribed to him by Accius from a speech which is alleged to be his (*mea enim esse dicitur. recitavit ex oratione nescio qua Accius, quam meam esse dicebat*). Cicero's formulaic evasiveness, neither confirming nor denying<sup>73</sup>, is not surprising, given the necessities of his case, but it does show the danger of publishing anything, lest the author be accused of inconsistency. However, by the composition of the *Orator*, Cicero's forensic career was behind him, allowing him greater freedom to admit authorship<sup>74</sup> of works in circulation under his name. So, for example, we see

<sup>73</sup> As this was the speech that launched Cicero's political career, Cicero was hardly likely to deny authorship outright. As Starr (1987:219) explains, 'readers had no guarantee that a work was even by its putative author. When Cicero's speech against Clodius and Curio leaked into circulation against his wishes, he exploited the potential ambiguity by suggesting to Atticus that he try to pass it off as a forgery.' Concerning this, see *Epistulae ad Atticum* 57.2.

<sup>74</sup> An interesting example of this takes place in *De Officiis* II.xiv.51, where Cicero proudly mentions his speech *Pro Roscio Amerino* while illustrating the point that defending someone oppressed or persecuted by the influence of someone in power brings glory and popularity to the pleader (*maxime autem et gloria paritur et gratia defensionibus, eoque maior, si quando accidit, ut ei subveniatur, qui potentis alicuius opibus circumveniri urguerique videatur*). Of course, this was easier to brag about with Sulla long dead, rather than going to Greece 'to study', as Cicero had done as a young man.

references to various speeches in the *Orator* to illustrate rhetorical principles, including references to *Pro Caecina*, *Pro Lege Manilia*, and *Pro Rabirio* (xxix.102), *In Verrem* (xxix.103; xxxvii.129; xxxviii.131), *Pro Cluentio* and the lost *Pro Cornelio* (xxix.103; xxx.108), and *Pro Roscio Amerino* (xxx.107). One could argue that these speeches are being used as examples because Cicero had them to hand, but the more likely reason for their inclusion is because they were already widely disseminated<sup>75</sup>, thereby encouraging readers of the *Orator* to read these speeches as well.

Concerning works that Cicero wanted to bring to public attention, these most often include his poetry, the little of which has come down to us as a result of lines quoted by Cicero himself in the philosophical works. So, for example, Cicero quotes over 80 lines of his *Prognostica*, a youthful verse translation of Aratus' Διοσηεῖα<sup>76</sup>, in *De Natura Deorum* (II.xli.104–xliv.114), and another 24 lines of the same work in *De Divinatione* (I.vii.13–ix.15). He also quotes 78 lines of his poem *De Consulatu Suo* in *De Divinatione* (I.xi.17–xiii.22) in the mouth of his brother. In addition, he quotes 33 lines of his poem eulogizing Marius in *De Divinatione* (I.xlvii.106–xlviii.108). He even mentions his brother's *Annales* in *De Divinatione* (I.xliv.100). He also mentions and quotes from his *Consolatio*, written after the death of his daughter, three times in his *Tusculanae Disputationes* (I.xxvii.66; I.xxxi.76; III.xxxi.76), published in the same year, as if to counter lingering public censure of his mental state at the time.

As Cicero's philosophical programme expanded, he availed himself of additional opportunities for clarification, to further argue points made previously, or to address comments on earlier works. For these reasons, he mentions *De Finibus* in the *Tusculanae Disputationes* (V.xi.32), the *Academica* in *De Natura Deorum* (I.v.11), *De Natura Deorum* in *De Divinatione* (I.iv.7; I.xvii.33; II.lxxii.148), both *De Natura Deorum* and *De Divinatione* in *De Fato* (i.1), and the *Tusculanae Disputationes* in *De Fato* (ii.4). As time went on, Cicero also began referring to his previous philosophical works as a form of shorthand, curtailing fuller treatment of a topic because he had already discussed it at length in an earlier work. So we see references to *De Re Publica* in *De Finibus* (II.xix.60) and *Tusculanae Disputationes* (I.xxii.53), to his *Consolatio*, the lost *Hortensius*, and *De Re Publica* in *Tusculanae Disputationes* (III.xxviii.70; III.iii.6; and IV.i.1 respectively), to *De Natura Deorum*, the not-yet-published *De Fato*, and his *Consolatio* in *De Divinatione* (I.li.117; II.vii.19; II.ix.22), and to the

<sup>75</sup> This makes the loss of most of the *Pro Cornelio* speech a bit of a mystery, since all the other works mentioned here have come down to us in a more complete form.

<sup>76</sup> Clausen (1986:161) does point out that Cicero generally only refers to his mature poetry, possibly as a result of his criticism of the new poets, and regards the Aratus is an anomaly. This view is shared by Gee (2001:523), who adds that 'the act of translation serves as a metaphor for the transfer of knowledge from Greece to Rome' (2001:535), one of Cicero's stated goals in writing philosophy in Latin, which I explore in 3.7 below.

*Academia* and *De Amicitia* in *De Officiis* (II.ii.8; II.ix.31). The effect of all of these would naturally be to encourage those interested in the broader discussions to consult or read the other works mentioned, spreading Cicero's fame as author and promoting his glory in the process.

By the composition of *De Divinatione*, Cicero was very much aware that his philosophical works constituted a programme, as he explains in the preface to part II. He uses the preface not only to mention and summarize most of the theoretical and philosophical works to date<sup>77</sup>, but to explain how these formed a sequential and coherent whole. While it is unlikely that this programme was conceived from the start of *De Re Publica* in 51, this preface is Cicero's attempt to order his own works and suggest a reading programme for his readers. Cicero completes the catalogue by stating that he was hastening to complete the remaining books in the series with much ardour, and that if it had not been for the disorder after Caesar's assassination, there would not be any phase of philosophy which he had failed to elucidate and make readily accessible in the Latin tongue (*ad reliqua alacri tendebamus animo sic parati, ut, nisi quae causa gravior obstitisset, nullum philosophiae locum esse pateremur, qui non Latinis litteris illustrates pateret* – *De Divinatione* II.ii.4). In naming, summarising, and ordering these works, he certainly improved his chances of being read and copied for posterity. It also demonstrates that while Cicero was increasing his fame and promoting his own glory through publication, there was also an element of social responsibility, as Cicero was increasingly functioning within a reciprocal relationship between himself and his growing number of readers, not all of whom were positively disposed towards his efforts.

---

<sup>77</sup> The works, mentioned in order, are *Hortensius*, *Academica*, *Tusculanae Disputationes*, *De Natura Deorum*, *De Divinatione*, *De Re Publica*, *Consolatio*, *De Senectute*, *Cato*, *De Oratore*, *Brutus*, and *Orator*. The omission of the *De Legibus*, *De Optimo Genere Oratorum*, and *De Partitione Oratoria* makes sense because of the generally non-philosophical character of these works, but the absence of the *Paradoxa Stoicorum* and *De Finibus* from this list is perhaps significant.

### 3.4 Publication to reply to his critics

As Cicero continued to publish, he not only elicited criticism but also created continuous opportunities to meet that criticism. While seeking glory<sup>78</sup> remains a primary purpose for publication, we see him engage with his critics<sup>79</sup> by offering reasons that suggest more public-spirited motives for publication as well. In *Academica* (I.ii), the fictional Atticus attempts to steer the conversation away from public affairs (*omitte ista*), since the speakers can ‘neither ask questions nor hear the answers without distress’ (*quae nec percontari nec audire sine molestia possumus*). This constitutes an authentic Ciceronian voice that corresponds to the sentiments expressed in the letters. Though the works composed and published after Caesar’s pardon in 48 include many moments like this, they remain circumspect in light of Cicero’s precarious political position. Just like any politician, Cicero always had his critics, but being debarred from active political life meant that he could no longer deal with them directly through his preferred vehicle of public oratory. As we saw in the matter of the Hirtius pamphlet (cf. section 2, pp.17-18), Cicero now sought more indirect ways of engaging his political opponents, but even these engagements reveal a certain amount of resignation. As Cicero’s attention shifted to his writings, however, we see his engagement with critics change from the political to the literary. Such engagements involve among other things his replies to those who disputed the value of philosophy compared to that of oratory, to those who criticized the study of philosophy in general, and to those who looked down on philosophy in Latin.

In the opening of *Orator* (iii.10), Cicero explains that the ideal orator has never existed, but that an image of him can nevertheless be perceived by the mind, quoting the *ἰδέαι* of Plato. Anticipating the criticism of genre purists and those who believe philosophy to be irrelevant to the study of oratory<sup>80</sup>, he continues:

---

<sup>78</sup> Allen (1954:128-129) explains that it was certainly ‘permissible to speak of personal glories in self-defense’ as this was required to maintain one’s *dignitas* in the rough-and-tumble of Roman politics.

<sup>79</sup> Murphy (1998:501) describes this process not as an act of creation but of *reaction*, explaining that Cicero ‘wrote with an eye to the prejudices of the audience he anticipated, in order to reinforce those prejudices or to overcome them.’

<sup>80</sup> One can imagine someone like Quintus Cornificius being one of these. In *Epistulae ad Familiares* 204.2, writing in September 46 to Cornificius, then acting as *quaestor pro praetore* in Illyricum on behalf of Caesar, Cicero expresses the hope that he will ‘befriend the book’ because he likes it and, if not, for Cicero’s sake (*huic tu libro maxime velim ex animo, si minus, gratiae causa suffragere*). Promoting his work through private channels such as this can be seen as an attempt by Cicero to improve the reception among Caesar’s intimates, with the unspoken hope that Cornificius would argue on Cicero’s behalf with the dictator. Murphy (1998:497) adds that, in sending the work to Cornificius, Cicero was hoping for wider circulation that would include Cornificius’ political and literary friends in Rome.

*ac video hanc primam ingressiōem meam, non ex oratoriis disputationibus ductam sed e media philosophia repetitam et ea quidem cum antiqua tum subobscura, aut reprehensionis aliquid aut certe admirationis habituram. nam aut mirabuntur quid haec pertineant ad ea quae quaerimus – quibus satis faciet res ipsa cognita, ut non sine causa alte repetita videatur – aut reprehendent quod inusitatas vias indagemus, tritas relinquamus. ego autem et me saepe nova videri dicere intellego, cum pervetera dicam sed inaudita plerisque, et fateor me oratorem, si modo sim aut etiam quicumque sim, non ex rhetorum officinis, sed ex Academiae spatiis exstitisse.*

Orator iii.11-12

*I know that this introduction of mine, which does not derive from the discussions on the subject of oratory, but from the heart of philosophy, and an ancient and rather obscure philosophy at that, will arouse criticism, or at least cause astonishment. For readers either will wonder how this can be relevant to our investigation – these will be satisfied when the facts are all laid before them so that it will seem reasonable to go so far back – or will criticize us for leaving the well-trodden paths and hunting for new ones. However, I am aware that I often seem to be making original remarks when what I am saying is very old but generally unknown; and I confess that whatever ability I possess as an orator comes, not from the workshops of the rhetoricians, but from the spacious grounds of the Academy.*

Apart from foreshadowing Cicero's turn to philosophical composition, this pre-emptive rebuttal to criticism is interesting because it reveals what Cicero felt was a general hostility towards philosophy as anything other than the private study of the scholar-gentleman rather than as an aid to public speaking and politics<sup>81</sup>. As a result, this criticism is addressed several times in the various prefaces to the philosophical works. One of the most interesting examples of this kind of rebuttal takes place in *De Finibus*, where Cicero divides his critics into four groups:

---

<sup>81</sup> One example of how Cicero attempts to deal with this antagonism is through the strategy of evasion used by his character Crassus in *De Oratore*, which is explored by Hall (1996:96), who writes that one aim of this strategy is 'to counteract the conventional Roman suspicion of philosophical debate. Since such discourses were regarded as typically Greek, Crassus' reluctance is intended to distinguish him from the more loquacious, tongue-wagging Greekling. There is a certain sleight of hand in all this, of course. Cicero ultimately intends for Crassus to embark in Book 3 upon an extensive and sophisticated analysis of oratorical style, including an emphatic plea for a synthesis of oratory and philosophy. But the character's initial resistance goes some way to disarming the cultural prejudices of the Roman reader.'

*hic noster labor in varias reprehensiones incurreret. nam quibusdam, et iis quidem non admodum indoctis, totum hoc displicet philosophari. quidam autem non tam id reprehendunt si remissius agatur, sed tantum studium tamque multam operam ponendam in eo non arbitrantur. erunt etiam, et hi quidem eruditi Graecis litteris, contemnentes Latinas, qui se dicant in Graecis legendis operam malle consumere. postremo aliquos futuros suspicor qui me ad alias litteras vocent, genus hoc scribendi, etsi sit elegans, personae tamen et dignitatis esse negent. contra quos omnes dicendum breviter existimo.*

*De Finibus I.i.1*

*The following essay is sure to encounter criticism from different quarters. Certain persons, and those not without some pretension to letters, disapprove of the study of philosophy altogether. Others do not so greatly object to it provided it be followed in dilettante fashion; but they do not think it ought to engage so large an amount of one's interest and attention. A third class, learned in Greek literature and contemptuous of Latin, will say that they prefer to spend their time in reading Greek. Lastly, I suspect there will be some who will wish to divert me to other fields of authorship, asserting that this kind of composition, though a graceful recreation, is beneath the dignity of my character and position. To all these objections I suppose I ought to make some brief reply.*

Cicero refers readers to the *Hortensius* for his reply to the first class of critics, namely those who disapprove of philosophy altogether. Although the work is lost, Cicero probably argued that the neglect of philosophy had led to the poor state of public affairs<sup>82</sup>. Excusing himself on the grounds that he does not wish to disappoint Brutus and others whose interest he had aroused (*plura suscepi, veritus ne movere hominum studia viderer, retinere non posse – De Finibus I.i.2*), Cicero goes on to deal with the second class of critics, namely those who believe the study of philosophy to be a mere pastime. Cicero argues that it is unreasonable to expect him to stop halfway in a study that increases in value the further it proceeds (*quam his qui rebus infinitis modum constituent in reque eo meliore quo maior sit mediocritatem desiderent*), even returning criticism by asking that if he enjoys writing, who would be so churlish as to set limits to another man's exertions (*etenim si delectamur cum scribimus, quis est tam invidus qui ab eo nos abducat – De Finibus I.i.3*). Cicero spends the next

<sup>82</sup> See Otto Plasberg (1892) and Michel Ruch (1958) for attempts at reconstruction.

several paragraphs (I.ii.4-iv.10) chastising those who object to philosophy in Latin, drawing attention to the continued service to his country that such activity constitutes, before completing his rebuttal by begging the indulgence of the last group, namely those who do not think that philosophy in itself is important enough and that it does not deserve Cicero's continued careful attention.

The Roman state, up until this point, had a fairly uncomfortable relationship with the discipline of philosophy, periodically banning its teachers from the city. The general objection seems to have been that it was profoundly impractical to matters of state, especially since it encouraged adherents to avoid public life<sup>83</sup>. As a product of Greece, which many conservative Romans considered to be decadent and weak, Greek philosophy also seemed poorly suited to Roman sentiment, hence the criticism from the first two classes identified by Cicero. The third class constituted a subtler problem. There seems to have been a current of intellectual snobbery among the well educated, who preferred their philosophy in the original language. However, the language preference also meant that there would be no unnecessary 'pollution' of Roman public *mores*, since few would have had sufficient command of sophisticated Greek to read or make sense of the originals, thereby rendering the study of philosophy acceptably distinct from Roman political life. This aspect also motivated the fourth category of objectors, who probably felt that Cicero, as a retired consul who had seen an exceptionally busy political life, should not engage in any activity that would be detrimental to his public dignity.

Similar issues are also addressed in *De Natura Deorum* (I.iii.6), where Cicero observes that 'a great deal of talk has been current about the large number of books that I have produced within a short space of time' (*multum autem fluxisse video de libris nostris, quos compluris brevi tempore edidimus*), adding that many were curious 'as to the cause of this sudden outburst of philosophical interest on my part' (*unde hoc philosophandi nobis subito studium extitisset*). Since several schools of philosophy advocate a life of quiet retirement, such curiosity seems apt, given that Cicero's own career was anything but calm and peaceful. He goes on to explain that he was no new convert to the study of philosophy, but had from his earliest youth devoted a lot of energy to its study (*nec mediocrem a primo tempore aetatis in eo studio operam curamque consumpsimus*), adding the philosophical maxims of which his speeches are full and the learned men that frequented his house as additional proofs (*quod et orationes declarant refertae philosophorum sententiis et doctissimorum*

---

<sup>83</sup> One of the principal goals of the introduction to *De Re Publica* was to argue against this assumption. Nicgorski (1991:234-238) explores Cicero's 'loving quarrel' with Plato, which derives from the rejection of the theoretical and speculative nature of the Πολιτεία in favour of something more practical and palatable to Roman readers.

*hominum familiaritates quibus semper domus nostra floruit*). Cicero explains why he had only begun to write and publish philosophy so late in the day, revealing in the process some of his main reasons for publication to serve society, Cicero continues:

*nam cum otio langueremus et is esset rei publicae status ut eam unius consilio atque cura gubernari necesse esset, primum ipsius rei publicae causa philosophiam nostris hominibus explicandam putavi, magni existimans interesse ad decus et ad laudem civitatis res tam gravis tamque praeclaras Latinis etiam litteris contineri; eoque me minus instituti mei paenitet quod facile sentio quam multorum non modo discendi sed etiam scribendi studia commoverim. complures enim Graecis institutionibus eruditi ea quae didicerant cum civibus suis communicare non poterant, quod illa quae a Graecis accepissent Latine dici posse diffiderent: quo in genere tantum profecisse videmur ut a Graecis ne verborum quidem copia vinceremur.*

*De Natura Deorum* I.iv.7–8

*For I was languishing in idle retirement, and the state of public affairs was such that an autocratic form of government had become inevitable. In these circumstances, in the first place I thought that to expound philosophy to my fellow countrymen was actually my duty in the interests of the commonwealth, since in my judgment it would greatly contribute to the honour and glory of the state to have thoughts so important and so lofty enshrined in Latin literature also; and I am the less inclined to repent of my undertaking because I can clearly perceive that a number of my readers have been stimulated not only to study but to become authors themselves. A great many accomplished students of Greek learning were unable to share their acquisitions with their fellow citizens, on the ground that they doubted the possibility of conveying in Latin the teachings they had received from the Greeks. In the matter of style, however, I believe that we have made such progress that even in richness of vocabulary the Greeks do not surpass us.*

These reasons seem to be motivated by what Cicero considered to be the lamentable political situation, believing that philosophy would not only comment on its causes and suggest possible remedies, but that this should be a public conversation in Latin rather than Greek. This line of reasoning is once more addressed at the beginning of Book II of *De Officiis*, but Cicero is far more explicit in connecting his publication activities with his service to the state. The more explicit

political tenor of this preface is not surprising. With Caesar dead and the second *Philippica* recently written, Cicero uses the preface as an opportunity to once more justify his activities as a writer of philosophy:

*atque utinam res publica stetisset, quo coeperat, statu nec in homines non tam commutandarum quam evertendarum rerum cupidos incidisset! primum enim, ut stante re publica facere solebamus, in agendo plus quam in scribendo operae poneremus, deinde ipsis scriptis non ea, quae nunc, sed actiones nostras mandaremus, ut saepe fecimus. cum autem res publica, in qua omnis mea cura, cogitatio, opera poni solebat, nulla esset omnino, illae scilicet litterae conticuerunt forenses et senatoriae. nihil agere autem cum animus non posset, in his studiis ab initio versatus aetatis existimavi honestissime molestias posse deponi, si me ad philosophiam rettulissem. cui cum multum adulescens discendi causa temporis tribuissem, posteaquam honoribus inservire coepi meque totum rei publicae tradidi, tantum erat philosophiae loci, quantum superfuerat amicorum et rei publicae temporibus; id autem omne consumebatur in legendo, scribendi otium non erat.*

*De Officiis* II.1.3-4

*I would that the government had stood fast in the position it had begun to assume and had not fallen into the hands of men who desired not so much to reform as to abolish the constitution. For then, in the first place, I should now be devoting my energies more to public speaking than to writing, as I used to do when the republic stood; and in the second place, I should be committing to written form not these present essays but my public speeches, as I often formerly did. But when the republic, to which all my care and thought and effort used to be devoted, was no more, then, of course, my voice was silenced in the forum and in the senate. And since my mind could not be wholly idle, I thought, as I had been well read along these lines of thought from my early youth, that the most honourable way for me to forget my sorrows would be by turning to philosophy. As a young man, I had devoted a great deal of time to philosophy as a discipline; but after I began to fill the high offices of state and devoted myself heart and soul to the public service, there was only so much time for philosophical studies as was left over from the claims of my friends and of the state; all of this was spent in reading; I had no leisure for writing.*

Although the work is addressed to Cicero's son, the presence of such a public defense in this philosophical work points towards the intention for wider dissemination. While philosophy certainly diverted his sorrow, this can only be considered a reason for composition, not subsequent publication. And while the circumstances of composition help to explain the move away from the more philosophical issues addressed in the other prefaces, the argument is basically the same: he writes philosophy to serve the state.

However, as we saw in letter 414.4 to Atticus, these prefaces were not necessarily composed together with the works to which they were then added. This suggests that they form a parallel engagement with the reading public and critics. While the theoretical and philosophical works were increasingly written as coherent expositions of specific aspects of oratorical and philosophical doctrine, these prefaces deal with matters of reception. As a result, it becomes difficult to determine to what extent their contents really reveal Cicero's true reasons for publication. However, given that they exist, and that the criticisms they address are countered with a fair degree of consistency, we can at least argue that these reasons for composition and publication were the reasons Cicero wanted his reading public to accept. What remains, therefore, is to evaluate these public reasons for composition and publication, and to determine to what extent they serve Cicero's glory, or the state, as proclaimed.

### 3.5 Publication to promote a political agenda

It seems only natural that a politician would use writing and publication to serve the state, especially when debarred from taking an active part in politics<sup>84</sup>. But as we have seen in several of the letters, Cicero considered writing to be a poor replacement for active politics. Ever the pragmatist, however, Cicero writes to Varro in April 46, after Caesar's victory at Thapsus, saying that 'if our services are not required, we must still read and write *Republics*. Like the learned men of old, we must serve the state in our libraries, if we cannot in senate house and forum' (*si nemo utetur opera, tamen et scribere et legere πολιτείας, et, si minus in curia atque in foro, at in litteris et libris, ut doctissimi veteres fecerunt, gnare rem publicam – Epistulae Ad Familiares 177.5*). Therefore, being forced to serve the state by other means resulted in publishing activities where the non-political<sup>85</sup> acquires political purposes<sup>86</sup>. These could include denouncing one's political enemies, offering strategic public compliments to rivals, rehabilitating the political position of oneself or one's friends, creating public records, creating models for political conduct, and generally lamenting the state of public affairs in the hope that shaming would help matters along and improve political actors.

Assailing one's enemies was a primary purpose of politically motivated writing. More than two decades before abandoning active politics, Cicero mentions a very interesting episode in the second *In Verrem* speech (V.xliii.112), concerning a man named Furius of Heraclia. Having denounced Verres, the man was imprisoned and, 'with death looking him in the face, while day and night his mother sat weeping by his side in the prison, he composed a written speech in his own defense; and there is no one in Sicily today who does not possess this speech, and read it, and learn from it,

---

<sup>84</sup> Gurd (2007:50) argues that Cicero's 'dialogues about textual matters played an important role in negotiating, establishing, and maintaining group coherence and identity; in time they became the template and the substance of a renewed republicanism. Revision, in other words, made literature a social concern.'

<sup>85</sup> Here 'non-political' simply refers to the general nature of the theoretical and philosophical works, since they are less overtly political in their content, but this does not imply that these works lacked political motives.

<sup>86</sup> I find Murphy's summary (1998:493) useful here. He explains that Cicero 'took great pains to make his writing and philosophizing, normally understood as characteristic activities of the *otium* of a Roman aristocrat, sound as much as possible like the *negotium* of a statesman, the hard work of advancing the interests of the *res publica*.' Murphy (1998:501) goes on to explain that for Cicero, the 'creative problem of writing was not distinct from the political problem of persuading a specific group of people with certain well-defined opinions.' He also points out that Cicero 'paid careful attention to the politics of his audience not only in disseminating his political speeches, but also with many of his philosophical and rhetorical works, [selecting] his readers ... on the basis of their political connections.' Habinek (1998:108) adds that 'writings that might seem to constitute depersonalized calls to political action and to take advantage of the liberating possibilities of written discourse tend on closer inspection to be instances of popular justice, that is, personal attacks designed to intimidate the aristocratic opponent, to console losers in political competition, or to inflame clients and followers to action. Cicero's Philippics or the anti-Caesarian invectives are examples of such tactics.' The projection of the literary into the political, and the implications for self-fashioning, are taken further by Dugan (2001), although his magisterial treatment focuses only on *Pro Archia* and *In Pisonem*. For an example of the interaction between the political and the philosophical in the speeches, see Stem's (2006) analysis of *Pro Murena*.

Verres, the tale of your crimes and your cruelty' (*verum morte proposita, cum lacrimans in carcere mater noctes diesque assideret, defensionem causae suae scripsit; quam nunc nemo est in Sicilia quin habeat, quin legat, quin tui sceleris et crudelitatis ex illa oratione commonefiat*). Although this is but one minor instance in a veritable catalogue of instances from this speech, and although we should remember that this speech was never delivered by a younger Cicero, at the time even more prone to hyperbole, the instance shows that, even in the provinces, men would put pen to paper to assail their enemies.

However, Cicero's speeches are problematic and it is worth taking a moment to offer some clarification. The various speeches composed by Cicero over the course of a long forensic career make up a large part of his output. However, they are not particularly helpful in determining Cicero's general reasons for publication. In the first place, they date from those times in Cicero's life when he was actively engaged in politics, thus taking the focus away from writing and publication. We also learn in *Brutus* xxiv.<sup>91</sup> that most orations were written after, not for, delivery (*pleraeque enim scribuntur orationes habitae iam, non ut habeantur*), and while Cicero may have taken more than the usual care in his own preparations for public speaking, this comment should disabuse us of any idea that the date of delivery and the date of 'composition' necessarily coincided, let alone the dates of composition and subsequent dissemination. Since the first speech against Verres was such an important triumph for a young barrister, the composition and dissemination of the second speech, clearly too long to be suitable for actual delivery, was an intentional act to celebrate the victory<sup>87</sup>. It was also meant to build political momentum supporting the popularity of an aspiring politician. But for most of the other speeches, we have very little information<sup>88</sup> indicating when they achieved some form of circulation. One may assume that Cicero would have kept notes on his cases and would have polished the speeches subsequently, but this is no indication that he intended for his speeches to be widely circulated shortly after composition or delivery. Since my conclusions mostly draw on the timing and circumstances of publication, this makes the speeches less helpful in determining Cicero's general reasons for publication.

---

<sup>87</sup> The most thorough exploration of Cicero's reasons for writing and disseminating this speech is made by Frazel (2004), who comes to the same conclusion as I do, namely that the younger Cicero published and disseminated to promote his glory. Gurd (2010:83) adds that the publication was meant to counter Verres' erasures by confronting them with a 'contradictory but more credible memory, which Cicero seeks to characterize as public and communal. Cicero insists that this public memory does more than preserve the truth of what actually happened; it is, more importantly, an act whose narration consolidates a projected community.' For Cicero's use of publication to create a record that determines public memory, see pp.63-65 below.

<sup>88</sup> As we have seen, the mentioning of specific speeches in theoretical discussions indicates that, by the time of the composition of the latter work, some form of dissemination of the former had been achieved.

In fact, the discussion in the *Brutus*, from which the quote above comes, focuses on reasons why many orators preferred not to publish. These include not wanting to add a task at home to their exertions in the forum (*ne domesticus etiam labor accederet ad forensem*), not caring to improve their style (*ut meliores fiant*), and not craving a memorial of their skill for posterity (*memoriam autem in posterum ingeni sui non desiderant – Brutus xxiv.92*). The very existence of Cicero's written speeches indicate that he was averse to neither additional work, improvement, nor renown, but since each speech was delivered in very specific circumstances, and since we have no way of knowing the date for circulation of most of these, it becomes impossible to determine whether subsequent publishing aimed at any specific political purpose. Bearing in mind that Cicero generally published to enhance his credit<sup>89</sup>, however, the best we can postulate is that the existence of a written version of a speech indicates that Cicero was happy with its contents being read by a broader public, perhaps even indicating a victory<sup>90</sup>, as Cicero was hardly likely to celebrate failure.

While denunciation would be easy in political speeches, especially in those subsequently published and circulated, being forced from politics on the other hand would result in denunciation that required greater subtlety – and was achieved with greater difficulty – in non-political works. Cicero attempts to deal with this issue for the first time in a series of letters to Atticus, written in April 59. Having temporarily abandoned politics after refusing Caesar's offer to join the first triumvirate, we see Cicero casting around for things to do with his enforced leisure, mentioning that he would happily amuse himself with the Muses and neither envies Crassus nor regrets that he had remained true to himself (*interea quidem cum Musis nos delectabimus animo aequo, immo vero etiam gaudenti ac libenti, neque mihi umquam veniet in mentem Crasso invidere neque paenitere quod a me ipso non desciverim – Ad Atticum 24.2*). One of the first projects suggested by Atticus was a work on geography, about which Cicero seems lukewarm, saying that he promises nothing and that it is a lot of work (*sed nihil certi polliceor. magnum opus est – Ad Atticum 24.3*). Cicero embraces literary work more enthusiastically in the next letter, writing that he wishes to 'put all political matters aside and concentrate my whole time and energy on study. Yes, that is what I intend. I wish I had done so from the first. Now, having discovered by experience the emptiness of the things I prized most highly, I mean to concern myself with all the Muses' (*quae cupio deponere et toto animo atque omni cura φιλοσοφείν. sic, inquam, in animo est; vellem ab initio, nunc vero, quoniam quae putavi esse praeclara expertus sum quam essent inania, cum omnibus Musis rationem habere cogito – Ad*

<sup>89</sup> Phillips (1986:236) agrees, adding that Cicero was compelled, from time to time, to hold something back due to political circumstances. This was certainly true of *Philippica Secunda*, but could also help explain the limited circulation and loss of *De Gloria*.

<sup>90</sup> This view is followed by Melchior (2008:283), who also references Crawford (1984:15).

*Atticum* 25.2). However, this complete change of heart should not be taken too seriously, as there are several indications in these letters that Cicero still hoped to resume some political role.

These letters, written from Antium, are full of enquiries about politics in Rome, showing that old habits died hard and suggesting that Cicero had no serious intention yet of completely abandoning politics for writing. But a work on geography would hardly have been a suitable vehicle for denouncing political enemies or promoting a political agenda in temporary retirement, so we see Cicero despairing of the project in the next letter, writing that he feels ‘a downright repugnance for writing’ and repeating that the geography is a very big undertaking (*a scribendo prorsus abhorret animus. etenim γεωγραφικὰ quae constitueram magnum opus est – Ad Atticum* 26.1), concluding sardonically that he may as well ‘write anecdotes, which I shall read to nobody but you, in the vein of Theopompus or a lot more savage even. And my sole form of political activity now is to hate the rascals’ (*itaque ἀνέκδοτα a nobis, quae tibi uni legamus, Theopompio genere aut etiam asperiore multo pangentur. neque aliud iam quicquam πολιτεύομαι nisi odisse improbos – Ad Atticum* 26.2). Even when Atticus requests copies of two unknown speeches, we are left with a tantalizing lacuna for the one, and for the other, we only have Cicero’s excuse that he did not care to write it down because he did not want to praise a man whom he did not like (*orationes autem me duas postulas; quarum alteram non libebat mihi scribere \* \* \* alteram ne laudarem eum quem non amabam – Ad Atticum* 27.1). This is a significant insight, as it helps us to understand that those speeches that were published and circulated by Cicero probably accorded with his political goals at the time of publication.

By the time of the composition of the *Academica* thirteen years later, however, we see Cicero a lot more comfortable with assailing his political foes in non-political works. As a result of his precarious position after the war, these continue to be circumspect, because an insult to an individual could easily be considered an insult to the whole family in the tangled web that was the Roman nobility. So, for example, we see that, even with his archenemy Clodius<sup>91</sup> long dead, Cicero places the insult in the playful mouth of his character Catulus:

*illud vero non censuerim ut eius auctoritate moveare, tantum enim te non modo monuit,"*  
*inquit adridens, "ut caveres ne quis improbus tribunus plebis, quorum vides quanta copia*  
*semper futura sit, arriperet te et in contione quaereret..."*

<sup>91</sup> This does not mean that Cicero did not take the opportunity to assail Clodius when the opportunity arose. There is every indication, as discussed by Melchior (2008:286), that the rewritten version of *Pro Milone* added the argument justifying Clodius’ murder as a public good. This would certainly fit Cicero’s political goal of determining the public record of events, as well as an opportunity and excuse to savage his opponent in defense of his client.

*“But I should not advise your letting [Lucullus’s] authority influence you; for he all but warned you just now,” he said with a smile at me, “to be on your guard lest some wicked tribune of the people – and what a plentiful supply there will always be of them you are well aware – should arraign you, and cross-examine you in public assembly...”*

Of course, such indirectness<sup>92</sup> could also be motivated by Cicero’s relative political position. A fascinating example of this can be seen by comparing two references relating to Caesar, both from works written in 44, but one written before the assassination and one after. In *De Divinatione*, with Caesar at the height of his power<sup>93</sup>, we see Cicero at his most indirect, as he lets the character of his brother quote from his poem *De Consulatu Suo*:

*tum quis non artis scripta ac monumenta volutans  
voces tristificas chartis promebat Etruscis?  
omnes civili generosa stirpe profectam  
vitare ingentem cladem pestemque monebant,  
vel legum exitium constanti voce ferebant,  
templa deumque adeo flammis urbemque iubebant,  
eripere et stragem horribilem caedemque vereri;*

*De Divinatione I.xii.20*

*Then what diviner, in turning the records and tomes of the augurs,  
Failed to relate the mournful forecasts the Etruscans had written?  
Seers all advised to beware the monstrous destruction and slaughter,  
Plotted by Romans who traced their descent from a noble ancestry;  
Or they proclaimed the law’s overthrow with voices insistent,*

<sup>92</sup> For a useful summary of the various rhetorical strategies aiming at indirect criticism, see Dyer (1990:26-30).

<sup>93</sup> It is worth noting the issues concerning date of composition as brought up by Falconer (1923) in his footnote on p. 214 of Volume XX in the Loeb edition. He states that “René Durand in ‘La Date du *De divinatione*,’ *Mélanges Boissier*, takes the view (now generally accepted) that this work was wholly written (except for some interpolations and changes) prior to Caesar’s death, and after that event revised and published. The translator, after a careful study of all the evidence bearing on the question, is unable to accept M. Durand’s view, and feels convinced that the latter part of Book I and all of Book II were written after March 15, 44.” I would add that, while this section occurs early in the work and is therefore not a point of contention, and while the poem itself was written much earlier, its inclusion and indirectness, with the concomitant implications for interpretation, place the composition of this section firmly before the assassination.

*Bidding us rescue the city from flames, and the deities' temples;  
Fearful they bade us become of horrible chaos and carnage;*

Although the *civili generosa stirpe* originally referred to Catiline, the repurposing of the line in this work allows Cicero to denounce Caesar while maintaining plausible deniability. However, by the time of the composition of the *Topica* in July 44<sup>94</sup>, Caesar's death had rendered a circumspect tone quite unnecessary, allowing Cicero to denounce Caesar openly by illustrating an example with 'arguments used brazenly by Caesar against my dear Cato' (*quibus omnibus generibus usus est nimis impudenter Caesar contra Catonem meum – Topica xxv.94*).

Of course, criticizing and denouncing political enemies directly or indirectly was not the only method by which a political agenda could be advanced through writing and publication. Sometimes, political expediency required extending guarded praise or literary compliments to one's political adversaries. We have already seen how Cicero's brother encouraged him to write works complimentary to Caesar. However, we also see Caesar complimented in *Brutus* (lxxi.248-lxxiii.255). After the fictional Brutus badgers Cicero for an opinion on living orators, something which Cicero professes to avoid, he allows the fictional Atticus to praise Caesar, saying that 'of all our orators, he is the purest user of the Latin tongue' (*illum omnium fere oratorum Latine loqui elegantissime*). While this may seem like a slightly backhanded compliment, it is in clear reference to Caesar's work *De Analogia*, mentioned in the next paragraph. This work, on correct Latin usage, was dedicated to Cicero, showing an attempt on the part of Caesar to advance his own political agenda through complimentary writing. Cicero acknowledges and returns the compliment here, presumably to thank Caesar for pardoning him after siding with Pompey.

There are also examples where Cicero uses his philosophical publishing activity to rehabilitate himself and his friends. In *Brutus* xlii.156, we see Cicero use a discussion of the competitive relationship between equally matched orators to make a case for his friend, Servius Sulpicius Rufus, who at this point was still in exile at Samos, following Pompey's defeat. After extending a compliment to both Cicero and Sulpicius, the character of Brutus goes on to lament that he 'cannot but grieve therefore that the Roman people have so long been deprived of [Sulpicius'] counsel and of

---

<sup>94</sup> See *Epistulae ad Familiares* 334, in which Cicero even provides reading instructions to Trebatius, to whom the work was dedicated. These include the observation that 'no technical subject can be acquired by reading, without an interpreter and a certain amount of practice' (*cogitare debetis nullam artem litteris sine interprete et sine aliqua exercitatione percipi posse*).

[Cicero's] voice – a thing to deplore in itself, and much more when one considers into what hands those functions I will not say have been transferred, but somehow or other have merely drifted' (*itaque doleo et illius consilio et tua voce populum Romanum carere tam diu; quod cum per se dolendum est tum multo magis consideranti ad quos ista non tralata sint, sed nescio quo pacto devenerint*). Cicero's purpose here is clear: to persuade Caesar, on the authority of a Brutus, with the added public pressure caused by dissemination of a work named *Brutus*, to pardon his friend, something which subsequently occurred, although we must assume that a piece of 'fiction' probably only played a minor role in such a decision. We also see Cicero using the character of Brutus here as a persona to express an otherwise dangerous opinion.

Another important aspect to consider is the creation of public records that resulted from Cicero's publishing activity. We have already seen how Cicero admonishes his brother to take special care in official correspondence, since this could easily become public record. But just as literature could exist in multiple versions, so we see the same difficulty with official record-keeping. We find an example of the process described in *Pro Sulla*. Answering the charge by the prosecution that Cicero had falsified records concerning Catiline's conspiracy<sup>95</sup>, Cicero argues that unless he had attested in the official records the authenticity of the information while memory of it was still fresh in the Senate, someone ... might say that the information was inaccurate (*vidi ego hoc, iudices, nisi recenti memoria senatus auctoritatem huius indicis monumentis publicis testatus essem, fore ... aliter indicata haec esse diceret* – *Pro Sulla* 41). He then goes on to praise the integrity of the men who took down the information. What follows next, though, is the best information we have for how Cicero disseminated to promote his political agenda:

*quid? deinde quid feci? cum scirem ita esse indicium relatum in tabulas publicas ut illae tabulae privata tamen custodia more maiorum continerentur, non occultavi, non continui domi, sed statim describi ab omnibus librariis, dividi passim et pervolgari atque edi populo Romano imperavi. divisi tota Italia emisi in omnis provincias; eius indicis ex quo oblata salus esset omnibus expertem esse neminem volui. itaque dico locum in orbe terrarum esse nullum, quo in loco populi Romani nomen sit, quin eodem perscriptum hoc*

---

<sup>95</sup> Habinek (1998:103), in discussing the performance aspect in Cicero's works, points out that Cicero 'knew the value of preserving the performance occasion through the written word; indeed, years after his successful expulsion of Catiline he was to regret his delay in publishing and circulating the written text of his orations. If circulating a written text, as opposed to delivering an oral performance, increases an author's renown by extending it in both space and time, it also runs the risk of disconnecting an author from his text and undercutting the importance of personal presence.' I would add that the regret also stemmed from a lost opportunity to determine the public record while the memory of the event was fresh in everyone's minds.

*indiciū pervenerit ... primum ne quis posset tantum aut de rei publicae aut de alicuius periculo meminisse quantum vellet; deinde ne cui liceret umquam reprehendere illud indicium aut temere creditum criminari; postremo ne quid iam a me, ne quid ex meis commentariis quaereretur, ne aut oblivio mea aut memoria nimia videretur...*

*Pro Sulla 42–44*

*Well, what did I do next? Since I knew that the information had been entered in the public records, but that they would be retained, as was the traditional practice, in the safekeeping of individuals, I did not conceal it or retain it at home, but immediately ordered it to be copied by all the clerks, distributed everywhere and given full publicity and made known to the Roman people. I broadcast it throughout Italy and dispatched it to all the provinces. I did not want anyone to be ignorant of the information which had been responsible for the salvation of us all. I say, therefore, that there is no place in the whole world where the name of the Roman people is known that has not received a copy of this information ... My purpose was, firstly, to stop anyone being able to remember only what suited him about the danger to the State or to any individual; secondly, to prevent anyone ever being allowed to discredit that information or complain that it was too readily accepted; and finally, to stop an investigation depending any longer upon myself or upon my private notes, any semblance on my part of remembering or forgetting too much...*

What makes this extract particularly fascinating is that public information was often stored<sup>96</sup> by individuals, which would naturally encourage falsification or alteration – a charge that Cicero hoped to avoid here. In an effort to maintain his reputation for probity, Cicero made sure in his subsequent action to avoid such censure through wide dissemination. In fact, such wide dissemination was likely to determine what the public record would end up being and would also therefore be more likely to survive the ages. This idea is expressed in *Pro Sestio* (lxi.120), where Cicero mentions that a decree in his favour had been delivered by Pompey from writing (*de scripto sententiae dicta mihi uni testimonium patriae conservatae dedit*), and that the fact that he had saved the state was committed to public records for the eternal remembrance of future ages (*idque ipsum tabulis publicis mandaretur ad memoriam posterī temporis sempiternam*). The *de scripto* is significant here, as it shows Cicero's

<sup>96</sup> For more on Republican archival practices and documents, especially concerning the 'premodern mindset unconcerned with careful representation of originals or master copies', see Culham (1989 & 1991).

preference for being praised in writing, rather than extempore. We also see Cicero complain in *Pro Sulla* 26 that he was not even being given time to ‘record and recollect even those measures which I took for the general safety’ (*quae pro salute omnium gessi recordanda et cogitanda quicquam relinquitur temporis*). The gerundives alone reveal his preference for a written record to immortalize his achievements. One can easily imagine the actions Cicero took in this case, to determine the public record, teaching him some valuable lessons on publication and dissemination – lessons which would have informed his later publishing activity.

Non-political composition and publication could also serve as an opportunity to create models of ‘correct’ political conduct, for the emulation of readers, and to undermine misconduct. We already see this connection explored in *Pro Archia*, where Cicero writes:

*sed pleni sunt omnes libri, plenae sapientium voces, plena exemplorum vetustas: quae iacerent in tenebris omnia, nisi litterarum lumen accederet. quam multas nobis imagines non solum ad intuendum, verum etiam ad imitandum fortissimorum virorum expressas scriptores et Graeci et Latini reliquerunt, quas ego mihi semper in administranda re publica proponens animum et mentem meam ipsa cogitatione hominum excellentium conformabam.*

*Pro Archia* vi.14

*All literature, all philosophy, all history, abounds with incentives to noble action, incentives which would be buried in black darkness were the light of the written word not flashed upon them. How many pictures of high endeavour the great authors of Greece and Rome have drawn for our use, and bequeathed to us, not only for our contemplation, but for our emulation! These I have held ever before my vision throughout my public career, and have guided the workings of my brain and my soul by meditating upon patterns of excellence.*

The implication of this line of reasoning is that the study of literature, in its broadest sense, was part of a political training. Even a cursory glance at Cicero’s philosophical and theoretical works reveals that they are populated with the kinds of historical exempla<sup>97</sup> that Cicero admired as patterns of

---

<sup>97</sup> D’Arms (1972:83) points out the importance of historical *exempla* in ancient rhetorical theory and explores their use in *Pro Murena*. Cicero’s long forensic career would have suggested a similar use in the theoretical works, in which case the

excellence. We can assume, therefore, that constant references to a Scipio Africanus were purposeful<sup>98</sup>, if not to reform the rascals mentioned above, then at least to point out how far they fell short. Cicero even uses composition and publication as an attempt to undermine political misconduct. So, for example, we see Cicero demolish the use of dreams as a form of divination, writing that he thought he was doing a great service to himself and his countrymen if he could tear this superstition up by the roots (*multum enim et nobismet ipsis et nostris profuturi videbamus, si eam funditus sustulissemus* – *De Divinatione* II.lxxii.148), as it could be abused so easily.

Finally, Cicero uses his non-political composition and publication to lament the state of public affairs. This happens so frequently that a few examples will suffice as illustration. These take on a variety of forms. We see examples of throwaway comments, as in *De Partitione Oratoria* (xxviii.98), where the character of Cicero's son Marcus asks for the arguments appropriate to a court of law, since that 'is the only kind of oratory we have left' (*idque nobis genus restare unum puto*). We see examples of wishful thinking, as in *De Fato* (i.2), where the characters of Hirtius and Cicero meet at his villa in Puteoli to discuss 'a line of policy that might lead to peace and concord in the state. For since the death of Caesar it seemed as if a search was being made for every possible means of causing fresh upheavals, and we thought that resistance must be offered to these tendencies' (*maxime nos quidem exquirentes ea consilia quae ad pacem et ad concordiam civium pertinerent. cum enim omnes post interitum Caesaris novarum perturbationum causae quaeri viderentur, eisque esse occurrendum putaremus*). We also find examples of resignation, as in *De Officiis* (III.i.3), where Cicero intends to 'shun the miscreants, with whom the world abounds' (*nunc fugientes conspectum sceleratorum, quibus omnia redundant*), comparing himself with Africanus, in that he intends to turn his leisure to account. While this publishing activity and the political purposes that motivated it certainly aimed at serving the commonwealth, we should remember that, in trying to remind his readers of his own services to the state, by comparing his political conduct to famous Romans, and by deliberate attempts to create a public record of his political achievements and opinions, Cicero was also aiming at promoting his own personal glory for posterity.

---

use of famous persons of good repute would have served to 'persuade' a 'jury' of potentially skeptical readers or listeners concerning the ideas and opinions expressed by these historical figures (meaning Cicero) in these works.

<sup>98</sup> Barlow (1987:353) argues that Cicero 'presents Scipio as the ideal moderator *rei publicae*, a statesman who is capable of teaching legislators. Scipio instructs the young men of his circle in the art of preserving good laws and changing bad laws for the better. The crucial stage in the young men's education is to recover the philosophic treatment of politics.' This helps us to understand the philosophical context in *De Re Publica*. Zetzel (1972:173) explores the idea of the Scipionic circle, but reminds us that, for Cicero, the 'choice of speakers and background for his dialogues was a matter of literary artifice, not of historical reconstruction.'

### 3.6 Publication to educate society

It is beguiling to think that the act of publishing anything for the purpose of educating others is a noble and selfless act, tending not so much to the glory of the writer as to the benefit of the state in general. However, as with most publishing activity after 56, personal honor remains a focus even here. We often see Cicero's ambivalence towards teaching and the dubious glory attached to the profession. At the same time, as an educator in oratory and philosophy, Cicero felt that he was more qualified than most<sup>99</sup>. We see him publishing to help his family and friends, as well as to indulge the educational requests of others. We also see him publishing to improve the morals of young men and thereby the state, as well as boasting that his writing includes material bringing topics, never before written about in Latin, out of obscurity. But all of these seem to have some benefit to Cicero's personal glory as well.

On or about the Ides of June, 51 BCE, a youngish man of equestrian stock, Caelius Rufus, wrote a charming letter to Cicero, then serving as proconsul in Cilicia. Apart from complaining that he should have spent more time in Cicero's delightful company, that Rome now seemed like a desert with Cicero absent, and speculating about his chances of being elected aedile in the next election, he makes an interesting request of someone then prosecuting a minor war in Asia Minor:

*illud nunc a te peto, si eris, ut spero, otiosus, aliquid ad nos, ut intellegamus nos tibi curae esse, σύνταγμα conscribas. qui tibi istuc inquis in mentem venit, homini non inepto? cupio aliquod ex tam multis tuis monumentis exstare quod nostrae amicitiae memoriam posteris quoque prodat.*

*Epistulae ad Familiares 79.3*

*Now I have a favour to ask. If you are going to have time on your hands, as I expect you will, won't you write a tract on something or other and dedicate it to me, as a token of your regard? You may ask what put that into my tolerably sensible head. Well, I have a desire that among the many works that will keep your name alive there should be one that will hand down to posterity the memory of our friendship.*

---

<sup>99</sup> For a useful summary of Cicero's own philosophical training and influences, see Ochs (1989:218).

Caelius may have been pleased to know that, apart from sharing a *praenomen* with the great orator, not to mention a certain lack of regard for an amenable lady named Clodia, the memory of their friendship would indeed survive the ages, both in the defense speech Cicero made on his behalf and in the several letters<sup>100</sup> that have come down to us<sup>101</sup>. However, this request was probably not unexpected to Cicero. Shortly after successfully defending Caelius in 56, Cicero published his work *De Oratore* in 55, the first literary fruit plucked from the tree of his forced retirement from politics. With many speeches already in circulation, the runaway success of this work in particular, and rumours that Cicero had begun work on his monumental treatise *De Re Publica*, his friends can perhaps be excused for jockeying for position to ride his literary coat-tails into posterity.

After shamelessly flattering Cicero, a man not insensible to flattery, for his command of ‘the whole range of knowledge’ (*qui omnem nosti disciplinam*), Caelius continues that it should be something of relevance to him, with a didactic character so as to have a steady circulation (*genere tamen quod et ad nos pertineat et διδασκαλίαν quondam, ut versetur inter manus, habeat*). The *διδασκαλίαν quondam ut versetur* is particularly illuminating, as it reveals that publishing to educate was most certainly not the disinterested activity it seems, but could become yet another pathway to glory. But while the theoretical and philosophical works certainly fall within the ‘didactic’ field, Cicero was not particularly interested in assuming a new role as *professor populo*<sup>102</sup>, because of the dubious honour, if any, derived from teaching. Nevertheless, since didactic works were likely to be widely circulated and read, writing them – and being *in* them, as Caelius suggests – constituted an almost guaranteed path to immortality.

While trying to avoid the title of teacher, we nevertheless see Cicero spend several paragraphs in *Orator* justifying the teaching of oratory. He begins by asking that if he were to profess that he would instruct students in oratory, and explain to them the roads which lead to eloquence – if such a thing were possible – what reasonable critic could find fault with him (*sed si profitear – quod utinam possem! – me studiosis dicendi praecepta et quasi vias quae ad eloquentiam ferrent traditurum, quis tandem id iustus rerum existimator reprehenderet – Orator xli.141*)? The *quod utinam possem* seems to function as a way for Cicero to disavow any teaching activity, but he then follows this by asking why it had always been honorable to teach civil law ... while a man would be severely criticized if he

<sup>100</sup> *Epistulae ad Familiares* 77; 78; 80; 81; 82; 83; 84; 85; 86; 87; 88; 89; 90; 91; 92; 93; 94; 95; 96; 97; 98; 149; 153; 154; and 156.

<sup>101</sup> Although he may have been less pleased that his body odour would be similarly immortalized by Catullus, if he is indeed the Rufus in those poems.

<sup>102</sup> Kenney (1982:10) reminds us that, whatever reasons Cicero may give concerning his educational services to the state, his writings served ‘the relatively small cultural élite in which high culture flourished’.

trained young men in oratory (*cur igitur ius civile docere semper pulchrum fuit ... ad dicendum si quis acuatur aut adiuvet in eo iuventutem, vituperetur*). He then asks why it is not glorious to teach that which it is most excellent to know (*aut quod nosse pulcherrimum est id non gloriosum est docere – Orator xli.142*).

However, the tone remains defensive throughout, suggesting that Cicero, together with his senatorial colleagues, probably considered teaching to be beneath his dignity. As if to defend himself against possible censure, Cicero goes on to explain that orators cannot impart their skills in the same way as juriconsults, since their hours at home are spent in studying and preparing cases, their time in the forum is devoted to pleading, all the rest of their day is given to recruiting their strength; hence what time was left for training or teaching (*alteri cum domesticum tempus in cognoscendis componendisque causis, forense in agendis, relicum in sese ipsis reficiendis omne consumerent: quem habebant instituendi aut docendi locum – Orator xlii.143*)? This is followed by anticipating both a question and possible critique from Brutus, to whom the work is addressed – although the character is simply being used as a mouthpiece to express the possible criticism. This gives Cicero an opportunity to both demolish the criticism and to explain why the activity of publishing on oratory adds to his honour:

*“at dignitatem docere non habet.” certe, si quasi in ludo; sed si monendo, si cohortando, si percontando, si communicando, si interdum etiam una legendo, audiendo, nescio cur non docendo etiam aliquid aliquando si possis meliores facere, cur nolis. an quibus verbis sacrorum alienatio fiat docere honestum est, a quibus ipsa sacra retineri defendique possint non honestum est?*

*Orator xlii.144*

*“But,” you will say, “there is no distinction in teaching.” Of course not, if you teach like a schoolmaster; but if by advice, by exhortation, by inquiry, by sharing your knowledge, if at times even by reading aloud to them or listening to their reading, if you could really improve men by some teaching of this sort, I cannot understand why you should decline to do so. Surely it is honourable to teach the formula for surrendering one’s rights; is it not equally honourable to teach the means of retaining and defending these rights?*

Even though it seems that Cicero is making a strong case for teaching oratory, adding once again that, since it is such a great and glorious art, it cannot be a disgrace to teach others what is highly honourable to learn for oneself (*in magna arte et gloriosa turpe esse docere alios id quod ipsi fuerit honestissimum discere* – *Orator* xlii.145), the section nevertheless concludes with the opinion that there is more glory in using these oratorical rules than in teaching them (*necessaria tamen fiunt magnificentius quam docentur* – *Orator* xliii.147). This did not, of course, stop Cicero from writing didactic works. In fact, he often gets around the problem by writing that, as a follower of the New Academy, he is under no obligation to say what is true, but only to say what seems most likely to be true, since the truth lies in obscurity (*sed ne in maximis quidem rebus quicquam adhuc inveni firmissimum, quod tenerem aut quo iudicium meum dirigerem, quam id quodcumque mihi quam simillimum veri videretur, cum ipsum illud verum tamen in occulto lateret* – *Orator* lxxi.237), thereby changing the more typical ‘recommendations’ of teaching to the disinterested observations of an elder statesman.

In this way, Cicero explains to Brutus in *De Finibus* (III.ii.6) that he avoids censure, as he does not approach the task as instructor (*quod si facerem quasi te erudiens, iure reprehenderer*), since it is unnecessary to teach what Brutus knows extremely well already (*neque ut ea cognoscas quae tibi notissima sunt ad te mitto*). But Cicero also expresses the general duty to teach in *De Natura Deorum* (II.lviii.148), where the character of Balbus praises the faculty of speech, saying that it enables men both to learn things they do not know and to teach the things they do know to others (*quae primum efficit ut et ea quae ignoramus discere et ea quae scimus alios docere possimus*), although this opinion, expressed in more general terms, could only apply broadly to the decision to publish didactic works. We are on firmer ground in the *Disputationes Tusculanae* (I.iii.6), where Cicero explains that he has exerted himself more actively, because of some poorly written philosophical books in Latin that were in circulation, continuing:

*sed mandare quemquam litteris cogitationes suas, qui eas nec disponere nec illustrare possit nec delectatione aliqua adlicere lectorem, hominis est intemperanter abutentis et otio et litteris. itaque suos libros ipsi legunt cum suis, nec quisquam attingit praeter eos, qui eandem licentiam scribendi sibi permitti volunt. quare si aliquid oratoriae laudis nostra attulimus industria, multo studiosius philosophiae fontis aperiemus ...*

*Tusculanae Disputationes* I.iii.6

*To commit one's reflections to writing, without being able to arrange or express them clearly or attract the reader by some sort of charm, indicates a man who makes an unpardonable misuse of leisure and his pen. The result is that such writers read their own books themselves along with their own circle, and none of them reaches any wider public than that which wishes to have the same privilege of scribbling extended to itself. For this reason, if by my assiduity I have won for our countrymen some measure of oratorical renown, I shall with far greater enthusiasm lay bare the springs of philosophy ...*

This is interesting, as it not only gives Cicero an opportunity to praise his own oratory and draw a useful comparison between his oratorical and philosophical (i.e. educational) efforts on behalf of the state, but it also suggests that he considered himself uniquely qualified to bring Greek philosophy to a broader public. We see this idea maintained until the last philosophical work, where Cicero explains to his son that, by reading his philosophical writings, he would render his mastery of the Latin language complete (*orationem autem Latinam efficies profecto legendis nostris plenior*), going on to say that he is not saying this boastfully (*nec vero hoc arroganter dictum existimari velim*), for while he may yield precedence to many in their knowledge of philosophy, he lays claim to the orator's peculiar ability to speak with propriety, clearness, and elegance, thinking his claim – as superior expounder of philosophy in Latin – to be justified, as he had spent his life in that profession (*nam philosophandi scientiam concedens multis, quod est oratoris proprium, apte, distincte, ornate dicere, quoniam in eo studio aetatem consumpsi, si id mihi assumo, videor id meo iure quodam modo vindicare – De Officiis I.i.2*).

That the publication of the philosophical works includes didactic motivation becomes clear when we compare the first and the last of these works with each other. Cicero addresses the *Paradoxa Stoicorum* (and several other works) to Brutus, giving as his reasons for doing so that he has amused himself by throwing into common form, for Brutus' benefit, some doctrines that even the Stoics themselves found difficult to prove. This included even those doctrines which the Stoics scarcely succeeded in proving under optimal conditions, namely in the retirement of the schools of philosophy (*ego tibi illa ipsa quae vix in gymnasiis et in otio Stoici probant ludens conieci in communes locos – Paradoxa Stoicorum 3*). While Cicero attempts to make light of his effort with the *ludens* and *conieci*, the *tibi* and *communes locos* reveal that the work had a didactic purpose beyond mere entertainment for the author.

A similar educative sentiment is expressed in the last philosophical work, *De Officiis*, addressed to his son. In this work, Cicero encourages the young man, then studying philosophy in Athens, to read carefully not only his orations but also his books on philosophy, which were now as extensive (*ut non solum orationes meas, sed hos etiam de philosophia libros, qui iam illis fere se aequarunt, studiose legas* – *De Officiis* I.i.3). In addition, the reasons Cicero gives for the need to study this final work is that the subject of moral duties has the widest practical application (*latissime patere videntur ea, quae de officiis tradita ab illis et praecepta sunt* – *De Officiis* I.ii.4), and that he wished for his son, being schooled at the time in the Old Academy by Crattipus, also to be acquainted with the New Academy to which Cicero adhered (*qui ista praeclara pepererunt, tamen haec nostra finitima vestris ignota esse nolui* – *De Officiis* II.ii.8). The focus on the practical seems an overt attempt by Cicero to undermine any ongoing criticism for his continuing focus on philosophical composition and publication.

Going even further back than the *Paradoxa Stoicorum* to the first mature theoretical work, *De Oratore*, we see the publication of the work fulfilling a didactic function, even if not originally intended. In a long letter, written in December 54 to Lentulus Spinther, Cicero thanks the general fulsomely for championing his restoration from exile and explains his recent conduct in defending Vatinius and his own changed relationship with Caesar. Towards the end of the letter, in reply to a request, Cicero writes:

*quod rogas ut mea tibi scripta mittam quae post discessum tuum scripserim, sunt orationes quaedam, quas Menocrito dabo, neque ita multae, ne pertimescas. scripsi etiam (nam me iam ab orationibus diiungo fere referoque ad mansuetiores Musas, quae me maxime sicut iam a prima adulescentia delectarunt) – scripsi igitur Aristotelio more, quem ad modum quidem volui, tris libros in disputatione ac dialogo De Oratore, quos arbitror Lentulo tuo fore non inutilis.*

*Epistulae Ad Familiares* 20.23

*You ask me to send you the products of my pen since you left Rome. There are some speeches, which I shall give to Menocritus – don't be alarmed, there are not very many of them! I have also composed – I am now tending to get away from oratory and go back to the gentler Muses who please me best, as they always have from my youth – composed, as I was saying, three volumes in the form of an argument and dialogue On the Orator, in*

*the manner (so at least I intended) of Aristotle. I think your son will find them of some use.*

While *De Oratore* was not dedicated to Lentulus but to Cicero's brother, and while Cicero was sending the works at Lentulus' request, the inclusion of the larger theoretical work, as well as drawing attention to it through an explanation of its contents and reason for its composition, allows us to see in the *Lentulo tuo fore non inutilis* the realization by Cicero that works such as these would not only show his gratitude, but also benefit the education of children of his friends and patrons.

Apart from benefiting his own family and friends through his publishing activity, we also see these educational benefits extending into broader society, beginning with Cicero's willingness to meet the requests of others. Cicero rejoices in being able to share his knowledge of oratory in a volume he jokingly says is being 'extorted' by Brutus (*tuum studium hoc a me volumen expressit – Orator* xliii.147). Brutus is also playfully blamed in the *Disputationes Tusculanae*, where Cicero writes that he intends to 'send this second set of five books'<sup>103</sup> to my friend Brutus by whom I was not only pressed to write on philosophical subjects, but provoked to do so as well (*ad Brutumque nostrum hos libros alteros quinque mitemus, a quo non modo impulsus sumus ad philosophiae scriptiones, verum etiam lacessiti – Tusculanae Disputationes* V.xli.121). A similar request by Trebatius results in the composition and subsequent publication of the *Topica*.

We even see the didactic possibilities of publication and meeting didactically motivated requests as early as 60 when, in letter 21.3 to Atticus, Cicero writes that he will 'send my little speeches, both those you ask for and some more besides, since it appears that you too find pleasure in these performances which the enthusiasm of my young admirers prompts me to put on paper' (*oratiunculas autem et quas postulas et plures etiam mittam, quoniam quidem ea quae nos scribimus adolescentulorum studiis excitati te etiam delectant*). While the *adulescentulorum studiis excitati* may seem condescending, Cicero was hardly a man to avoid praise or deny the requests of admirers wishing to learn from him. That these young admirers wished to learn from Cicero lends a didactic motivation to the subsequent publication. Sixteen years later, we see an even more public-spirited approach, when Cicero addresses Atticus in *De Amicitia* (i.4), writing that for a while, Atticus had been pleading with him often to write something 'on friendship ... therefore I have not been

---

<sup>103</sup> These refer to the five books of *De Finibus*.

unwilling to benefit the public at your request' (*cum enim saepe mecum ageres, ut de amicitia scriberem aliquid ... itaque feci non invitus ut prodessem multis rogatu tuo*).

Benefiting the public, especially the youth, becomes one of the principal reasons given by Cicero for publishing, especially in the theoretical works on oratory. As we have seen, the way he frames this reason also functions as a way for Cicero to counter those who would criticize his writing and publishing in the first place. While publishing to educate would benefit Cicero's glory by keeping his works in circulation, benefiting the public is mentioned so often and consistently that we can at least conclude that Cicero honestly wanted to appear to serve the state with his pen. In letter 74.2 to Atticus, written at the beginning of October 57, Cicero praises the quality of his speech *De Domo Sua*, going on to say that 'our younger generation cannot be kept waiting for the speech. I shall send it to you shortly, even if you are not anxious to have it' (*itaque oratio iuventuti nostrae deberi non potest; quam tibi, etiam si non desideras, tamen mittam cito*).

We also see a focus on the young in *De Oratore* (II.ii.9), where Cicero gives as one of his reasons for publishing that he wishes to recommend illustrious orators like Lucius Crassus and Marcus Antonius to those who have never seen either of them (*ut duos summos viros eis, qui neutrum illorum viderint*). Similarly, concerning the speeches, in *Brutus* (xxxii.123), after the fictional Brutus jokes about the source of 'that mass of new volumes' (*teneo qui istam turbam voluminum effecerit*), Cicero goes on to say that he had contributed some benefit to the rising generation by showing them a more elevated and more elaborated style, and perhaps too some harm, in that the older orations in comparison with his have ceased 'to be read by the majority; not by me however, since I prefer them to my own' (*certe enim et boni aliquid attulimus iuventuti, magnificentius quam fuerat genus dicendi et ornatius; et nocuimus fortasse, quod veteres orationes post nostras, non a me quidem – meis enim illas antepono – sed a plerisque legi sunt desitae*). Pointing out the popularity of his own works would certainly encourage those who had not read them to do so, thereby creating yet another opportunity for Cicero to promote his glory<sup>104</sup>.

Benefiting the public is also given as an important reason for publication in the philosophical works. So, for example, in *Academica* (I.i.11) Cicero describes his publishing activity as the most useful means of educating his fellow citizens (*etiam ad nostros cives erudiendos nihil utilius*). In *De Finibus* (I.iii.7), this becomes a patriotic service to introduce those transcendent intellects (meaning Plato and

---

<sup>104</sup> This argument is broadly followed by Murphy (1998:498).

Aristotle) to the acquaintance of his fellow countrymen (*mererer de meis civibus si ad eorum cognitionem divina illa ingenia transferrem*). Cicero continues that it was assuredly also incumbent on him to use his best endeavours, with such zeal, enthusiasm and energy as he possesses, to promote the advancement of learning among his fellow countrymen (*debeo profecto, quantumcumque possum, in eo quoque elaborare ut sint opera, studio, labore meo doctiores cives mei*). These sentiments expressed over and over, e.g. in *Topica* (xix.72), *De Divinatione* (I.xiii.22), *De Officiis* (I.xliv.156), and even in *Philippica Secunda* (II.viii.20).

Of course, Cicero would not be Cicero if his educational purposes did not also intersect with his political purposes. We see an example of this occurs in *De Divinatione*. When summarizing the philosophical works, Cicero asks:

*quod enim munus rei publicae afferre maius meliusve possumus, quam si docemus atque erudimus iuventutem, his praesertim moribus atque temporibus, quibus ita prolapsa est, ut omnium opibus refrenanda atque coercenda sit?*

*De Divinatione* II.1.4

*For what greater or better service can I render to the commonwealth than to instruct and train the youth – especially in view of the fact that our young men have gone so far astray because of the present moral laxity that the utmost effort will be needed to hold them in check and direct them in the right way?*

Being very much aware of the damage done by Caesar to the commonwealth, in that his death opened the floodgates for younger imitators, not least of which was Octavian, Cicero could easily conceive of his educational publishing activity as serving the state<sup>105</sup>. We see the sentiment repeated in *De Officiis* (I.xliv.155), where Cicero writes that scholars have not ‘failed to contribute to the advantages and blessings of mankind, for they have trained many to be better citizens and to render larger service to their country’ (*tamen ab augendis hominum utilitatibus et commodis non recesserunt; nam et erudiverunt multos, quo meliores cives utilioresque rebus suis publicis essent*).

<sup>105</sup> Murphy (1998:505) adds Cicero’s use of *exempla* here, describing the resulting dissemination process in such cases as ‘a hierarchical, from-the-top-down picture of how a Roman hands on *exemplaria* to his juniors’ which fits the picture of literary dissemination that emerges from the letters.

Using publication to reform<sup>106</sup> would naturally redound to Cicero's glory, as populating the state with virtuous young men would benefit all – assuming that the objects of his attempts read what he published.

A final point to consider, concerning educational reasons for publishing, is those instances where Cicero felt he was either correcting faulty learning, or bringing something new to his readers. Concerning the former, two intellectual disputes come up several times in the later works. Cicero argues against those who would wilfully misunderstand Epicureanism as a defense of their dissolute lifestyles, using it as an excuse to disengage from serving the state through active participation in politics. He also argues against those who would reject Cicero's more ornate Asiatic oratorical style for a misunderstood Attic brevity.

Concerning the faux-Epicureans, Cicero uses an opportunity in the *Tusculanae Disputationes* (III.xviii.41-42) to correct their misunderstanding, quoting directly from one of his own teachers, Zeno of Sidon, even stating that he plays the role of translator so that no one may think he is inventing (*fungar enim iam interpretis munere, ne quis me putet fingere*). He concludes by stating that Zeno says this much 'in the words I have quoted, so that anyone you please may realize what Epicurus understands by pleasure' (*atque haec quidem his verbis, quibus ut intelligat quam voluptatem norit Epicurus*). This point aims at chastising those who would use a superficial study of philosophy to excuse their immoral and apolitical behavior, a malaise which Cicero blames for damaging the state. Similarly, Cicero uses an opportunity in *Orator* (vii.23-24) to inveigh against Rome's so-called 'Atticists'<sup>107</sup>, advising them to study the orations of Demosthenes that they may learn what is Attic, and measure eloquence by his strength, not by their own weakness. He also criticizes them for praising only what they hope to imitate. However, as they were men of high ambition but poor judgment, he thinks it important to explain to them the true glory of Atticism (*quid enim sit Atticum discant eloquentiamque ipsius viribus, non imbecillitate sua metiantur. nunc enim*

---

<sup>106</sup> Astin (1985:239), for example, explores Cicero's conception of a reformed Censorship in *De Legibus* as a way in which Cicero hoped to address 'the misconduct of individuals and the abandonment of traditional standards in public life, as the principal causes of the instability and disorder which Rome was experiencing. It was therefore entirely natural that the supervision of mores and the maintenance of senatorial standards should have been closely linked in his thought, that he should have perceived this aspect of the censorship as essential to the office, and that in the *De legibus* he should have envisaged for the censorship a role of special importance as the institution through which high standards might be maintained in the quality and conduct of those who governed.' I agree with Kries's (2003:379) assessment that *De Officiis*, as another example, is not so much an extended letter from father to son, as from *pater patriae* to many sons (young men) engaged in politics, thus serving a broadly educational purpose.

<sup>107</sup> Laughton (1961:27) makes the valid point that almost everything we know about Cicero's public opinion of Greek orators, especially in *Brutus*, *Orator*, and *Optimo Genere Oratorum*, derives from his criticism of the Atticists. Obviously, these give an additional opportunity for him to show off his own vast knowledge of these orators.

*tantum quisque laudat quantum se posse sperat imitari. sed tamen eos studio optimo, iudicio minus firmo praeditos docere quae sit propria laus Atticorum non alienum puto*). Similar to the point concerning Epicureanism, Cicero's censure lies in the superficial understanding and misuse of knowledge – in this case a specific oratorical style which was then fashionable among Rome's young orators, but useless in persuading men or serving the state.

Cicero also boasts on several occasions that he has written on topics which no one before him has done, such as in *Orator* (lxvii.226), where he states that he has written more on rhythmical prose than anyone before him (*plura de numerosa oratione diximus quam quisquam ante nos*). Similarly, in *Academica* (I.ii.8), Cicero praises himself for bringing to light doctrines which nobody had been teaching up till then, and for which there was nobody available from whom those interested could learn (*quae autem nemo adhuc docuerat nec erat unde studiosi scire possent*). He continues with feigned humility that he had done 'as much as lay in my power – for I have no great admiration for any of my own achievements – to make them known to our fellow countrymen' (*ea quantum potui – nihil enim magnopere meorum mirror – feci ut essent nota nostris*). One can certainly imagine a snort of derision and some eye-rolling from all those readers who knew Cicero well upon reading *nihil enim magnopere meorum mirror*. But in feigning to avoid praising himself, Cicero nevertheless points out these achievements.

From an educational point of view, however, Cicero's greatest pride lay in having rendered a great service to his countrymen, so that not only those who were unacquainted with Greek literature but even the cultured could consider that they had gained much both in oratorical power and mental training (*magnum attulimus adiumentum hominibus nostris, ut non modo Graecarum litterarum rudes, sed etiam docti aliquantum se arbitrentur adeptos et ad dicendum et ad iudicandum – De Officiis I.i.1*). He reflects the pride he has in his achievements in disseminating learning and wisdom by repeating the sentiment in *De Officiis* (II.ii.5), stating that he had committed to written form matters not at all familiar to his countrymen but still very much worth their knowing (*ut ea litteris mandaremus, quae nec erant satis nota nostris et erant cognitione dignissima*). He goes on to ask what is more to be desired than wisdom (*quid enim est, per deos, optabilius sapientia*)? In transferring philosophy from the Greek into the Latin language, with the firm hope to improve the morals of the young as well as society in general in the process, Cicero certainly published to serve the state. But as with all his publishing activity, it also tended to his honour, because the act of making philosophy and rhetorical learning available to the public allowed him to draw attention to his own distinctions in these fields.

### 3.7 Publication to promote Latin literature

Many of Cicero's works have survived, but many of his contemporaries' works have not. As a result, it is difficult to judge the full impact of Cicero's works on his immediate context. Cicero certainly felt that he was dominating his colleagues by mere volume (*nemo enim orator tam multa ne in Graeco quidem otio scripsit quam multa sunt nostra – Orator xxxi.109*) and, because of this asymmetrical transmission, we have to take his word for it. Whatever the truth of the matter may be, Cicero felt that he was doing a service to his countrymen by his publishing activity, because it promoted the cause of Latin literature. Of course, by writing many works in his native tongue, Cicero was increasing the chances that his works would be read and that his name would survive through the ages, so even here we should remember that this publishing activity was not merely a disinterested service to the public.

Cicero expresses a range of opinions concerning his services to Latin literature. We have already seen that he considered himself uniquely qualified to bring Greek learning to the Roman people, mostly derived from his own competent bilingualism<sup>108</sup> and experience in public affairs. Cicero also questioned the pragmatic Roman bias against home-grown literature<sup>109</sup>, blaming it for a dearth of Latin works of quality. In addition, Cicero professes in these later works that Latin was not only a suitable language for writing philosophy, but that Romans were naturally suited to the study of philosophy because of their superior virtue. Therefore, bringing these philosophical principles into the Roman literary environment constituted a patriotic activity<sup>110</sup>, but this required the creation of a new technical vocabulary and a flexible approach to translation that rendered Greek philosophy palatable to the Roman temperament<sup>111</sup>. As Cicero's publishing activity accelerated towards the end

---

<sup>108</sup> For details on Cicero's own Greek education, see Powell (2007:334-335) and Eyre (1963:48-50), especially concerning the tensions between Greek and Latin as vehicles for oratorical training. For a general summary of bilingualism in ancient Rome, see Goold (1961:191-192).

<sup>109</sup> Kenney (1982:5) points out the slow rate of change from Greek models, concluding that 'the Roman consumer of literature may indeed be said to have been a prisoner of Greek culture', which helps to explain why Cicero's stated attempt to liberate philosophy from Greece ultimately failed.

<sup>110</sup> Erskine (2003:6) summarises Cicero's practical approach to philosophy by describing Cicero as a 'user' rather than as a 'participant' in philosophy. I argue that one of these 'uses' was to allow Cicero an additional vehicle for promoting his glory, a point taken up by Erskine (2003:13-14), concerning Cicero's view in *De Officiis* that he was adding to Greek philosophy, for example, by 'completing' Panaetius.

<sup>111</sup> Levine (1958:146) explains that the literary dialogue 'provided Cicero with the necessary instrument to propagate Greek thought among his fellow-citizens, and, though this was itself a Greek creation, it became in his hands a highly effective means to Romanize foreign material sufficiently to satisfy domestic standards of propriety that obtained in the case of intellectual pursuits.' He goes on to explain that 'Cicero well realized that to the average Roman, philosophic speculation in itself was a rather undignified, not to say suspect, activity of Hellenizing eggheads and that it could only be made palatable if it was presented in a respectable Roman setting. This awareness of a national prejudice left its mark on several important aspects of his dialogue technique.'

of his life, he also functions within a compositional ecosystem where writers both inspired and encouraged each other to write, thereby promoting Latin literature even further.

Cicero's own youthful studies, his sojourn at Rhodes, his continuous use of Greek<sup>112</sup> in his correspondence with Atticus, and his insistence in *De Officiis* (I.i.1) that he had always combined Greek and Latin studies (*semper cum Graecis Latina coniunxi neque id in philosophia solum, sed etiam in dicendi exercitatione feci*) and therefore encouraged his son to do the same (*idem tibi censeo faciendum, ut par sis in utriusque orationis facultate*) while studying in Athens, create the impression of a well-educated Roman who was academically bilingual.

As early as 60, we see mature attempts at composition in Greek, concerning his consulship, which, apart from avoiding censure from those who could read Latin but not Greek, was intended to encourage others to take up the theme in that language. In Letter 20.6, written in May, Cicero mentions this work, which has not survived, joking that as a 'Greek' himself, Atticus might look askance at the effort (*puto te Latinis meis delectari, huic autem Graeco Graecum invidere*), before going on to mention that if others are stimulated to take up the same theme and write about his consulship, he would send copies to Atticus (*alii si scripserint, mitemus ad te*), presumably to copy and disseminate.

However, it seems as if most recipients of this work were hesitant to take this theme further in either language (*sed, mihi crede, simul atque hoc nostrum legerunt, nescio quo pacto retardantur*). In letter 21, the next letter on the subject written the following month, Cicero explains this hesitancy as the result of his own superior effort in Greek:

*quamquam ad me rescripsit iam Rhodo Posidonius se, nostrum illud ὑπόμνημα cum legeret, quod ego ad eum ut ornatius de isdem rebus scriberet miseram, non modo non excitatum esse ad scribendum sed etiam plane deterritum. quid quaeris? conturbavi Graecam nationem. ita vulgo qui instabant ut darem sibi quod ornarent iam exhibere mihi molestiam destiterunt. tu, si tibi placuerit liber, curabis ut et Athenis sit et in ceteris oppidis Graeciae; videtur enim posse aliquid nostris rebus lucis adferre.*

*Epistulae ad Atticum 21.2*

---

<sup>112</sup> For a very thorough summary and identification of all the Greek speakers that Cicero had contact with throughout his life, see Rowland (1972).

*However, Posidonius has already written to me from Rhodes that when he read this 'draft' of mine, which I had sent him with the idea that he might compose something more elaborate on the same theme, so far from being stimulated to composition he was effectively frightened away. The fact is, I have dumbfounded the whole Greek community, so that the folk who were pressing me on all sides to give them something to dress up are pestering me no longer. If you like the book, please see that it is made available at Athens and the other Greek towns. I think it may add some shine to my achievements.*

There are several things to note in this section. Firstly, when Cicero failed to have his consulship celebrated in Latin by a Roman author, he turned to his Greek connections. The *iam exhibere mihi molestiam destiterunt* seems to suggest that they were far more enthusiastic to indulge Cicero's request, probably encouraged by the prospect of greater patronage. Although we cannot judge the quality of the Greek, the *conturbavi Graecam nationem*, as well as the request to have the work widely disseminated, shows that Cicero did not feel his Greek to be in any way inferior. The last sentence also shows us once again that, even in another language, Cicero was aware of the potential benefits to his glory<sup>113</sup>, although the *videtur enim posse aliquid* suggests that he probably would have preferred something in Latin.

Even under great stress, Cicero's commitment to bilingual composition unimpaired. In letter 173 (IX.4.ii-iii), written eleven years later in March 49, vacillating over whom to join shortly after Caesar had crossed the Rubicon, Cicero composes an extended section of the letter in Greek only, considering various philosophical questions pertinent to the decision before writing that he does practise exercises upon these questions and sets out the arguments on either side, now in Greek, now in Latin, to take his mind for a while off his troubles (*in his ego me consultationibus exercens et disserens in utramque partem tum Graece tum Latine et abduco parumper animum a molestiis*). Apart from functioning as coded language, necessitated by the sensitivity of the information, Cicero comfortably discusses philosophical issues in both languages, perhaps foreshadowing his eventual confidence in composing philosophical works in Latin, modelled on Greek examples.

However, as excellent as Cicero's Greek may have been, large-scale composition in the language was out of the question for a Roman statesman trying to use publication as a way to promote his own

---

<sup>113</sup> Phillips (1986:229) concludes that Atticus did not follow Cicero's instructions to the letter, but probably only sent the work to friends with the instructions to pass it on to those who were interested. However, this conclusion, probably based on the loss of the work, is speculative. Murphy (1998:496) concludes that Atticus would presumably have placed copies of the book in the public libraries of these towns, since these institutions existed in Greece but not yet in Rome.

glory and serve the state. The obvious reason to avoid Greek was that there was already a large amount of Greek literature in existence. Therefore, the first step in promoting Latin philosophical literature was to point out that there was not enough of it<sup>114</sup>, such as in the *Tusculanae Disputationes* (IV.iii.6). This is often done through unflattering comparison to Greek literature. One example of this comes from *De Oratore* (II.xxii.92). While Cicero considers the question of why each age seems to produce its own style of oratory, he goes on to say that the truth cannot easily be judged in the case of Latin authors, since they have left but very few writings on which a judgement could be based (*quod non tam facile in nostris oratoribus possumus iudicare, quia scripta, ex quibus iudicium fieri posset, non multa sane reliquerunt*). He subsequently appeals to Roman pride by comparing the situation to that of the Greeks, from whose works the method and tendency of the oratory of every generation could be understood (*quam in Graecis; ex quorum scriptis, cuiusque aetatis quae dicendi ratio voluntasque fuerit, intellegi potest*). One can imagine such a comparison perhaps stinging patriotic Romans into compositional action<sup>115</sup>.

Cicero had a complicated relationship with the Greek language and culture<sup>116</sup>. In his private correspondence, we generally see a man who is broadly philhellenic<sup>117</sup>. In his public speeches, we sometimes see praise, more often mild disdain, for Greek culture, depending on the circumstances and the possible need for pandering to conservative Roman audiences. In the theoretical and philosophical works, we see a competitive spirit, which speaks to Roman cultural attitudes, while at the same time being motivated by the quest for personal glory through composition and publication. As his philosophical programme crystallized, we therefore see Cicero beating the drum for increasing the supply of Latin works. So, for example, he writes in the *Tusculanae Disputationes* (II.ii.6) that ‘once these studies have been transferred to ourselves, we shall have no need even of Greek libraries, in which there is an endless number of books due to the crowd of writers; for the same things are said

---

<sup>114</sup> Kenney (1982:6) points out that cultivated Romans at this time were generally ‘conscious of the need for a literature of their own and eager to exploit it as it came into being.’ This would help explain why so many of Cicero’s works, especially the speeches, were being read in his own lifetime.

<sup>115</sup> Murphy (1998:499) points out Cicero’s praise of Varro in *Academica* (I.iii.9), where he writes that Varro’s work *Antiquitates Rerum Divinarum* had enabled Romans, who had been wandering about like visitors in their own city, to remember who they were (*nam nos in nostra urbe peregrinantis errantisque tamquam hospites tui libri quasi domum reduxerunt, ut possemus aliquando qui et ubi essemus agnoscere*). Murphy argues that Varro’s book mirrored Cicero’s own purpose in philosophical writing. I would argue that the praise was rather to ameliorate the literary blackmail mentioned above.

<sup>116</sup> Guite (1962:157) summarises the inconsistency as follows: Cicero was ‘fighting to give the Roman spirit a chance to declare itself in letters as well as in life. It was the Greeks who had made him aware of what Roman literature could be; it was they who had nourished its earliest growth; it was they who even now furnished his mind, exercised his intelligence, and sharpened his pen. And yet it was these same Greeks who by their terrible dominance were preventing Roman literature from ever achieving its rightful stature.’

<sup>117</sup> For an illuminating treatment of the role the letters play in developing philosophical discourse between Cicero and his contemporaries, see Blyth (2010:83-84).

by many since the day they crammed the world with books: and things will be the same here too if a larger stream of writers sets toward these studies' (*quod si haec studia traducta erunt ad nostros, ne bibliothecis quidem Graecis egebimus, in quibus multitudo infinita librorum propter eorum est multitudinem, qui scripserunt; eadem enim dicuntur a multis, ex quo libris omnia referserunt: quod accidet etiam nostris, si ad haec studia plures confluxerint*). The tone is generally condescending<sup>118</sup>, the *multitudo infinita librorum* and *referserunt* adhering broadly to negative Roman attitudes towards recondite study.

Of course, anyone interested in these studies was likely to prefer and read the originals in Greek, a point contested in *Academica* (I.ii.4). However, as we have seen, Cicero's enthusiasm for Latin philosophical publication derived from a political programme that aimed at a more virtuous citizenry, and the fact that there was no personal honour to be derived from merely reading philosophy in the original language as opposed to writing philosophy in a new one. Therefore Cicero declares in *De Divinatione* (II.ii.5-6) that it would contribute greatly to the fame and glory of the Roman people (and also of Cicero) to be 'made independent of Greek writers in the study of philosophy, and this result I shall certainly bring about if my present plans are accomplished' (*magnificum illud etiam Romanisque hominibus gloriosum, ut Graecis de philosophia litteris non egeant; quod adsequar profecto, si instituta perfecero*).

In a sense, Cicero was creating an audience for his publishing activity, using the persuasive techniques developed over a long forensic career. Flattering one's audience was an effective way to achieve one's ends. Cicero appeals to his Roman audience by flattering their innate ability for philosophy and their general superiority over the Greeks. So, for example, the character of Catulus praises Crassus in *De Oratore* (III.lxi.228) that he (meaning Cicero) had gathered together all the points with such genius, that he 'appears not to have learnt from the Greeks but is even competent to instruct the Greeks themselves in these subjects' (*collegisti omnia, quantum ego possum iudicare, ita divinitus ut non a Graecis didicisse sed eos ipsos haec docere posse videare*). Similarly, in the *Tusculanae Disputationes* (I.i.1), Cicero explains, in true Roman fashion, that it is incumbent on him to throw light upon philosophy in the Latin tongue – not that philosophy could not be learnt from Greek writers and teachers, but that it had always been his conviction that Romans have shown more wisdom everywhere than the Greeks, either in making discoveries themselves, or improving upon

---

<sup>118</sup> Murphy (1998:494-494) explains that the 'strident tone' with which Cicero promotes Latin and attacks philhellenists functions as an ancient analogue of linguistic nationalism. I disagree with this assessment, holding that Cicero attacks in an attempt to defend himself against censure. For more on Roman attitudes to and use of Greek, see Kaimio (1979).

what they had received from Greece – in such subjects at least as they judged worthy of the devotion of their efforts (*hoc mihi Latinis litteris illustrandum putavi, non quia philosophia Graecis et litteris et doctoribus percipi non posset, sed meum semper iudicium fuit omnia nostros aut invenisse per se sapientius quam Graecos aut accepta ab illis fecisse meliora, quae quidem digna statuissent in quibus elaborarent*). One can imagine this opinion to have been broadly shared by those who would criticize Cicero's efforts in philosophical composition, so that this section serves to persuade them of the value of philosophy in Latin, thereby removing barriers to the promotion of Cicero's glory.

Cicero was very much aware of the traditional limits to the Roman love for 'book learning' when compared to the Greeks (*iam illa, quae natura, non litteris adsecuti sunt, neque cum Graecia neque ulla cum gente sunt conferenda – Tusculanae Disputationes I.i.2*), but felt that the Roman nation was ideally suited to the study of philosophy, given the abundance of virtuous examples from history<sup>119</sup> that Roman versions could contain. *De Finibus* (II.xxi.67) provides a good example. Cicero, in a nod to both himself and Atticus, explains that 'now that we Romans too have begun to treat of these themes, what a marvellous roll of great men will our friend Atticus supply to us from his storehouses of learning' (*nunc vero, quoniam haec nos etiam tractare coepimus, suppeditabit nobis Atticus noster e thesauris suis quos et quantos viros*), referring to Atticus' own composition of miscellanea.

In a similar vein, just as the Romans possessed a superior capacity to benefit from philosophical study and had better historical examples to draw from, so the Roman language is praised as a vehicle superior to Greek for expounding philosophical thought. As if anticipating the objections of purists to such an idea, Cicero allows the character of Atticus to speculate in *Academica* (I.iv.15) whether philosophy can be satisfactorily expressed in Latin (*et simul videre satisne ea commode dici possint Latine*), later exclaiming that he loves 'our literature and our fellow countrymen profoundly, and I delight in the doctrines of your school when set forth in Latin as you are setting them forth' (*valde enim amo nostra atque nostros, meque ista delectant cum Latine dicuntur et isto modo – Academica I.v.18*). By the time of *De Finibus*, we see Cicero positively savaging opponents to this ideal, writing:

---

<sup>119</sup> For an evaluation and overview of Cicero's own historical knowledge and use of historical *exempla*, see Rawson (1972). Concerning his role as historian, Rawson summarises that 'Cicero himself was not going to contribute real antiquarian monographs to the antiquarian movement [of the 50s]. They were a fit subject neither for the greatest stylist of Rome nor for one of her greatest political figures. He never, in fact, again gets so deeply entangled in the study of antiquity as in the *De Re Publica*; but for the rest of his life he finds it a fascinating sideline' (1972:35).

*ego autem mirari satis non queo, unde hoc sit tam insolens domesticarum rerum fastidium. non est omnino hic docendi locus, sed ita sentio et saepe disserui, Latinam linguam non modo non inopem, ut vulgo putarent, sed locupletiozem etiam esse quam Graecam.*

*De Finibus* I.iii.10

*But for my part, I can never cease wondering what can be the origin of the exaggerated contempt for home products that is now fashionable. It would of course be out of place to attempt to prove it here, but in my opinion, as I have often argued, the Latin language, so far from having a poor vocabulary, as is commonly supposed, is actually richer than the Greek.*

Cicero goes on to write that his business is to serve those who desire to enjoy literature in both languages, or who, if books in their own language are available, do not feel any great need of the Greek ones (*iis servire qui vel utrisque litteris uti velint vel, si suas habent, illas non magno opere desiderent*), perhaps making Cicero the founding father of the open university. That Cicero was determined in his mission can already be seen in the *Tusculanae Disputationes* (I.iii.5), where he writes that philosophy ‘has lain neglected to this day, and Latin literature has thrown no light upon it: it must be illuminated and exalted by us’ (*philosophia iacuit usque ad hanc aetatem nec ullum habuit lumen litterarum Latinarum quae illustranda et excitanda nobis est*), adding in *De Natura Deorum* (I.i.1) that a number of branches of philosophy had not as yet been adequately explored (*multae res in philosophia nequaquam satis adhuc explicatae sint*). His resolve to explore various branches of philosophy in Latin is also expressed in *Academica* (I.i.3), *De Natura Deorum* (I.iii.7) and *De Divinatione* (II.ii.4). Being the first to do this competently would naturally add to Cicero’s glory.

That being said, Cicero nevertheless had to deal with the reality of a general lack of Latin philosophical terms, thereby necessitating a veritable avalanche of Latin neologisms. These are generally introduced in the following manner: writing the Greek term, giving its new Latin equivalent, and often explaining why the neologism is necessary compared to an adjacent term already in existence. An excellent example of this occurs in *Academica* (I.vii.25), after which Cicero defends the choice by explaining that the coining of new terms is a feature ‘shared by almost all the sciences: either new names have to be coined for new things, or names taken from other things have to be used metaphorically. This being the practice of the Greeks, who have now been engaged in these studies for so many generations, how much more ought it to be allowed to us, who are now

attempting to handle these subjects for the first time' (*et id quidem commune omnium fere est artium, aut enim nova sunt rerum novarum facienda nomina aut ex aliis transferenda. quod si Graeci faciunt qui in his rebus tot iam saecula versantur, quanto id magis nobis concedendum est qui haec nunc primum tractare conamur*). Apart from rebutting criticism, the *primum* aims to focus our attention on Cicero's efforts and the glory derived from these. The same defense is given almost identically in *De Finibus* (III.ii.5).

Apart from inventing the vocabulary required, in transferring Greek philosophy into Latin, Cicero also needed to make editorial decisions<sup>120</sup> that would allow the ideas to remain consistent, while allowing for points of reference that would be understandable to, and even appeal to, a Roman audience<sup>121</sup>. While the choice of Roman characters as interlocutors and the use of Roman examples from Roman history are the most obvious examples of this procedure, Cicero is explicit that he is not a mere translator. So, in *De Finibus* (I.iii.7), Cicero explains that he could give a direct translation of Plato or Aristotle if he chose to do so, but that this has not been his procedure hitherto (*sed id neque feci adhuc nec mihi tamen ne faciam interdictum puto*), though he feels that he is not debarred from adopting it, expressly reserving the right to borrow certain passages when an appropriate occasion offers for doing so (*locos quidem quosdam, si videbitur, transferam, et maxime ab iis quos modo nominavi, cum inciderit ut id apte fieri possit*).

Nevertheless, Cicero was also a practically minded Roman who understood his equally practically minded audience. An example of this is found in the preface (4) to the *Paradoxa Stoicorum*, where he wants to see whether it is possible for the paradoxes to be 'brought out into the light of common daily life and expounded in a form to win acceptance, or whether learning has one style of discourse and ordinary life another' (*tentare volui possentne proferri in lucem, id est in forum, et ita dici ut probarentur, an alia quaedam esset erudita alia popularis oratio*). We see this pragmatism repeated in the first paradox (10), where he writes that these views 'may possibly seem somewhat repellent when they are discussed too coolly. They need to have the light thrown upon them by the life and actions of men of eminence: wordy discussion of them seems to be excessive subtlety' (*sed haec videri possunt odiosiora cum lentius disputantur: vita atque factis illustranda sunt summorum*

---

<sup>120</sup> One example of this process is taken up by Thompson (1980), who explores the nature of Cicero's editing of mythological material in *De Natura Deorum*. This was made possible by the survival of Cicero's material in other works, including that of Plato.

<sup>121</sup> Rubinelli (2002:612) makes the point that, even as early as *De Inventione*, Cicero already takes a more practical approach to render the work more 'Roman' rather than just recording the dictation of his teacher. However, the extent to which Cicero innovated or wrote truly original philosophy is impossible to know, as most of his sources have been lost to us (Striker 1995:56).

*virorum haec quae verbis subtilius quam satis est disputari videntur*). This explains Cicero's efforts to make Greek philosophy thoroughly Roman, thereby increasing his readership, avoiding criticism, and adding to his glory.

In order that he may 'shine the light of common life' on philosophy, Cicero needed comrades in arms<sup>122</sup>. While Cicero certainly was not the only Roman to write philosophy, his tireless efforts, his prolificacy, not to mention his relentlessly stubborn opposition to purists and detractors, would have served as an inspiration to other would-be Roman philosophers. Similarly, their efforts would prompt Cicero to even greater exertion. We see this process in Cicero's relationship with Brutus, to whom several of the theoretical and philosophical works are dedicated. So, for example, we see Cicero compliment Brutus in *Orator* (x.34), writing that 'even in your busiest days you never neglect the pursuit of learning, but are always either writing something yourself or arousing me to write' (*quod in maximis occupationibus nunquam intermittis studia doctrinae, semper aut ipse scribis aliquid aut me vocas ad scribendum*). We see a similar sentiment in *De Finibus* (I.iii.8), where Cicero writes that Brutus rivals even the Greeks as a philosopher (*ne Graecis quidem cedentem in philosophia*), compelling Cicero to write *De Finibus* as Brutus himself had challenged Cicero to the venture by dedicating his essay *De Virtute* to him (*quamquam a te ipso id quidem facio provocatus gratissimo mihi libro quem ad me de virtute misisti*). This almost playful interaction, often expressed as a reciprocal challenge, is often worded in terms of payment and repayment, as can also be seen in *Brutus* (v.18-19). Here the character of Brutus goads Cicero to write, describing how his *De Re Publica* had fired him with the ambition to put together a record of public men and events (*ipsi ad rerum et magistratum memoriam comprehendendam impulse atque incense sumus*) and demanding payment for the effort.

Apart from goading Brutus to action and being goaded in return, Cicero sounds the challenge to Latin philosophical composition in general, more broadly in the *Tusculanae Disputationes* (II.ii.5), where he encourages 'all, who have the capacity, to wrest from the now failing grasp of Greece the renown won from this field of study and transfer it to this city, just as our ancestors by their indefatigable zeal transferred here all the other really desirable avenues to renown' (*hortor omnes, qui facere id possunt, ut huius quoque generis laudem iam languenti Graeciae eripiant et transferant in hanc urbem, sicut reliquas omnes, quae quidem erant expetendae, studio atque industria sua maiores*

---

<sup>122</sup> Murphy (1998:495) discusses this in greater detail, making a case for Caesar's literary circle. Schmidt (1978) gives a useful summary of the context in which Cicero produced philosophy, focusing on his effort to Romanize philosophy and how he dealt with criticism to the project.

*nostris transtulerunt*). He goes so far as to proclaim: ‘in consequence of these evil days, let it be now the birthday of philosophy in Latin literature and let us lend it our support and submit to contradiction and refutation’ (*philosophia nascatur Latinis quidem litteris ex his temporibus eamque nos adiuvemus, nosque ipsos redargui refellique patiamur*). This challenge was indeed taken up, allowing Cicero to refer later to the large number of readers who had become writers themselves in *De Natura Deorum* (I.iv.8) and *De Officiis* (II.i.2). It is therefore clear that Cicero’s efforts to encourage publication of philosophical works in the Latin language had good results, but these should always be measured against his political purposes and the benefits to his own glory. Since Cicero’s efforts were more likely to be read by future generations rather than those persons whom he wished to reform, we see that this publishing activity resulted in magnifying his glory, an outcome which was certainly intended, rather than serving the state.

### 3.8 Publication to pay literary compliments

A final issue to consider is how Cicero used his publishing activity to compliment people<sup>123</sup> and whether these compliments were motivated by a desire to enhance his personal glory or in order to benefit the state. For the most part, Cicero's status as a *novus homo* and the vicissitudes of his public life made him wary of making enemies unnecessarily<sup>124</sup>. This is a pattern that is generally consistent throughout his published works<sup>125</sup>, mostly deriving from an early decision to focus on defending rather than prosecuting cases. This in turn has implications for the decision to publish speeches, generally as a testament to his own skills as an orator, and as a reminder to his noble clients of his good offices. In addition, he compliments famous historical figures, and by extension their families, either by using them as positive exempla, or as interlocutors in the dialogues. Cicero also uses the dialogues to extend compliments to his intimates, thereby allowing those compliments to be returned. Finally, it is worth considering those compliments extended to several contemporaries, including Caesar, Brutus, Cato, and Hortensius, and to determine whether these were motivated by self-interest or the public good.

In order to appreciate Cicero's use of publication to compliment, it is useful first to understand his commitment to forensic defense. Most of the speeches that have come down to us are for the defense, so much so that Cicero, who considered his speech against Verres to be his only speech for the prosecution, comfortably refers to it simply as the *Accusation* (*Orator*, xxix.103). He even goes so far as to make his preference clear in the speech itself, stating that it is the defender's part, and not the prosecutor's, which he is most ambitious to play with applause (*sed ego defensorum in mea persona, non accusatorem, maximi laudari volo – In Verrem Actio Secunda* I.xxxviii.98). This is followed by an extended explanation of the choice in the same speech (III.i.2-ii.5), mostly focusing on why prosecution places unnecessary restrictions on one's subsequent life and actions. As if to emphasize this commitment to forensic defense, the speech ends with the hope that his country and conscience may let him 'rest content in having been a prosecutor in this one case; and that I may henceforth be free for the defense of honest men, and not forced to undertake the prosecution of evil-doers' (*utique res publica meaque fides una hac accusatio mea contenta sit, mihi que posthac bonos potius defendere liceat quam improbos accusare necesse sit – IV.lxxi.189*). Apart from functioning as an

<sup>123</sup> Kenney (1982:10) explains that 'writers were acutely alive to the need to please if their works – and hence themselves – were to survive'. This is an important point to bear in mind when considering complimentary writing.

<sup>124</sup> One of the most interesting examples of this, explored by Craig (1990:78), is Cicero's forbearance of Marcus Iuventius Laterensis as the prosecutor in *Pro Plancio*.

<sup>125</sup> The letters to Atticus and his brother are the notable exceptions, but since these were not generally written for publication, it is easy enough to reconcile the differences in opinion expressed publicly and in private.

opportunity not to burn any bridges, this argument reveals a young man entering Roman politics on the back foot, lacking senatorial ancestry, but nevertheless determined to build rather than destroy relationships with the powerful and politically well connected.

The benefits of defending clients feature in several speeches. In *Pro Murena* (19), for example, Cicero explains that when a single individual takes great pains in a profession that will benefit so many, he wins great credit with men and widespread gratitude (*magna laus et grata hominibus unum hominem elaborare in ea scientia quae sit multis profutura*). In the same speech, Cicero also argues that power, force, influence, and popularity are assets that should ‘deliver the innocent, protect the weak, and help those in trouble; for the trial and destruction of fellow citizens they should be rejected’ (*valeant haec omnia ad salutem innocentium, ad opem impotentium, ad auxilium calamitosorum, in periculo vero et in pernicie civium repudientur* – *Pro Murena* 59). There was also the fact that defending a client placed him under obligation to you (*Brutus* lvii.209) and that the side of the defense is more honourable (*laudabilior est defensio* – *De Officiis* II.xiv.49). Cicero goes on to say that prosecution should be avoided, but if it has to be done, that it should not be done often – never, in fact, except in the interest of the state, or to avenge wrongs, or for the protection of Rome’s provincials (*sed hoc quidem non est saepe faciendum nec umquam nisi aut rei publicae causa ... aut ulciscendi ... aut patrocinii* – *De Officiis* II.xiv.50). These reasons mostly explain those instances when Cicero delivered speeches against individuals, such as against Verres, Catiline, Piso, and Anthony. But this only shows that Cicero did not go out of his way to damage the public reputation of someone through his publishing activity. We see this hesitancy in two letters to Atticus, written shortly after Caesar’s assassination. In letter 368.5, in which we learn that Atticus had apparently encouraged Cicero to write history and ‘list the outrageous crimes’ of the Caesarian party (*et hortaris me ut historias scribam, ut colligam tanta eorum scelera a quibus etiam nunc obsidemur*), Cicero asks whether he can speak other than well of those who had invited Atticus as a witness to their wills (*poterone eos ipsos non laudare qui te obsignatorem adhibuerunt*). He goes on to say that it is a hard thing to revile one’s well-wishers, be they what they may (*sed homines benevolos, qualescumque sunt, grave est insequi contumelia*). Of course, this decision was also motivated by pragmatism, as we learn in letter 371.6, written a few days later, in which Cicero explains that the material that Atticus would like to see included in the work must await another separate volume, for he believed that there was less risk in attacking the Caesarian faction when the tyrant was alive than now when he was dead (*ista vero quae tu contexi vis aliud quoddam separatum volumen exspectant. ego autem, credas mihi velim, minore periculo existimo contra illas nefarias partis vivo tyranno dici potuisse quam mortuo*).

We have already seen that Cicero avoided publishing anything praising someone he did not like, but this should not lead us to believe that praise of individuals was without calculation. Cicero was aware that praise of famous men, and by extension their families, would be both to his credit and benefit. In letter 90.9, written to Atticus in July 54 while Cicero was politically inactive and only beginning to awaken to the benefits of regular publication to shore up his position and promote his glory, Cicero writes about his work preparing for speeches defending Marcus Livius Drusus Claudianus and Marcus Aemilius Scaurus, whose fathers ranked among the great names of Roman history, continuing, in a tone of mock self-aggrandizement, that these names were ‘fine titles for my speeches I’m collecting’ (*parantur orationibus indices gloriosi*). In a similar vein, we see Cicero active as a writer of eulogies for famous noble personages, including not only Cato and his sister Porcia, as already mentioned, but also for her son with Lucius Domitius Ahenobarbus, mentioned in *Epistulae ad Quintum* 26.5. In these cases, the necessities of political expediency would be balanced by the glory derived through association.

When not seeking favour with Rome’s noble families through complimentary publication, Cicero would praise those famous people with whom he shared a particular affinity. The most obvious example of this is Cicero’s mostly consistent praise of Gaius Marius, especially after his own return from exile. Both men were from Arpinum, both were *novi homines*, and both had suffered exile at the hands of a jealous nobility. Not only did Cicero pattern his political persona on the older general<sup>126</sup>, but benefited from praising him, as comparisons between them would tend to favour Cicero. In the lost poem *Marius*, Cicero even used such complimentary language that he takes an opportunity in *De Legibus* (I.i.4) to reply to criticism, voiced by the character of Atticus, that his language strained the limits of truth (*multa quaerentur in Mario fictane an vera sint, et non nullis, quod et in recenti memoria et in Arpinati homine versere, veritas a te postulatur*). He goes on to say that he has no desire to be thought to deal in falsehood, but that critics displayed their ignorance ‘by demanding in such matter the truthfulness expected of a witness in court rather than from a poet’<sup>127</sup> (*et mehercule ego me cupio non mendacem putari; sed ... faciunt imperite, qui in isto periculo non ut a poeta, sed*

---

<sup>126</sup> Lavery (1971:138) draws our attention to the *philarchia* of both men and offers a detailed description of their connection and the emotional comfort Cicero derived from his association with the general during his own exile.

<sup>127</sup> Concerning the rules for ‘truthiness’ applicable to poetry and history, Benardete (1987:298-299) makes the interesting observation that, since *De Legibus* was written in the context of a broken republic, this conversation seems to suggest that in writing about perfect laws, Cicero realized and wished to confirm that he was writing fiction, probably as a form of veiled criticism of Caesar.

*ut a teste veritatem exigent*). The complimentary language and the need Cicero felt to reply to his critics show the importance that such comparisons had for developing his own glory<sup>128</sup>.

Cicero would also use his publishing activity to compliment those who shared his politics and had done him service. An example of this is Cicero's praise of Publius Cornelius Lentulus Spinther in *Brutus* (lxxvii.268), calling him 'the avenger of my wrongs and the author of my recall from banishment' (*ille nostrarum iniuriarum ultor, auctor salutis*) and praising him for his brilliant mind, noble spirit, and 'his aspiration to all the honours which belonged to distinction, holding them with becoming dignity' (*tantus animi splendor et tanta magnitudo ut sibi omnia quae clarorum virorum essent non dubitaret asciscere eaque omni dignitate obtineret*). Naturally, it did not hurt Cicero's glory to compliment and be associated so intimately with a member of the venerable and thoroughly noble Cornelia clan.

Of course, these complimentary examples generally occur in works published after the deaths of the individuals concerned, keeping broadly to Cicero's stated preference in the later works for not writing about the living, lest he offend anyone by omission, an excuse he uses in *De Re Publica* (I.i.1). But with so many famous dead Romans to choose from, it is worth considering those whom Cicero did choose as interlocutors<sup>129</sup> in his philosophical works. Apart from the veritable catalogue of Rome's heroes in *De Re Publica*, Cicero's choice of such nobles as Lucius Licinius Crassus, Marcus Antonius Orator, and Quintus Mucius Scaevola Augur is significant, as they were not only from noteworthy families, but had been Cicero's own mentors and teachers when he was a young man. This close association serves not only to increase the verisimilitude of the dialogues, but to draw attention to Cicero's association with such noble personages<sup>130</sup>. In the case of Crassus especially, Cicero uses several opportunities in *De Oratore* to compliment his old teacher:

<sup>128</sup> The benefits to Cicero's glory as a primary motivation for the composition and dissemination of this poem is generally accepted, but Benario (1957:179) argues that there was also a political purpose, in that Cicero was praising Caesar's uncle by marriage, thereby flattering Caesar's family. In effect, it was a useful opportunity for praise to both Caesar and Cicero through a mutual connection.

<sup>129</sup> Cicero begins by using famous ancient Romans, but switches to his teachers and himself and contemporaries over time. Gurd (2007:53) points to *Epistulae ad Quintum* (25.1), where a certain Sallust advises Cicero to speak in his own voice in *De Re Publica* rather than in the *personae* of ancestral Romans, arguing that 'speech uttered by men of a generation lost to living memory would be read as fiction.' While Cicero did make some changes, the letter itself points out that Cicero wished to avoid giving offence in any quarter (*ne in nostra tempora incurrens offenderem quempiam* – 25.2). The point of using such characters, as Cicero himself writes, was to lend weight to the words (*luculente hominumque dignitas aliquantum orationi ponderis adferebat* – 25.1).

<sup>130</sup> Murphy (1998:505) discusses this 'chain of transmission', explaining how it was important for the participants in the dialogues to be 'real people, and the connections between them historical', since this would allow them to function as *superiores* and *exempla*, thereby benefiting the *auctoritas* of the work and Cicero's glory.

*sermonemque L. Crassi reliquum ac paene postremum memoriae prodamus, atque ei etsi nequaquam parem illius ingenio at pro nostro tamen studio meritam gratiam debitamque referamus. neque enim quisquam nostrum, cum libros Platonis mirabiliter scriptos legit in quibus omnibus fere Socrates exprimitur, non, quamquam illa scripta sunt divinitus, tamen maius quiddam de illo de quo scripta sunt, suspicatur; quod item nos postulamus non a te quidem qui nobis omnia summa tribuis sed a ceteris qui haec in manus sument, ut maius quiddam de L. Crasso quam quantum a nobis exprimetur, suspicentur.*

*De Oratore* III.iv.14-15

*Let me place on record the remaining and almost final discourse of Lucius Crassus, and repay him the gratitude due to his deserts, which if it by no means comes up to his genius yet is the best that my devotion can achieve. In point of fact, when reading the admirable volumes of Plato, almost all of them containing a picture of Socrates, there is not one of us who, although they are works of genius, yet does not imagine something on a larger scale in regard to the personality that is their subject; and I make a similar claim not indeed upon yourself [Quintus], who pay me the highest possible consideration, but upon everybody else who takes this work into his hands, that he shall form a mental picture of Lucius Crassus on a larger scale than the sketch that I shall draw.*

This injunction to his readers is interesting, because it elevates Cicero's choice of character even beyond the glowing language he employs to describe him<sup>131</sup>. The feigned modesty in *nequaquam parem illius ingenio* is a nice touch, as it allows Cicero to display the deference proper to his subject while subtly reminding the reader of the connection between himself and Crassus.

Concerning both Crassus and Antonius, Cicero gives his reasons for committing their supposed conversation to writing in *De Oratore* (II.ii.7), explaining that he wishes to dispel the notion that they were not learned<sup>132</sup> (*ut illa opinio, quae semper fuisset, tolleretur, alterum non doctissimum, alterum plane indoctum fuisse*), to hold them up as models of the kind of oratory Cicero favours (*ut ea, quae existimarem a summis orationibus de eloquentia divinitus esse dicta, custodirem litteris*), and, most

<sup>131</sup> Görler (1988:232) makes the point that Cicero may even have tampered with historical facts to increase the glory of his philosopher-hero.

<sup>132</sup> Hall (1994:211-216) analyzes Cicero's rhetorical strategies for persuading his readers that these men were indeed learned, but fails to explain why he does so. I would submit my own conclusion – that he wished to flatter the families and benefit his own glory through association – as a potential answer to this problem.

importantly, to ‘rescue, as far as possible, from disuse and from silence, the reputation of these men which was already beginning to wane’ (*vel mehercule etiam, ut laudem eorum, iam prope senescentem, quantum ego possem, ab oblivione hominum atque a silentio vindicarem*). Cicero goes on to say that he thinks it a tribute due from him to these great intellects, that while all still held them in living memory, he should render that memory immortal, if he can (*deberi hoc a me tantis hominum ingeniis putavi, ut, cum etiam nunc vivam illorum memoriam teneremus, hanc immortalem redderem, si possem* – *De Oratore* II.ii.8). While immortalizing his aristocratic mentors in this way can be considered a dutiful act, Cicero naturally hoped to join them in the process, perhaps even encouraging others to do for him what he had done for others.

Apart from rescuing the memory of the famously departed, Cicero gives pride of place to his intimates in the dialogues<sup>133</sup>. So we see him use as characters his brother (*De Legibus, De Divinatione*), his son Marcus (*De Partitione Oratoria*), his student Gaius Trebatius Testa (*Topica*), and his brother-in-law Atticus (*De Legibus, Brutus, Academica*). As we have seen, Cicero’s growing fame as an author prompted several friends to request a role, including Gaius Trebonius in *Epistulae ad Familiares* 328.4 and, we learn, even Atticus, in letter 415.3. While Cicero uses their presence to give honorable mention to their own literary efforts, such as Quintus’ *Annales* in *De Divinatione* (I.xliv.100), more often than not he uses them and the intimacy between them to engineer compliments to himself<sup>134</sup>. One such example is found in *Brutus* (lxxii.253), where Atticus goes so far as to quote Caesar describing Cicero as ‘almost the pioneer and inventor of eloquence’ that has ‘deserved well of the name and prestige of Rome’ (*cuius te paene principem copiae atque inventorem bene de nomine ac dignitate populi Romani meritum esse existimare debemus*).

---

<sup>133</sup> Gurd (2007:55) argues that by using contemporaries, Cicero ‘bound them in the shared project of imagining a literary work and lent the ensuing text the added authority of a community of commentators. A desire for this corporate authority may have been strong enough motivation for Cicero [to revise].’ I would add that this corporate authority was an ideal way for Cicero to deflect criticism and indeed ‘share the blame’, not only safeguarding his position, but adding to his glory by being in such erudite and illustrious company.

<sup>134</sup> Dickey (1997:588) surveys the dialogues to point out the use of vocatives and Cicero’s studious avoidance of his own name or being addressed directly when he features as a character. While she offers no explanation for why this may be so, I would submit that Cicero, already identified as the author from the context, was paying respects to his intimates by addressing them directly and creating opportunities to put remarks about himself in the mouths of others, since their familiarity would allow their praise to be both realistic and acceptable to his Roman readers.

As much as Cicero detested Caesar's politics, there was nevertheless a mutual friendship and respect motivated by shared culture and interests<sup>135</sup>. As a member of one of Rome's most eminent patrician families, Caesar's friendship was worth seeking and Cicero does make an effort to be complimentary towards him through publication. This is most obvious in letter 18.2 to his brother, written in June 54 while Quintus was campaigning with Caesar in Gaul and Britain. Cicero writes that it was good brotherly advice to make Caesar the one man he would exert himself to please and that he was more than willing to do so (*qua re facis tu quidem fraterne quod me hortaris, sed mehercule currentem nunc quidem, ut omnia mea studia in istum unum conferam*), going on to say that he himself had been asleep too long in cultivating Caesar's friendship (*sic ego, quoniam in isto homine colendo tam indormivi diu te mehercule saepe excitante*). This is followed by the promise that he would now compensate for his slowness by putting his horse to gallop – not just his horse but his poetic chariot, since his first draft of the poem complimenting Caesar had met with the latter's approval (*cursu corrigam tarditatem cum equis tum vero, quoniam tu scribis poema ab eo nostrum probari, quadrigis poeticis*). That Cicero was anxious to obtain Caesar's approval<sup>136</sup> and actively sought his friendship also comes to the fore in letter 20.5 to his brother, written two months later.

We also gain insight into this process in an exchange of letters in 44 between Cicero and his friend, Gaius Matius, who, as a mutual friend of Caesar's, had not only encouraged Cicero towards rapprochement after the civil war, but is even credited by Cicero as prompting him towards philosophical composition (*ut haec φιλοσοφούμενα scriberem tu me impulisti – Epistulae ad Familiares 348.5*). One can easily imagine that this earlier conversation would have pointed out the benefits of complimentary language towards Caesar in these philosophical works, which we see most clearly in *Brutus* (lxxi.249-lxxv.261).

---

<sup>135</sup> According to Phillips (1986:231), while Cicero respected Caesar as a stylist, seeking his approval of these works was important in the difficult political climate. Gurd (2007:58) argues that Cicero's principal objection to Caesar's stylistic ideology is that 'Caesar's canon is autocratic, Cicero's republican. Cicero suggests [in the *Brutus*] that texts are public because they are produced through a social process of revision, and this process defines the community that undertakes it. Where no collective revision exists, no community can exist either. Caesar's rhetoric refuses such processes, and hence refuses community.' While this certainly is an intriguing idea, this assessment is anachronistic, as it imposes monolithic personalities on both men, both of whom published within an environment which we have already seen was rather more complex. I would also argue that Cicero had more self-serving reasons for seeking collaborators, an aspect which Gurd ignores. Concerning their shared culture and interests, Montague (1992:573) points out, for example, that the artistry and canonical rhetoric of *Pro Ligario* served as a compliment to Caesar, who was presiding as judge in this case and was himself a forensic orator.

<sup>136</sup> Gurd (2007:65-66) argues that Cicero's initial hesitation concerning this work was the result of Caesar's non-collaborative style. I would argue that there was probably far more to Cicero's hesitancy than Caesar's literary opinions and working methods.

Just like Cicero, Caesar was aware of the benefits to glory that resulted from complimentary publication. This is why he did not tolerate libel, as becomes clear in *Ad Familiares* 237.2, written at the end of 46 by Cicero's friend and client, Aulus Caecina Severus. Caecina had written a 'very libelous' book<sup>137</sup> against Caesar during the war and questions in the letter why Caesar was angry with him for writing something to his displeasure, while he pardoned all those who often prayed for his destruction (*irascitur ei qui aliquid scripsit contra suam voluntatem cum ignorit omnibus qui multa deos venerati sint contra eius salutem*). The answer to this is obvious: words last, while people do not. Cicero tries to comfort his friend in letter 234.8, writing that 'in Caesar, we find a mild and merciful disposition, as portrayed in your excellent volume of Remonstrances'<sup>138</sup>. Moreover, he is remarkably partial to outstanding talents like your own' (*in Caesare haec sunt: mitis clemensque natura, qualis exprimitur praeclaro illo libro Querelarum tuarum. accedit quod mirifice ingeniis excellentibus, quale est tuum, delectatur*). This letter coincides with the publication of *Brutus*, so Cicero has some experience on which to base his judgment.

Even if propriety prevented Cicero from complimenting Caesar endlessly in writing, he could find proxies to serve this end. So, for example, in a letter written to Caesar himself at the end of 46, Cicero recommends Crassus' freedman Apollonius to Caesar, going on to say:

*doctum igitur hominem cognovi et studiis optimis deditum, idque a puero. nam domi meae cum Diodoto Stoico, homine meo iudicio eruditissimo, multum a puero fuit. nunc autem incensus studio rerum tuarum eas litteris Graecis mandare cupiebat. posse arbitror; valet ingenio, habet usum, iam pridem in eo genere studi litterarumque versatur, satis facere immortalitati laudum tuarum mirabiliter cupit.*

*Epistulae ad Familiares* 316.4

*I know him to be a scholar, devoted to liberal studies from boyhood. For he was much in my house from an early age with Diodotus the Stoic, a most erudite person in my opinion. Now his imagination has been captured by your career, and he wants to write an account of it in Greek. I think he can do it. He has a strong natural talent cultivated by practice, and has for a long time been engaged in this type of literary work. To do justice to your immortal fame is his passionate ambition.*

<sup>137</sup> According to Suetonius, *Julius* 75.5, who refers to it as a *crimosissimo libro*.

<sup>138</sup> Caecina had written a retraction, which seems to have had little effect at the time of writing the letter.

Whether or not this plan was originally intended by Apollonius, or cooked up by Cicero to flatter the dictator, the existence of the letter itself and the *posse arbitror* suggests that Cicero was keen to associate himself with efforts to promote Caesar's glory, not only for political expediency<sup>139</sup>, but because closer association with powerful men from famous families could only tend to his own credit and safety.

There is a similar focus in Cicero's relationship with Brutus. Several of the philosophical works (*Orator*, *Paradoxa Stoicorum*, *De Finibus*) are dedicated or addressed to Brutus, while he also features as a character in *Brutus*. We have already seen that any association with Brutus would have positive implications for dissemination, thereby benefiting Cicero's own glory. But what made the association particularly useful to Cicero was that he could use Brutus as an excuse to write about topics, such as the teaching of oratory, that could be censured or offend those whom Cicero did not wish to offend. An example of this line of reasoning occurs in *Orator*:

*occurrere enim posse reperiri non invidiosos solum quibus referta sunt omnia, sed fautores etiam laudum mearum, qui non censerent eius viri esse, de cuius meritis tanta senatus iudicia fecisset comprobante populo Romano quanta de nullo, de artificio dicendi litteris tam multa mandare. quibus si nihil aliud responderem nisi me M. Bruto negare roganti noluisse, iusta esset excusatio, cum et amicissimo et praestantissimo viro et recta et honesta petenti satis facere voluissem.*

*Orator* xli.140

*For the thought occurred to me that there might be found not only envious men – and the world is full of them – but even admirers of my success, who will think that it ill becomes one whose achievements have been praised more highly than those of any other man by the senate with the full approval of the Roman people to write so much about the technique of oratory. If I had no answer to make to these except that I am unwilling to refuse the request of Marcus Brutus, this would be a sufficient excuse; I should be*

---

<sup>139</sup> Murphy (1998:504) cites *Epistulae ad Atticum* (13:13-14) in which Cicero considers dedicating a work to Dolabella, concluding that the probable reason for this lies in Dolabella's close ties with Caesar. While I am arguing that association with the powerful would benefit Cicero's glory, I nevertheless acknowledge the very real need Cicero had to safeguard his position after Pompey's defeat, hence the attempts at flattery. Gurd (2007:74) argues that 'the fame Cicero aimed for implied more than being read by influential men. He wanted his texts corrected by them', which ties in with my argument that by associating himself with the powerful, he was avoiding criticism for writing about those aspects that would tend to his own glory.

*granting the just and honourable request of a very dear friend and a most distinguished man.*

Never one to pass up an opportunity for self-aggrandizement, Cicero cleverly engineers a compliment to himself, put into the mouths of his enemies and detractors, before distracting the reader with the famous name of Brutus, including the shared praenomen, emphasizing the connection between them with *amicissimo*, and then complimenting Brutus even further with *praestantissimo viro*. The compliments to Brutus also generally follow a pattern, emphasizing his knowledge, learning, and intelligence. Even in an early work such as the youthful *De Inventione* (II.lix.178), Cicero writes that praising a man's mind is honorable (*animi autem et laus honesta et vituperatione vehemens est*). Examples of this can be seen in *Orator* (x.34; xxxix.136; and lii.174) and *De Finibus* (III.ii.6), all of which coincidentally compare the erudition of two very erudite men, thereby emphasizing the connection.

Concerning Cato, we also see several attempts by Cicero to compliment his contemporary and members of his family. Apart from the examples already mentioned, we see Cicero mostly extend compliments to Cato by complimenting his illustrious great-grandfather and emphasizing the family relationship and similarities of character. So, for example, Cicero mentions a work by Archias praising Cato the Elder in *Pro Archia* (ix.22), saying that 'he exalted to heaven the Cato whose great-grandson is now with us; and great glory is added thereby to the name of the Roman people. The rule holds good in every case; the glory of universal Rome borrows an added lustre from those works which distinguish the bearers of great names' (*in caelum huius proavus Cato tollitur: magnus honos populi Romani rebus adiungitur. omnes denique illi ... non sine communi omnium nostrum laude decorantur*). Cicero also uses Cato the Elder as the principal speaker in *De Senectute*, which was also named after the elder statesman. He is mentioned once again in *De Amicitia* (i.4). All of these seem intended to flatter the family.

Of course, these glowing compliments to Cato and his ancestor were by no means unintentional. Cicero's true reasons for complimenting Cato through publication are revealed explicitly in *Ad Familiares* 110.11, written at the end of 51 from Cilicia to Cato himself. Cicero spends most of the letter giving a detailed and flattering account of his own administration of the province<sup>140</sup>. The

---

<sup>140</sup> For the uses of such writing, especially as it pertained to magnifying one's achievements and determining the accepted reality of one's administration outside of Rome, Osgood (2009) offers a useful study, focusing on Caesar, but including several comparisons with Cicero's description of his governorship.

purpose of doing so was to persuade Cato to vote in favour of a triumph to Cicero in the senate (*nunc velim sic tibi persuadeas, si de iis rebus ad senatum relatum sit, me existimaturum summam mihi laudem tributam si tu honorem meum sententia tua comprobaris*). As part of this persuasion, Cicero points out the services he had performed towards Cato through complimentary publication:

*a me autem haec sunt profecta, quae non ego in benefici loco pono sed in veri testimoni atque iudici, ut praestantissimas tuas virtutes non tacitus admirarer (quis enim id non facit?) sed in omnibus orationibus, sentiis dicendis, causis agendis, omnibus scriptis Graecis, Latinis, omni denique varietate litterarum mearum te non modo iis quos vidissemus sed etiam iis de quibus audissemus omnibus anteferrem.*

*Epistulae Ad Familiares 110.12*

*On my side there has been forthcoming this much (and I do not regard it as a favour but as testimony of a sincerely held opinion), that I have not confined myself to tacit admiration of your extraordinary qualities (that, after all, is universal), but have publicly exalted you beyond any man we have seen or of whom history tells us. This I have done in all my speeches, whether addressing the Senate or pleading in court, in all my writings, Greek or Latin, in fact throughout the entire range of my literary output.*

This reminder to Cato may well be our clearest evidence for Cicero's purpose in complimenting through publication. By doing so, over the course of many works, Cicero hoped to build up a certain amount of 'social capital' that he could then draw upon when required. Cicero even explains later in the letter that the reason for seeking the bauble of a triumph is that after the wrong suffered during his exile, he has been 'ambitious to receive tokens of esteem, the more flattering the better, from the Senate and People of Rome' (*idem post iniuriam acceptam ... studui quam ornatissima senatus populi que Romani de me iudicia intercedere* – 110.13). While we must measure this statement against Cicero's efforts to persuade Cato, it does perhaps reveal the psychology underlying Cicero's continuous efforts after his exile to promote his own glory through publication.

A final example of complimenting through publication to consider is the case of Cicero's lifelong professional rival, Quintus Hortensius Hortalus<sup>141</sup>. These compliments are mostly motivated by professional respect. Cicero praises Hortensius fulsomely at the end of *De Oratore*<sup>142</sup> (III.lxi.228-230), engineering the compliment through the characters of Catulus and Crassus, in which the former wishes that the 'young' Hortensius had been present at the fictional conversation as he is convinced that Hortensius 'will come to the top in all the accomplishments that you (Crassus) have included in oratory' (*ac vellem ut meus gener, sodalis tuus Hortensius affuisset; quem quidem ego confido omnibus istis laudibus quas tu oratione complexus es excellentem fore*). Cicero takes the compliment even further in the mouth of Crassus, who says that Hortensius has already achieved these things and that the young man 'lacks no gift of nature or of education' (*nihil enim isti adolescenti neque a natura neque a doctrina deesse sentio*) and that he is 'no ordinary orator, but one gifted with a very keen intelligence, ardent devotion to study, exceptional learning, and an unrivalled memory' (*non enim ille mediocris orator vestrae quasi succrescit aetati, sed et ingenio peracri et studio flagranti et doctrina eximia et memoria singulari*). Apart from the complimentary use of polysyndeton, and unlike the case with Cato, this description is highly flattering to someone who had already retired from public life<sup>143</sup>.

Since Cicero and Hortensius often worked as colleagues (*Pro Rabirio Postumo*, *Pro Murena*, *Pro Sulla*, and *Pro Milone*), this praise seems to be motivated by nothing more than professional courtesy. The same can be said for the lost *Hortensius* and the several compliments in *Brutus*<sup>144</sup> (i.1-2; xciv.324). However, we should bear in mind that any compliment to Hortensius was also automatically a compliment to Cicero, for their relationship and comparisons between them would always call to mind Cicero's famous victory over Hortensius in the case against Verres. From this and other examples it becomes clear that even when complimenting someone through publication, an eye was always kept firmly on what possible advantage to glory Cicero could gain from such publication.

---

<sup>141</sup> Dyck (2008:142-143) reminds us that, given the loss of Hortensius' works, we are forced to view him through a Ciceronian lense. He continues to argue that we 'need to be alive to the possibility that the portrait of Hortensius we have has been crafted in subtle ways to enhance Cicero's own image.' He summarises the relationship by pointing out that 'Hortensius was important for Cicero's self-image, in his youth as a yardstick against which to measure his progress, and in his maturity as a quasi-father figure whose approval he sought and valued' (2008:169).

<sup>142</sup> This seems to have been Cicero's attempt at making amends after an unspecified falling out with the older orator (Dyck 2008:163).

<sup>143</sup> Hortensius retired from politics in 61 after Pompey's return from the East, devoting himself to his work at the bar.

<sup>144</sup> Dyck (2008:167) points out that using Hortensius as *exemplum* in this work also served the twin purposes of pointing out the death of the republic and to deflect criticism of Cicero's own Asiatic oratorical style.

#### 4. Conclusion

Did Cicero publish to serve his glory (personal honour) or to serve the commonwealth (social responsibility)? As I have tried to show, the question centres on the decision to publish rather than the decision to write. However, especially in the correspondence, we have enough to suggest that Cicero always considered writing and publication to be inferior ways of ‘doing’ politics. In answering the question *cui bono*, I have therefore concluded that Cicero's decision to publish was motivated by his quest for personal glory, mostly as a form of rehabilitation after his exile. Publishing to serve the commonwealth was a secondary concern, mostly because the reasons Cicero gives serve as a defense against censure for writing about himself or on topics inimical to conservative Roman pragmatism. This manifests in the publication and circulation of that which was complimentary to his glory, while destroying or suppressing that which was not.

As we have seen in the letter to Cato, Cicero developed a hunger for personal glory after his exile. This hunger manifests in the decision to publish as Cicero confronted the limits to glory achieved through active politics and began experimenting with alternatives. As his publishing activity accelerated after Luca, Cicero and his contemporaries became increasingly aware of his growing achievement in this field and the glory and immortality that could be achieved through writing and publication. This powerful incentive motivated Cicero to seek glory through the recording of his political achievements in the works of others, such as Archias and Luceius, as well as works in Greek, before taking matters into his own hands with works like *De Consulatu Suo* and *De Temporibus Suis*. This process also included reciprocal dedications, as in the case of Varro, Caesar, and Brutus, where the weight of association would increase circulation and Cicero's glory.

These efforts often derived from a social context that not only encouraged reciprocal publication, but also seemed to require that the seeking of personal glory should contribute to the intellectual debate through the endorsement of peers. This led to Cicero's increasing habit of identifying himself as the author of his works in circulation, mostly as a result of his retirement from politics. It also offered Cicero multiple opportunities to refer readers to other works, thereby increasing demand and circulation, as well as bringing attention to literary works and political accomplishments he was particularly proud of. In addition, the prefaces to the theoretical and philosophical works constitute a parallel engagement with the reading public, both suggesting a reading programme, and functioning as a way to engage with critics.

These engagements mostly serve to justify writing about oratorical and philosophical subjects, giving reasons that suggest public-spirited motives for publication. The first of these involve indirect engagement with political adversaries, though mostly motivated by periods of political impotence. Philosophical publication, especially, allowed Cicero to comment on what he considered to be the degradation of political life, believing that philosophy would not only comment on causes but also suggest possible remedies. To this end, these works include denouncing his political enemies, offering strategic public compliments to rivals, rehabilitating his political position and that of his friends, creating or influencing the public record, and creating models for political conduct, hoping that shaming would help political circumstances and actors improve. However, by utilising the writing of philosophy as a political strategy, Cicero hoped to persuade readers and undermine critics of his publishing activity, thereby justifying content that was highly complimentary to himself and his past services to the state.

We have seen that another way in which Cicero dealt with his critics was to describe his publishing activity as fulfilling a didactic purpose. By describing himself as uniquely qualified to write about oratorical and philosophical topics, Cicero gains an opportunity for promoting his own learning and didactic preferences, as well as avoiding criticism through his adherence to the New Academy and its pragmatic approach to the truth. We see him publishing to indulge the requests of family and friends, including his brother, Atticus, Trebatius, and Brutus, thereby engineering opportunities for self-praise through his sympathetic characters and avoiding criticism, which such characters would not have put forward. We also see him insist that he publishes to improve the morals of the young and thereby assure the future of the state, thus tending to his credit and glory as a retired statesman. We also see him boasting that his writing includes material never before written about in Latin, encouraging not only himself and others to greater composition, but also writing in a ‘genre’ that was likely to be widely circulated, allowing himself and everyone involved to be read and immortalized.

Another reason Cicero gives for his publishing activity is the need to increase the availability of important works and ideas in Latin. By transferring rhetorical and philosophical learning from Greek to Latin, Cicero had ample opportunity to point out his own distinctions in these fields, thereby adding to his glory. Even when feigning to avoid praise, he uses the situation to point out his own achievements. By criticising those purists who preferred their philosophy in Greek, and by praising Romans as uniquely suited to the subject because of their superior virtues and noble historical antecedents, Cicero creates multiple opportunities to draw attention to his association with his own noble teachers, as well as his efforts to make philosophy truly Roman and create a technical

vocabulary for the subject, all of which contributed to his honour. In addition, by pointing out the relative dearth of works in Latin, Cicero seems to have motivated and inspired a flourishing of composition, all of which allowed his works to be read and circulated. Emphasizing that he was the first Roman author to expound philosophy competently in Latin also helped promote his glory through composition and publication.

Finally, we have seen that Cicero tended to extend praise through his publishing activity, not only hoping that the praise would be reciprocated, but to build up social capital that could be drawn upon when opportunities for increasing his glory presented themselves. While publishing speeches generally bore testament to his own skills as an orator, this activity was also intended to serve as a reminder to his noble clients of his efforts on their behalf, and to emphasize through association his relationships with some of Rome's most eminent families and individuals. In the theoretical and philosophical works, compliments to individuals and their illustrious ancestors, by including them as positive exempla or characters, as well as compliments to his own intimate circle, including his brother and Atticus, all seem to be calculated to serve Cicero's own glory through association. This practice of complimenting individuals such as Caesar, Cato, and Hortentius engineered compliments to himself, promoting circulation of his own works, and the development or reestablishment of friendly ties with those most likely to benefit Cicero's glory and political position. It also strengthened ties with those who would allow him to avoid censure for publishing on oratory and philosophy, or expressing dangerous opinions, most notably Brutus.

This thesis has argued that Cicero had excellent but also very complex reasons for publication. But *cui bono*? The answer to the question whether Cicero published to enhance his own glory or in support of the commonwealth cannot be a simplistic one. On balance, Cicero published as a response to circumstances that affected him profoundly. The most viable response was to try to influence future assessment of his efforts to cope with such circumstances. Enhancing his glory would therefore ensure a continuation of the reputation of his efforts beyond his own immediate future. If, in addition, publication supported the glory of the commonwealth, Cicero was also ensuring a future context in which his glory could flourish. Since Cicero's glory and the glory that is Rome was irrevocably linked, at least in Cicero's mind, publication with the aim to enhance his own glory, in the end, just as surely served to enhance the glory of the commonwealth.

## Reference List

**Primary Sources**

- Cicero. *Academica*. Translated by H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library, Cicero Volume XIX. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1933.
- Cicero. *Brutus*. Translated by G. L. Hendrickson. Loeb Classical Library, Cicero Volume V. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1939.
- Cicero. *De Amicitia*. Translated by W. A. Falconer. Loeb Classical Library, Cicero Volume XX. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1923.
- Cicero. *De Divinatione*. Translated by W. A. Falconer. Loeb Classical Library, Cicero Volume XX. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1923.
- Cicero. *De Fato*. Translated by H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library, Cicero Volume IV. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1942.
- Cicero. *De Finibus*. Translated by H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library, Cicero Volume XVII. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1914.
- Cicero. *De Inventione*. Translated by H.M. Hubbell. Loeb Classical Library, Cicero Volume II. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1949.
- Cicero. *De Legibus*. Translated by Clinton W. Keyes. Loeb Classical Library, Cicero Volume XVI. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1928.
- Cicero. *De Natura Deorum*. Translated by H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library, Cicero Volume XIX. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1933.
- Cicero. *De Officiis*. Translated by Walter Miller. Loeb Classical Library, Cicero Volume XXI. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1913.
- Cicero. *De Oratore I*. Translated by E. W. Sutton & H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library, Cicero Volume III. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1942.
- Cicero. *De Oratore II*. Translated by H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library, Cicero Volume IV. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1942.
- Cicero. *De Partitione Oratoria*. Translated by H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library, Cicero Volume IV. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1942.
- Cicero. *De Re Publica*. Translated by Clinton W. Keyes. Loeb Classical Library, Cicero Volume XVI. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1928.
- Cicero. *Epistulae ad Atticum I*. Translated by D.R. Shackleton Bailey. Loeb Classical Library, Cicero Volume XXII. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1999.

- Cicero. *Epistulae ad Atticum II*. Translated by D.R. Shackleton Bailey. Loeb Classical Library, Cicero Volume XXIII. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Cicero. *Epistulae ad Atticum III*. Translated by D.R. Shackleton Bailey. Loeb Classical Library, Cicero Volume XXIV. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Cicero. *Epistulae ad Atticum IV*. Translated by D.R. Shackleton Bailey. Loeb Classical Library, Cicero Volume XXIX. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Cicero. *Epistulae ad Familiares I*. Translated by D. R. Shackleton Bailey. Loeb Classical Library, Cicero Volume XXV. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Cicero. *Epistulae ad Familiares II*. Translated by D. R. Shackleton Bailey. Loeb Classical Library, Cicero Volume XXVI. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Cicero. *Epistulae ad Familiares III*. Translated by D. R. Shackleton Bailey. Loeb Classical Library, Cicero Volume XXVII. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Cicero. *Epistulae ad Quintum*. Translated by D. R. Shackleton Bailey. Loeb Classical Library, Cicero Volume XXVIII. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Cicero. *In Verrem I*. Translated by L.H.G. Greenwood. Loeb Classical Library, Cicero Volume VII. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1928.
- Cicero. *In Verrem II*. Translated by L.H.G. Greenwood. Loeb Classical Library, Cicero Volume VIII. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1935.
- Cicero. *Orator*. Translated by G. L. Hendrickson. Loeb Classical Library, Cicero Volume V. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1939.
- Cicero. *Paradoxa Stoicorum*. Translated by H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library, Cicero Volume IV. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1942.
- Cicero. *Philippica Secunda*. Translated by D. R. Shackleton Bailey. Loeb Classical Library, Cicero Volume XVa. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2010.
- Cicero. *Pro Archia*. Translated by N. H. Watts. Loeb Classical Library, Cicero Volume XI. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1923.
- Cicero. *Pro Cluentio*. Translated by H. Grose Hodge. Loeb Classical Library, Cicero Volume IX. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1927.
- Cicero. *Pro Murena*. Translated by C. Macdonald. Loeb Classical Library, Cicero Volume X. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- Cicero. *Pro Sestio*. Translated by R. Gardner. Loeb Classical Library, Cicero Volume XII. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1958.
- Cicero. *Pro Sulla*. Translated by C. Macdonald. Loeb Classical Library, Cicero Volume X. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1976.

- Cicero. *Topica*. Translated by H. M. Hubbell. Loeb Classical Library, Cicero Volume II. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1949.
- Cicero. *Tusculanae Disputationes*. Translated by J. E. King. Loeb Classical Library, Cicero Volume XVIII. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1927.
- Hesiod. *Theogony. Works and Days. Testimonia*. Translated by G.W. Most. Loeb Classical Library, Hesiod Volume I. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2007.
- Suetonius. *Lives of the Caesars*. Translated by J.C. Rolfe. Loeb Classical Library, Suetonius Volume I. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1914.

### Secondary Sources

- Allen, W. 1954. Cicero's Conceit. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 85:121-144.
- Astin, A.E. 1985. Cicero and the Censorship. *Classical Philology* 80(3):233-239.
- Barlow, J.J. 1987. The Education of Statesmen in Cicero's De Republica. *Polity* 19(3):353-374.
- Bell, A.J.E. 1997. Cicero and the Spectacle of Power. *The Journal of Roman Studies* 87:1-22.
- Benardete, S. 1987. Cicero's De Legibus I: Its Plan and Intention. *The American Journal of Philology* 108(2):295-309.
- Benario, H.W. 1957. Cicero's Marius and Caesar. *Classical Philology* 52(3):177-181.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1973. Cicero: Reipublicae amantissimus. *The Classical Journal* 69(1):12-20.
- Berry, D.H. 2004. The Publication of Cicero's Pro Roscio Amerino. *Mnemosyne Fourth Series* 57(1):80-87.
- Birt, T. 1882. *Das Antike Buchwesen*. Berlin: W. Hertz.
- Blyth, D. 2010. Cicero and Philosophy as Text. *The Classical Journal* 106(1):71-98.
- Carcopino, J. 1947. *Les Secrets de la correspondance de Cicéron*. Paris: L'Artisan du Livre.
- Clausen, W. 1986. Cicero and the New Poetry. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 90:159-170.
- Craig, C.P. 1990. Cicero's Strategy of Embarrassment in the Speech for Plancius. *The American Journal of Philology* 111(1):75-81.
- Crawford, J. 1984. *M. Tullius Cicero: The Lost and Unpublished Orations*. Göttingen. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Culham, P. 1989. Archives and Alternatives in Republican Rome. *Classical Philology* 84(2):100-115.
- Culham, P. 1991. Documents and Domus in Republican Rome. *Libraries & Culture* 26(1):119-134.

- D'Arms, J.H. 1972. Pro Murena 16 and Cicero's Use of Historical Exempla. *Phoenix* 26(1):82-84.
- Dickey, E. 1997. Me autem nomine appellabat: Avoidance of Cicero's Name in His Dialogues. *The Classical Quarterly* New Series 47(2):584-588.
- Dolganov, A. 2008. Constructing Author and Authority: Generic Discourse in Cicero's De Legibus. *Greece & Rome* Second Series 55(1):23-38.
- Dufallo, B. 2001. Appius' Indignation: Gossip, Tradition, and Performance in Republican Rome. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 131:119-142.
- Dugan, J. 2001. How to Make (and Break) a Cicero: Epideixis, Textuality, and Self-fashioning in the Pro Archia and In Pisonem. *Classical Antiquity* 20(1):35-77.
- Dyck, A.R. 2008. Rivals into Partners: Hortensius and Cicero. *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 57(2):142-173.
- Dyer, R.R. 1990. Rhetoric and Intention in Cicero's Pro Marcello. *The Journal of Roman Studies* 80:17-30.
- Dziatzko, K. 1894. Autor- und Verlagsrecht im Altertum. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* Neue Folge 49:559-576.
- Erskine, A. 2003. Cicero and the shaping of Hellenistic philosophy. *Hermathena* 175:5-15.
- Eyre, J.J. 1963. Roman Education in the Late Republic and Early Empire. *Greece & Rome* Second Series 10(1):47-59.
- Frazel, T.D. 2004. The Composition and Circulation of Cicero's In Verrem. *The Classical Quarterly* New Series 54(1):128-142.
- Gee, E. 2001. Cicero's Astronomy. *The Classical Quarterly* 51(2):520-536.
- Gibson, R. 2012. On the Nature of Ancient Letter Collections. *The Journal of Roman Studies* 102:56-78.
- Görler, W. 1988. From Athens to Tusculum: Gleaning the Background of Cicero's De Oratore. *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 6(3):215-235.
- Goodwin, J. 2001. Cicero's Authority. *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 34(1):38-60.
- Goold, G.P. 1961. A Greek Professorial Circle at Rome. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 92:168-192.
- Guite, H. 1962. Cicero's Attitude to the Greeks. *Greece & Rome* Second Series 9(2):142-159.
- Gunderson, E. 2007. S.V.B.; E.V. *Classical Antiquity* 26(1):1-48.
- Gurd, S. 2007. Cicero and Editorial Revision. *Classical Antiquity* 26(1):49-80.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2010. Verres and the Scene of Rewriting. *Phoenix* 64(1-2):80-101.
- Habinek, T.N. 1998. *The Politics of Latin Literature*. Princeton: Princeton University press.
- Hales, S. 2000. At Home with Cicero. *Greece & Rome* 47(1):44-55.

- Hall, J. 1994. Persuasive Design in Cicero's De Oratore. *Phoenix* 48(3):210-225.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1996. Social Evasion and Aristocratic Manners in Cicero's De Oratore. *The American Journal of Philology* 117(1):95-120.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1998. Cicero to Luceius (Fam. 5.12) in Its Social Context: Valde Bella. *Classical Philology* 93(4):308-321.
- Harrison, I. 2008. Catiline, Clodius, and Popular Politics at Rome During the 60s and 50s BCE. *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 51:95-118.
- Harrison, S.J. 1990. Cicero's De Temporibus Suis: The Evidence Reconsidered. *Hermes* 118(4):455-463.
- Jaeger, M. 2002. Cicero and Archimedes' Tomb. *The Journal of Roman Studies* 92:49-61.
- Jones, C.P. 1970. Cicero's Cato. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie Neue Folge* 113(2-3):188-196.
- Kaimio, J. 1979. *The Romans and the Greek Language*. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.
- Kenney, E.J. 1982. Books and readers in the Roman world. In Easterling, P.E. & Kenney, E.J. (eds). *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, 2:3-32. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kleberg, T. 1967. *Buchhandel und Verlagswesen in der Antike*. Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft Darmstadt.
- Krebs, C.B. 2009. A Seemingly Artless Conversation: Cicero's De Legibus (1.1-5). *Classical Philology* 104(1):90-106.
- Kries, D. 2003. On the Intention of Cicero's De Officiis. *The Review of Politics* 65(4):375-393.
- Laughton, E. 1961. Cicero and the Greek Orators. *The American Journal of Philology* 82(1):27-49.
- Laurence, R. 1994. Rumour and Communication in Roman Politics. *Greece & Rome* 41(1):62-74.
- Lavery, G.B. 1971. Cicero's 'Philarchia' and Marius. *Greece & Rome* 18(2):133-142.
- Levine, P. 1958. Cicero and the Literary Dialogue. *The Classical Journal* 53(4):146-151.
- Melchior, A. 2008. Twinned Fortunes and the Publication of Cicero's Pro Milone. *Classical Philology* 103(3):282-297.
- Mitchell, T.N. 1969. Cicero before Luca (September 57 – April 56 B.C.). *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 100:295-320.
- Montague, H.W. 1992. Advocacy and Politics: The Paradox of Cicero's Pro Ligario. *The American Journal of Philology* 113(4):559-574.
- Murphy, T. 1998. Cicero's First Readers: Epistolary Evidence for the Dissemination of His Works. *The Classical Quarterly* 48(2):492-505.
- Nicgorski, W. 1991. Cicero's Focus: From the Best Regime to the Model Statesman. *Political Theory* 19(2):230-251.

- Nicholson, J. 1994. The Delivery and Confidentiality of Cicero's Letters. *The Classical Journal* 90(1):33-63.
- O'Neill, P. 2003. Going Round in Circles: Popular Speech in Ancient Rome. *Classical Antiquity* 22(1):135-176.
- Ochs, D.J. 1989. Cicero and Philosophic Inventio. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 19(3):217-227.
- Osgood, J. 2009. The Pen and the Sword: Writing and Conquest in Caesar's Gaul. *Classical Antiquity* 28(2):328-358.
- Pauli, A.F. 1958. Letters of Caesar and Cicero to Each Other. *The Classical World* 51(5):128-132.
- Phillips, J.J. 1986. Atticus and the Publication of Cicero's Works. *The Classical World* 79(4):227-237.
- Plasberg, O. 1892. *De M. Tullii Ciceronis Hortensio Dialogo*. Leipzig. Gustav Fock.
- Powell, J. 2007. Cicero. *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies Supplement* 94:333-345.
- Rawson, E. 1972. Cicero the Historian and Cicero the Antiquarian. *The Journal of Roman Studies* 62:33-45.
- Robinson, A. 1994. Cicero's References to His Banishment. *The Classical World* 87(6):475-480.
- Robinson, E.A. 1951. The Date of Cicero's Brutus. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 60:137-146.
- Rowland, R.J. 1972. Cicero and the Greek World. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 103:451-461.
- Rubinelli, S. 2002. The Invention of the Young Cicero. *The Classical Quarterly New Series* 52(2):612-615.
- Ruch, M. 1958. L'Hortensius de Cicéron, histoire et reconstitution. *Revue des Études Anciennes* 61(3):489-490.
- Schmidt, P.L. 1979. Cicero's Place in Roman Philosophy: A Study of His Prefaces. *The Classical Journal* 74(2):115-127.
- Sommer, R. 1926. T. Pomponius und die Verbreitung von Ciceros Werken. *Hermes* 61:389-422.
- Starr, R.J. 1987. The circulation of literary texts in the Roman world. *The Classical Quarterly* 37(1):213-223.
- Steele, R.B. 1900. The Greek in Cicero's Epistles. *The American Journal of Philology* 21(4):387-410.
- Stem, R. 2006. Cicero as Orator and Philosopher: The Value of the Pro Murena for Ciceronian Political Thought. *The Review of Politics* 68(2):206-231.
- Striker, G. 1995. Cicero and Greek Philosophy. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 97:53-61.

- Summers, K. 1997. The Books of Phaedrus Requested by Cicero (Att. 13.39). *The Classical Quarterly* 47(1):309-311.
- Syme, R. 1939. *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- Thompson, C.L. 1980. Cicero's Editing of Mythographic Material in the *De Natura Deorum*. *The Classical Journal* 75(2):143-152.
- Welch, K.E. 1996. T. Pomponius Atticus: A Banker in Politics. *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 45(4):450-471.
- Wilcox, A. 2005a. Paternal Grief and the Public Eye: Cicero *Ad Familiares* 4.6. *Phoenix* 59(3-4):267-287.
- Zetzel, J.E.G. 1972. Cicero and the Scipionic Circle. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 76:173-179.