VII.—Cicero's Conceit

WALTER ALLEN, JR.
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

Many scholars would probably agree with the person mentioned in the lively little episode described by Cicero in *Har. resp.* 17. On that occasion this person did not suppress a groan when Cicero, taunted with his enforced absence from Rome, replied that he was the citizen of a state which had not been able to do without him:

> Vidi enim hesterno die quendam murmurantem, quem aiebant negare ferri me posse, quia, cum ab hoc eodem impurissimo parricida rogarer cuius essem civitatis, respondi me, probantibus et vobis et equitibus Romanis, esse eius quae carere me non potuisset. Ille, ut opinor, ingemuit.

Yet we cannot let the matter rest with this, for the two sentences just quoted are preceded by Cicero's claim to indulgence if he should be carried away emotionally while replying to insults: "Quamquam si me tantis laboribus pro communi salute perfunctum ecferret aliquando ad gloriam in refutandis maledictis hominum improborum animi quidam dolor, quis non ignosceret?" And later in the passage is the rhetorical question as to whether a statesman can properly reply to his opponents without self-praise: "Potest quisquam vir in rebus magnis cum invidia versatus satis graviter inimici contumeliis sine sua laude respondere?" This passage alone, therefore, strongly suggests that Cicero was here following a recognized code of etiquette, which naturally differs from the standard of modesty of modern times. We thus have before us a twofold problem, the extent to which self-esteem was socially acceptable in Rome, and the question of whether Cicero exceeded the bounds of propriety in self-laudation.

One factor which renders our problem difficult is the fact that the evidence has to be drawn from such a variety of Ciceronian sources. The passages from the orations have to be regarded differently from those in the letters, and the reader must also distinguish among the letters to various recipients and at the several stages of Cicero's career. Especially useful is the information we can derive from the various treatises, because there Cicero was

trying to generalize and because there he perhaps comes closest to informing us about contemporary attitudes and manners. 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.

"Vanity" is the word commonly applied to one who preens himself on beauty or wealth; or on family, as the Romans so often did. I should partly agree with Tyrrell and Purser in their edition of the correspondence, when they wrote (1[3].36): "That vanity and self-laudation, which is so repugnant to our sense of fitness, was a vice not only of the man but also of the age, though no doubt he was vain to a degree conspicuous even then." Kroll is more to the point when he indicates how very vain all the senators were,[1] for I know of no evidence to show that Cicero was more vain than his contemporaries. I should also observe that Cicero was at least conscious of this failing in others when he invented the terms Appius-ness and Lentulus-ness to apply to two men who possessed proud names (*Fam.* 3.7.5).

G. Ferrero wrote[2]: "He [Cicero] was one of those unusual characters rarely to be found even in the world of thought and of letters, who have no ambition for power, no thirst for wealth, but merely the far nobler desire, whatever the vanity which it implies, to become the objects of admiration." Ferrero, although he fails to add that Cicero desired admiration for his good deeds rather than for himself, does remark (188 f.) that Cicero's contemporaries had the same weaknesses, vacillation, and inconsistencies as Cicero, but that he has exposed them to our view.[3]

I should agree with the statements of Petersson, with only the regret that he did not present documentation[4]:

[1] W. Kroll, *Die Kultur der ciceronischen Zeit* (Leipzig 1933) 1.19–23, 32–44. Kroll shows the evidence that other people in Cicero's day thought well of themselves. Using the running title "Senatorisches Selbstgefühl" (1.21) he points out (1.19) that outside Rome a leading senator was "ein Wesen höherer Ordnung," and on 1.23 he adds "dass man auch in Rom selbst im Senator ein höheres Wesen erblickte."

[2] G. Ferrero, *The Greatness and Decline of Rome*, translated by A. E. Zimmern and Rev. H. J. Chaytor (New York 1909) 3.189 f.

[3] Cf. Petrarch, *Fam.* 24.3, who also shares the modern attitude towards Cicero's vanity and frailties.

[4] T. Petersson, *Cicero: A Biography* (Berkeley 1920) 356 f. On 288 f., 291 f., 352–60, Petersson is chiefly discussing Cicero's autobiographical writings and his attitude towards fame.

Cicero had of course the confidence in his own powers that invariably accompanies genius, and he took the delight in applause and praise that is equally inseparable from the ability to sway great multitudes, whether it be by word or by song or by acting. He knew this, and laughed about it with Atticus. But his so-called vanity went no further. He had done a great service to Rome; he had been made to suffer through political terrorism and had been gloriously vindicated; he was one of Rome's greatest men, and owed this to his own ability and tireless efforts; and he was conscious of having performed unselfish public service. His contemporaries, except those who were his pronounced enemies, admitted this, and there is no sign that any one of them thought that he wrote or spoke too much about himself.

Petersson also commented that Atticus had favored Cicero's autobiographical writing.[5]

Carcopino, in a subsection of his book entitled "Morbid Vanity,"[6] can find little to object to even though his book is in the nature of an exposé. This subsection really objects only to Cicero's glorification of his consulship, a matter we shall go into presently. Carcopino has to strain the evidence to find anything else objectionable; he is in error, for example, when he tries to regard Cicero's proconsular activities as petty, for Syme has shown that Cilicia was an important province when Cicero was proconsul there.[7] Carcopino also deliberately refused to see that Cicero was joking about the obscurity of the Pindenissitae whom he had conquered (*Att.* 5.20.1).

Drumann was of course very severe with Cicero, although the passages about Cicero in later Roman writers (cited by Drumann) tend to praise him.[8] In 6.376–84 Drumann-Groebe presented an excellent collection of passages about Cicero's views on fame, except that to Cicero's views on fame have been added the passages about Cicero's regard for the good opinion of his contemporaries.

I presume, in my collection of passages, that we do not wish to

[5] Th. Zielinski, *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte*[3] (Leipzig and Berlin 1912) 142, on the basis of *Att.* 13.13.1, remarks that a proper value of one's own talents is a first principle of human life. Then he goes on to comment that we should observe, in regard to Cicero's vanity, that there was ample cause in the fact that he was a man whose career had been devoted to the cultivation of his own talents. On p. 327 (note to p. 142) he compares *Att.* 13.13.1 with a somewhat reminiscent sentiment in Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 9.8.6.

[6] J. Carcopino, *Cicero: The Secrets of his Correspondence*, trans. E. O. Lorimer (London 1951) 1.249–52.

[7] R. Syme, "Observations on the Province of Cilicia," *Anatolian Studies Presented to W. H. Buckler* (Manchester 1939) 299–332.

[8] W. Drumann-P. Groebe, *Geschichte Roms* 6.497 f.

accuse Cicero of conceit when he speaks in terms which would not have had that connotation to his contemporaries. All the noble Romans were concerned about their *dignitas*, for example.[9] Remarks about *virtus* would have seemed only the usual sort of thing to be expected from a senator.[10] The stress on *industria* was practically the trademark of the new man.[11]

Among the words the Romans commonly used to denote boasting were *laus* and *laudare*, of course; and *gloria* belongs to a different classification, as will presently be discussed. But *gloriari* has a less elevated tone than *gloria* (*Att.* 1.16.8; *Dom.* 92; *Prov. cons.* 44; *Off.* 1.77 f.), while Quintilian's words *iactatio* and *iactator* (*Inst.* 11.1.15, 17) seem less usual in Cicero's day. Cicero used such words as *adrogo* (*Phil.* 7.8), *adrogantia* (*Div. Caec.* 36; *Orat.* 132), *adrogans* (*Leg. agr.* 2.2), *adroganter* (*Off.* 1.2), *adrogantius* (*Phil.* 12.21), *praedicare* (*Att.* 5.21.7; *Fam.* 5.13.5; *Dom.* 92; *Off.* 1.137), and *gloriosius praedicare* (*Dom.* 93), while *inanis* could be used in various forms and modifications for the person who was vain (*Att.* 2.17.2; *Ad Brut.* 1.3.2; cf. *Att.* 6.9.2). We perhaps can also find *levitas* with this connotation (*Att.* 2.5.2, where it is an emendation), although *vanitas* means something else.

The subject of Cicero's attitude towards *gloria* has been so well treated in recent years[12] that there is no need to go into the matter extensively here. It is almost enough just to say that Cicero's views on *gloria* have nothing to do with the petty personal vanity

[9] H. Wegehaupt, *Die Bedeutung und Anwendung von dignitas in den Schriften der republikanischen Zeit* (Breslau 1932); Kroll (above, note 1) 1.64; R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford 1939), *passim*, see index. It will be observed that I am taking a different approach from that of R. S. Conway who thought that one could evaluate Cicero's "complacency" at various periods by "counting the occurrences of the Plural of Dignity in the letters": *New Studies of a Great Inheritance* (London 1921) 13–17.

[10] E. W. Webster, *"Virtus" and "Libertas": The Ideals and Spirit of the Roman Senatorial Aristocracy from the Punic Wars through the Time of Augustus* (Chicago 1936); Syme (above, note 9) 57, 146, 157, 206, 490.

[11] M. Gelzer, *Die Nobilität der römischen Republik* (Leipzig and Berlin 1912) 22, n. 7; H. Strasburger, "Novus Homo," *RE* 17 (1937) 1226 f.

[12] F. A. Sullivan, "Cicero and Gloria," *TAPA* 72 (1941) 382–91; J. J. Sullivan, "Consecratio in Cicero," *CW* 37 (1943/44) 157–59; A. D. Leeman, *Gloria; Cicero's waardering van de roem en haar achtergrond in de Hellenistische wijsbegeerte en de Romeinse samenleving* (Rotterdam 1949). In a wider vein we should also refer to U. Knoche, "Der römische Ruhmesgedanke," *Philologus* 89 (1934) 102–24; U. Knoche, "Magnitudo animi," *Philologus* Suppl. 27.3 (1935) chap. 5: "Die stoisch-republikanische Prägung der magnitudo animi als einer Adelstugend"; J. C. Plumpe, "Roman Elements in Cicero's Panegyric on the *Legio Martia*," *CJ* 36 (1940/41) 275–89.

we are investigating. His 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.

Glory was the reward for great deeds (*De or.* 3.13 f.), the sort of thing that was meant when the elder Curio termed Cicero's consulship an apotheosis (*Att.* 1.16.13; the interpretation of the passage favored by L.-A. Constans in the Budé edition). Although Cicero admitted that he had always been avid of praise (*Arch.* 14; *Att.* 1.15.1), he wrote to Cato that he had not pursued glory itself so much as the course of conduct which would produce true glory (*Fam.* 15.4.13); and he also wanted such heraldings as a poem from Archias because he was more concerned with the opinion of history and of posterity than with contemporary comment (*Arch.* 28–31; *Att.* 2.5.1).

The concrete quality of *gloria* is aptly shown by Cicero's attitude towards his provincial governorship. One gains the impression that he was more concerned with his own reputation as an administrator than he was with good administration as an abstract ideal, for he was anxious to leave the province after he estimated that he had obtained glory, preferring to follow the model of Scaevola (who had remained in Asia only nine months) rather than to endure the possibility of a diminution of his fame (*Att.* 5.17.2, 5; *Fam.* 2.11.1).

It is also valuable to observe from the correspondence an instance of the desire for *gloria* by someone other than Cicero. In May of 43 Lentulus gave a list of his own achievements to Cicero. He then went on to request some *gloria* from the senate and the people as a stimulus for himself and for others. When Lentulus gave this full category of his own good deeds and entered a request for "aliqua gloria iusta et merita" (*Fam.* 12.14.6 f.), he meant that he was in search of specific honors which would assist his present standing and his future reputation, both of them objects which a Roman statesman was always frankly interested in furthering.

We must next consider what we can observe of contemporary amenities with regard to admiration of one's own talents. We should expect that one would have to be modest about his oratorical abilities in the course of actual speeches, and such was the case. It is perhaps surprising to find that in *Div. Caec.* 40–43, although Cicero was mock-modest about his abilities, he frankly contrasted

his energetic study and practice of the art with Caecilius' inexperience.[13]

In *Div. Caec.* 36 Cicero took more the line we should expect by stating that he would not claim any talent, even if he had it, for boasting of eloquence is odious:

> Intellego quam scopuloso difficilique in loco verser; nam cum omnis adrogantia odiosa est, tum illa ingeni atque eloquentiae multo molestissima. Quam ob rem nihil dico de meo ingenio; neque est quod possim dicere, neque si esset dicerem; aut enim id mihi satis est quod est de me opinionis, quidquid est, aut, si id parum est, ego maius id commemorando facere non possum.

The circumstances of the speech for Archias dictated that he should take a somewhat different line (*Arch.* 1):

> Si quid est in me ingeni, iudices, quod sentio quam sit exiguum, aut si qua exercitatio dicendi, in qua me non infitior mediocriter esse versatum, aut si huiusce rei ratio aliqua ab optimarum artium studiis ac disciplina profecta, a qua ego nullum confiteor aetatis meae tempus abhorruisse, earum rerum omnium vel in primis hic A. Licinius fructum a me repetere prope suo iure debet.

Cicero says that his talents are modest in *Caecin.* 64: "mihi, non copioso homini ad dicendum"; in *Mur.* 29: "nunc nihil de me dico, sed de eis qui in dicendo magni sunt aut fuerunt"; in *Phil.* 2.2: "in hac mea mediocritate ingeni"; and in *Phil.* 7.8: "quantuscumque sum — nihil enim mihi adrogo."[14] He varies the theme slightly in *Balb.* 1: "Quae sunt igitur meae partes? Auctoritatis tantae quantam vos in me esse voluistis, usus mediocris, ingeni minime voluntati paris."

It was expected also that one would introduce with an apology remarks which had to be made about oneself. When he has to come to this topic in *Planc.* 24, Cicero says: "timide dicam, sed tamen dicendum est."[15] In *Sest.* 31 Cicero asked pardon if he seemed to speak of himself too much: "Ac si in exponendis vulneribus illis de me ipso plura dicere videbor, ignoscitote." On much the same theme we find in *Vatin.* 9 f. that Cicero prefers not to speak of himself but to abide by what *boni viri* think of him; and in *Phil.* 14.17 we find he had spoken of himself for other reasons than just to speak in his own behalf, because he would have been badly off indeed if it had been necessary to justify himself to the senators.

[13] Cf. similar claims of energetic literary study in *Arch.* 1, 12 f.
[14] Cf. *Arch.* 13.
[15] Cf. *Sull.* 80.

It is more surprising to find the same sort of apology in letters, although they are letters of the more formal sort. In *Fam.* 5.13.5 he includes an apology for writing of himself: "Ignosces mihi de me ipso aliquid praedicanti"; in *Fam.* 6.21.2 he wrote: "Haec scripsi, non ut de me ipse dicerem"; in *Ad Brut.* 1.3.2 f.: "Sed haec te malo ab aliis" (after he has said everything himself); and in *Ad Brut.* 1.15.6: "Longa sunt, quae restant, praetereunda; sunt enim de me." Cicero had even written the same sort of thing in *Att.* 5.17.2: "etsi hoc te ex aliis audire malo." This formula is discussed by Tyrrell and Purser, 6^2.58.

We can be reassured that we have found a point of Roman etiquette here, since the same kind of apology is found in other works. In *Orat.* 106, in speaking of the new fashion of oratory he had introduced, Cicero wrote: "easque [*sc.* auris] nos primi, quicumque eramus et quantulumcumque dicebamus, ad huius generis [dicendi] audiendi incredibilia studia convertimus." In *Orat.* 130 he said his orations showed the limits of his powers: "Quae qualiacumque in me sunt — me [enim] ipsum paenitet quanta sint — sed apparent in orationibus. . . ." In *Orat.* 132 he wrote that he would claim real talent for arousing the minds of an audience, but he added: "dicerem perfectum, si ita iudicarem, nec in veritate crimen arrogantiae extimescerem." In *Nat. deor.* 1.12 he says of a *facultas* that he had not attained it but that he had pursued it. In *Tusc.* 4.52 there is a becoming reluctance (of Cicero?) to assert that he had done something *fortiter* in the state. In *Acad. pr.* 3 he declined to praise Lucullus in one connection because it would have been necessary to mention himself at the same time: ". . . nisi de me ipso dicendum esset, quod hoc tempore non est necesse. Itaque privabo potius illum debito testimonio quam id cum mea laude communicem."

This section of our investigation allows us to conclude that there also prevailed in ancient times the modern notion that one should not speak of himself, and that an apology was necessary if one did. It follows that, since Cicero was aware of this standard of conduct, he must have had reasons for not following it upon occasion, and those reasons must have seemed adequate to his contemporaries. There is excellent evidence for this conclusion in a passage quoted in part in the preceding paragraph; quoted in full it demonstrates that Cicero regarded himself as an artist in the matter of playing

upon the minds of his audience:[16] "Nullo enim modo animus audientis aut incitari aut leniri potest, qui modus a me non temptatus sit, — dicerem perfectum, si ita iudicarem, nec in veritate crimen arrogantiae extimescerem."

A moment's reflection will convince the reader that a successful orator, which Cicero certainly was, would regard it as lunacy to say anything which would tend to alienate the sympathies of the jury or of the audience. Cicero was, so far as we can judge, even more careful than his contemporaries in the matter of consistency with accepted *mores*. I cannot believe that he would 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.

In fact Cicero recommended in *Inv. rhet.* 1.22 the attempt to win *benevolentia* by reference to one's own qualities: "si de nostris factis et officiis sine arrogantia dicemus"; likewise in *Partit. orat.* 28: "aut meritis nostris aut dignitate aut aliquo genere virtutis et maxime liberalitatis, officii, iustitiae, fidei, contrariisque rebus in adversarios conferendis." This latter passage is, of course, reminiscent of the *fortunarum contentio* which we shall find in *Pis.* 51, *Phil.* 2.10–20. In *De or.* 2.209 f. Antonius gives us a variant of this approach when he is discussing how to stir up *invidia* against others and how to allay it in one's own case. There (2.210) he recommends the approach, used frequently in Cicero's orations, of showing how one's own good fortune had not been unmixed: "omninoque perficiendum est . . . ut haec opinio minuatur et illa excellens opinione fortuna cum laboribus et miseriis permixta [esse] videatur."

It was, of course, permissible to speak of personal glories in self-defense. In *Att.* 2.23.3 Cicero wrote that he had been staying out of public affairs and devoting himself to court oratory, with consequent reference to, and regret for, the days when he had guided the destinies of the state: "Ex quo, quod facile intellegi possit, in multa commemoratione earum rerum quas gessimus desiderioque versamur." In addition to the passage from *Har. resp.* 17 with which this paper opened we can produce some passages from *De domo sua* which give us a concrete example of how this sort of defense was

[16] *Orat.* 132; cf. F. Solmsen, "Aristotle and Cicero on the Orator's Playing upon the Feelings," *CP* 33 (1938) 390–404.

treated. In two places in that oration Cicero stated that he spoke of his own glories only when compelled to do so:

Et quoniam hoc reprehendis, quod solere me dicas de me ipso gloriosius praedicare, quis umquam audivit cum ego de me nisi coactus ac necessario dicerem? . . . Ego vero etiam rei publicae semper interesse putavi me illius pulcherrimi facti . . . splendorem verbis dignitatemque retinere (*Dom.* 93 f.);

Dicendum igitur est id, quod non dicerem nisi coactus, — nihil enim umquam de me dixi sublatius adsciscendae laudis causa potius quam criminis depellendi . . . (*Dom.* 96).[17]

Not only was it permissible to speak of one's own achievements in order to maintain their greatness and rightness against vicious attack, but it was also permissible to go into a personal narrative publicly under some other circumstances. In *Pis.* 2–7, 51 f., we have an account of Cicero's accomplishments and honors to date, and we can only conclude that this was the thing to do in order to win the favor of the auditors. The special point about this extended personal narrative is that in paragraph 51 we find the phrase *fortunarum contentionem*, which shows that Cicero was not so much defending his own career against defamation as he was undertaking a comparison of his career with Piso's, to his own advantage of course.

Not only was this a technique which we found recommended in the rhetorical works, but we can even supply another example of the same technique from *Phil.* 2.10–20. The pattern is neatly set in the way this passage opens, for *Phil.* 2.10 admonishes the fictitious audience to remember Cicero's usual restraint even though now he must speak for his consulship of 63 and against Antony's of 44:

Sed cum mihi, patres conscripti, et pro me aliquid et in M. Antonium multa dicenda sint, alterum peto a vobis ut me pro me dicentem benigne, alterum ipse efficiam ut, contra illum cum dicam, attente audiatis. Simul illud oro: si meam cum in omni vita tum in dicendo moderationem modestiamque cognostis, ne me hodie, cum isti, ut provocavit, respondero, oblitum esse putetis mei.

There is one further apology for speaking of one's own deeds, a kind of apology which might not occur to a modern statesman. Cicero said that if he did not defend his great consulship when it was assailed, it might have been thought that his

[17] Cf. *Sull.* 80.

achievements had been fortuitous or accidental. We might not be inclined to take this sort of apology seriously except that we find that Cicero used it under varied circumstances. It occurs in the letter to Metellus Celer (*Fam.* 5.2.8), where Cicero is stating why he resisted the attacks of Metellus Nepos as tribunus plebis in 62. There he states that lack of resistance would have discredited him: "quis esset qui me in consulatu non casu potius existimaret quam consilio fortem fuisse?" In the same year Cicero said much the same thing in *Sull.* 83: "ego sim tam demens, ego committam ut ea quae pro salute omnium gessi, casu magis et felicitate a me quam virtute et consilio gesta esse videantur?" In 60 he even wrote the same sort of thing privately to Atticus (*Att.* 1.20.3): "Reliqua sic a me aguntur et agentur ut non committamus ut ea quae gessimus fortuito gessisse videamur."

It was, on the other hand, bad form to boast. In addition to the passage in *Div. Caec.* 36 in which Cicero deplored the expression of pride in eloquence, we should also note that he advised his son that one should beware of sounding off like the boastful soldier (*Off.* 1.137): "Deforme etiam est de se ipsum praedicare, falsa praesertim, et cum inrisione audientium imitari militem gloriosum." Cicero naturally wrote freely to his brother of the fame of both of them and of their temple and monument for which there had been contemplated contributions from Quintus' province (*Q. fr.* 1.1.26, 28, 38, 41, 43 f.); yet when proconsul himself he took an inverse pride in declining every statue, shrine, and *quadrigae* (*Att.* 5.21.7). He was interested by the report of Appius Claudius' *propylon* at Eleusis, but he feared Atticus might think him gauche if he erected one in Athens at the Academy (*Att.* 6.1.26). Atticus approved of the project, rather to Cicero's astonishment (*Att.* 6.6.2).

Much can be made by modern authors of Cicero's lictors and the laurelled fasces they bore from the proconsulship through most of 47 B.C. Seldom is mention made of the fact that Cicero had been hesitant in seeking a triumph, urged on by his friends and by the thought that he would be denigrating his own campaign if he did not try for one in the event that the do-nothing Bibulus[18] sought one (*Att.* 6.6.4, 6.8.5, 7.2.6 f.). He considered the expense involved in holding a triumph, and he assured Atticus that he would be neither silly in seeking one nor stolid in rejecting it (*Att.* 6.9.2).

[18] R. Y. Tyrrell and L. C. Purser, *The Correspondence of Cicero* 4².98, believed that Cicero was unjust in his estimate of Bibulus' achievements.

In *Orat.* 104 Cicero expressed himself as such a perfectionist that he was so far from marvelling at his own works that he was also prepared to find fault with Demosthenes: "Nec enim nunc de nobis, sed de re dicimus; in quo tantum abest ut nostra miremur, et usque eo difficiles ac morosi sumus, ut nobis non satis faciat ipse Demosthenes." We might here recall the story in Plut. *Cic.* 35.3 that Cicero was so anxious not to be outdone by Hortensius, when they and Crassus were defending Murena, that he stayed awake all night making his preparations, with the result that he was not at his best in his performance. Cicero was not vain about his philosophical works (cf. *Att.* 12.52.3, 13.10.1), except as regards their style: "nitorem orationis nostrum, si modo is est aliquis in nobis" (*Att.* 13.19.5; cf. *Off.* 1.2); and he was even willing to yield to Quintus the palm for poetic composition (*Q. fr.* 2.15.4, 3.4.4, 3.5 & 6.4).

Vanity of the oppressive type usually ascribed to Cicero would have had to be entirely humorless. Yet Cicero was a wit and saw his own failings just as clearly as he saw other people's. Let us begin with his comment that no poet or orator ever recognized superior talent in another (*Att.* 14.20.3): "Nemo umquam neque poeta neque orator fuit qui quemquam meliorem quam se arbitraretur." He also said (*Planc.* 35) that he did not mind having other people's jokes fathered on him provided they were worthy of him. In *Att.* 1.16.15 Cicero wryly said that, since he had no hope of poems from Thyillus and Archias,[19] he would be content with the epigram which Atticus accorded Cicero's statue (or bust) in Atticus' Amaltheum.[20]

In the famous passage where Cicero wrote (*Att.* 2.17.2) that he was now relieved to know that posterity would think better of him than Pompey, he preceded that remark with the statement that perhaps the thought was foolish of him (*subinane*) and avid of glory, but that it was wise to know one's own faults ("bellum est enim sua vitia nosse"). Carcopino (above, note 6) deliberately distorted the meaning of the passage in *Att.* 5.20.1 by taking it seriously, whereas Cicero was joking about the obscurity of the Pindenissitae whom he conquered in Cilicia.

Cicero had also been pleased that, when he was in his province

[19] Cf. J. H. Taylor, "Political Motives in Cicero's Defense of Archias," *AJP* 73 (1952) 62–70, who finds a connection in thought between the speech and Cicero's letter to Pompey (*Fam.* 5.7) which will be discussed later in this paper.

[20] F. G. Moore, "Cicero's Amaltheum," *CP* 1 (1906) 121–26.

in 51, people were anxious to see him because they remembered his accomplishments in 63. Yet he had the humor to indicate to Caelius only part of what the bystanders said, on the assumption that Caelius would be able to fill out for himself the rest of the familiar theme (*Fam.* 2.10.2): ". . . quadam auctoritate apud eos, qui me non norant, nominis nostri; multum est enim in his locis: 'Hicine est ille, qui urbem? quem senatus?' nosti cetera."

Cicero also admitted to Atticus that he was aware that Atticus knew that Cicero liked being praised (*Att.* 15.7): "Gratum quod mihi epistulas; quae quidem me delectarunt, in primis Sexti nostri. Dices, 'quia te laudat.' Puto me hercule id quoque esse causae, sed tamen etiam ante quam ad eum locum veni, valde mihi placebat. . . ." In *Q. fr.* 2.15.5, when he asked Quintus to tell him precisely what Caesar thought about his poem, Cicero admitted that his opinion of himself would not thereby be diminished: "Nihil est quod vereare; ego enim ne pilo quidem minus me amabo."

We might also well look at some passages where Cicero frankly expressed pride without any humor or any qualification such as the excuse of self-defense. Sometimes he was following in a tradition, as when in *Leg. agr.* (2.1–5, 100) he remarked that he could not praise his ancestors, as was customary for the nobles at the beginning of their year of office. Instead he did what was possible for the occasional new man who was elected to high magistracy, he praised his own industry and merits; and Cicero added the special circumstance that he had been elected to the consulship at the earliest legal age and without repulse, and in a sweeping victory.

In 61 Cicero expressed pleasure at the fact that the jurors at Clodius' trial spontaneously rose to protect him from immediate harm (*Att.* 1.16.4), and he was later delighted that he and Pompey were the two whose retention at Rome was regarded by the senate as imperative when *legati* were being selected to be sent to treat with the Gauls (*Att.* 1.19.2 f.). The Nones of December remained for him a great day to live up to (*Att.* 1.19.6; *Flac.* 102), and the date of a letter was enough to recall to Cicero that on the last day of his consulship in 63 he had been as Great as Pompey (*Att.* 6.1.22). Marcus Brutus once, when he was irked by Cicero, expressed weariness at constantly hearing about the Nones of December (*Ad Brut.* 1.17.1).[21]

[21] If the reader is interested by Cicero's recalling of specific days, he should also note particularly Cicero's recollection of the *pugna Bovillana* in which Clodius had been slain: *Att.* 5.13.1.

We should also add that there are passages in which, while Cicero mentions his own great deeds, his emphasis is not so much upon the deeds as upon the fact that they compelled him so to regulate his conduct as to live up to his own past greatness, either as savior of the city (*Att.* 1.20.3, 9.10.3)[22] or as the author of the treatise on the state (*Att.* 5.13.1, 6.3.3, 7.3.2, 8.11.1). Similarly, in *Att.* 7.3.3 he was reminded of the standard of conduct expected of him by the inscription of the statuette of Minerva he had dedicated just before he left Rome in 58.

As a literary man Cicero was fully aware of his own worth, as is noted in some detail by W. Drumann-P. Groebe, *Geschichte Roms* 6.543 f. He thought highly of the *Orator*, in fact he was willing to stake his reputation as a judge of oratory on it (*Fam.* 6.18.4). In the same work (*Orat.* 108) he claimed that he had written more speeches than any Greek orator had, and also with varied tones. Cicero also wrote his son that he could improve his Latin style (*oratio Latina*) by reading his father's orations and philosophical works (*Off.* 1.2 f.).

We should be able to use a group of passages from the letters to Atticus as a criterion of the latitude of allowable self-praise. The most significant passage is probably the first (*Att.* 1.16.8), in which we learn that Cicero felt that it was not overstepping the bounds of propriety to speak of himself in a strictly private letter to Atticus: "non enim mihi videor insolenter gloriari cum de me apud te loquor, in ea praesertim epistula quam nolo aliis legi." In *Att.* 1.19.10 Cicero, feeling that perhaps he was going too far now that he had in hand a third work praising himself and the year 63, entered the plea that the intention was historical and not encomiastic. In *Att.* 1.20.6 (cf. *Att.* 2.1.1 f.) he expressed satisfaction with the literary quality of his Greek memoir on his consulship.

In *Att.* 2.1.3, when sending his consular orations to Atticus, Cicero remarked that he had written them to satisfy the studious interest of the young and that he had dispatched the group to Atticus because of his pleasure in Cicero's deeds as well as in his oratory. He is there careful to state that he would not have sent the speeches except upon request: "et quoniam te cum scripta tum res meae delectant, isdem ex libris perspicies et quae gesserim et quae dixerim; aut ne poposcisses; ego enim tibi me non offerebam."

[22] A. Alföldi, "Die Geburt der kaiserlichen Bildsymbolik: 2. Der neue Romulus; 3. Parens patriae," *MusHelv* 8 (1951) 190–215, 9 (1952) 204–43, 10 (1953) 103–24, 11 (1954) 133–69.

Much later, when describing to Atticus the second version of the *Academica* (*Att.* 13.13.1), he remarked that the work was better than the Greeks', unless he was deceived by ordinary human self-esteem.

When Cicero was writing that his proconsulship did not cause any trouble to the provincials, he also felt compelled to remark that he hoped that Atticus was not troubled by the recital of the good deeds to which he had encouraged Cicero (*Att.* 5.21.7): "nec sum in ulla re alia molestus civitatibus — sed fortasse tibi qui haec praedicem de me. Perfer, si me amas; tu enim me haec facere voluisti."

We can also learn something about the etiquette of the day by observing conduct when friendships were strained. The reader will recall the instance when Cicero, finding that Atticus was annoyed enough to remind him of past services, felt compelled to stress that he respected Atticus' way of life and believed it to be as valuable and creditable as his own (*Att.* 1.17.5 f.). Under those circumstances we can be quite sure that even the famous friendship of Cicero and Atticus would never have weathered the storms of troubled times if Cicero had been given to self-importance of the variety which would tend to regard other people as insignificant.

One item which is certain to arise in a discussion of Cicero's conceit is the famous letter to Pompey about the great deeds of 63. The nature and the purpose of this letter are easily misunderstood, and students are all too ready to forgive Pompey's boorish conduct while they ridicule Cicero.

Perhaps the most common error arises from the fact that it was a letter which Cicero sent to Pompey, and that we consequently assume that it was in the nature of modern private correspondence. In antiquity letters were often used to serve the purpose of what would be pamphlets in modern times, or official reports, or even the "white papers" or "white books" published as official documents by some modern governments.[23] We might gather the wrong impression of the size of this document to Pompey from the fact that *Schol. Bob.*,[24] which looked upon it unkindly (p. 167, ed. Stangl), said that it was "epistulam non mediocrem ad instar voluminis scribtam"; this false impression is rectified by the fact that in 49

[23] Sykutris, "Epistolographie," *RE* Suppl. 5 (1931) 200–202; Kroll (above, note 1) 1.83, 86 f.

[24] *Schol. Bob.* (pp. 144 f., ed. Stangl) also found a lack of becoming modesty in *Vatin.* 8 and expressed dissatisfaction with the poem on the consulship on p. 165, ed. Stangl (cf. p. 137).

Atticus sent Cicero a group of letters, one of which was *voluminis instar* (*Att.* 10.4.1). Cicero was not being vain, moreover; he was merely trying to formalize the statement of his deeds in 63 and he was also trying to elicit from Pompey a declaration that he and his associates were in sympathy with Cicero's actions with regard to his disposal of the Catilinarian Conspiracy.

"The cold tone of Pompey's reply"[25] was not merely unexpected, in view of Cicero's constant help to Pompey, it was also damaging to Cicero's political status while it likewise exposed him to ridicule. The public nature of the letter allowed the accuser of Sulla to have access to it and to quote it as evidence against Sulla in *Sull.* 67. It continued to be generally known and in *Planc.* 85 the accuser remarked that it had done Cicero harm. It was therefore not personal vanity which led Cicero to remonstrate with Pompey in *Fam.* 5.7; it was that his disregard of the letter was hurting Cicero's political stature.

It was a political necessity that there should be an interchange of praise among statesmen, and also that there should be gratitude when one heard that he had been praised (*Att.* 2.25.1). Crassus' praise of Cicero's consulship was a source of gratification to Cicero in 61 (*Att.* 1.14.2–4), although it was as much a way of irritating Pompey as of saying where Crassus stood politically at that moment; and Cicero's comments to Atticus show that he was aware of this fact.

When the political situation altered in 60, Pompey too was obliged to change his tune and to praise Cicero's consulship in the terms in which he should have praised it in reply to Cicero's letter. At that time Pompey took up and repeated essentially what Cicero had said in *Cat.* 4.21 when he had wondered whether it was greater to open up provinces for the Roman people or to preserve the city to which the conquerors might return:

> Quem de meis rebus, in quas eum multi incitarant, multo scito gloriosius quam de suis praedicare; sibi enim bene gestae, mihi conservatae rei publicae dat testimonium. Hoc facere illum mihi quam prosit nescio; rei publicae certe prodest. Quid? si etiam Caesarem cuius nunc venti valde sunt secundi reddo meliorem, num tantum obsum rei publicae? (*Att.* 2.1.6; cf. *Phil.* 2.12, *Off.* 1.77 f.)

Pompey later also had to make a similar statement to indicate that he sided with Cicero politically (*Red. sen.* 29): "qui non solum apud

[25] The phrase is used by Tyrrell and Purser 6^2.371.

vos, qui omnes idem sentiebatis, sed etiam apud universum populum salutem populi Romani et conservatam per me et coniunctam esse cum mea dixerit." Praise of Cicero was to be construed as a public profession of political conservatism, although not always with unmixed motives, of course,[26] and at least once to Cicero's discomfiture because embarrassment to Pompey was intended (*Q. fr.* 2.3.3 f.).

Cicero had had a like difficulty with Metellus Celer, for we learn from *Fam.* 5.2.2 in 62 that Cicero had looked in vain for praise from Metellus Celer, and that the senators had been amused when he said so ("mediocris quidam est risus consecutus"). The fact that we are dealing with a political item rather than with a personal matter is shown when Cicero later joined the glories of his return with the testimony of prominent men that he had saved the state in 63.[27]

In this connection it might also be stated that the famous letter to Lucceius (*Fam.* 5.12), in which Cicero requested a monograph on his own life and times from the beginning of the Catilinarian Conspiracy up to his return from exile, is not to be taken as an example of vanity either. Cicero did not intend the letter to Lucceius for general circulation but he did not object to its being read by others than Lucceius, nor did he think his request unusual or shameful.[28] The date of the letter, which is properly in April of 55 B.C.,[29] indicates that Cicero's political fortunes were at a low ebb and that he hoped to recall to mind the great days of the conservatives and of himself by the historical work of Lucceius. It is to be noted that we do not know what success Cicero finally had with Lucceius,[30] although Lucceius promised to undertake the work (*Att.* 4.6.4, 4.9.2, 4.11.2).

The letter to Pompey does assure us, however, that Cicero's contemporaries were only too ready to comment upon any breach of etiquette, and it is remarkable to observe how few things they found to censure in a man whose writings were so numerous and so available, and whose remarks were so public and so frequent.[31] The point mentioned most frequently by his contemporaries is his poetry,

[26] L. G. Pocock, *A Commentary on Cicero In Vatinium* (London 1926) 198 f.

[27] *Red. Quir.* 8–10, 16 f.; *Dom.* 75 f., 94–99.

[28] B. L. Ullman, "History and Tragedy," *TAPA* 73 (1942) 53.

[29] L. R. Taylor, "On the Chronology of Cicero's Letters of 56–55 B.C.," *CP* 44 (1949) 217–21. I also accept the dating of *Att.* 4.6, 4.9, 4.11 in 55.

[30] Petersson (above, note 4) 359 f. He shrewdly compares the request to Cicero by Trebonius (*Fam.* 12.16).

[31] For the Romans' prying attitude towards each other's conduct see the section on "Klatsch" in Kroll (above, note 1) 1.80–82.

with stress upon two or three verses, a matter to which we shall come presently. The only other major lapse emphasized by his contemporaries was his use of *comperisse* with regard to the Catilinarian Conspiracy.[32] The humor of the word eludes me, but it followed Cicero not only for a few years after 63 (*Fam.* 5.5.2; *Att.* 1.14.5), it was even worth a mention as late as the *Acad. pr.* (62 f.; cf. Ps. Sall. *In Cic.* 2.3). Surely it is remarkable that Cicero's contemporaries found so few bludgeons to belabor him with.

The question of Cicero's poetry, as well as of the objections to some verses, is only partially within the scope of this paper, for the critics of Cicero were engaged at least as much in literary criticism as in criticism of his vanity. The question of poetical claims to eternal fame, and the problem of the precise way in which these claims were phrased,[33] that is, the question of poetical good taste, can hardly be treated here. It is further to be noted that Cicero's contemporary critics did not object to his poems as a whole, but rather to certain verses. The famed *O fortunatam natam* seems to have been the object of derision more after Cicero's death.[34]

During Cicero's lifetime there was more said about the verse which begins *Cedant arma togae*,[35] which is of course a repetition of the theme which he had started in *Cat.* 4.21 when he had claimed that his deeds in 63 were greater than generals' foreign conquests. Yet no one seems to have expressed dissatisfaction with the prose passage. In *Pis.* 72–75 and in *Phil.* 2.20 there are defenses of this verse by Cicero, who in *Off.* 1.77 f. stated at length how true the verse was and also repeated Pompey's open declaration of thanks to Cicero that there existed a city to which he could return in triumph. It has not been generally enough noted that C. Cassius,

[32] Cf. W. C. McDermott on the fact that Caesar also used *comperisse* to make fun of Cicero: "Suetonius, *Iul.*, 74, 2," *Latomus* 6 (1947) 173–75.

[33] E.g., G. L. Hendrickson, "*Vates biformis*," *CP* 44 (1949) 30–32.

[34] Yet Horace thought well enough of *O fortunatam natam* to include a reminiscence of it in his epistle to Augustus (2.1.256): M. T. Tatham, "An Echo of Cicero in Horace," *CR* 39 (1925) 71; G. Pasquali, "Un verso oraziano, Cicerone ed Ennio," *StItal* N.S. 24 (1950) 127 f., thought they both were echoing Ennius. Cf. Cicero's own reminiscence in *Flac.* 102: "O Nonae illae Decembres quae me consule fuistis! quem ego diem vere natalem huius urbis aut certe salutarem appellare possum." It is not pertinent to discuss whether the last word of the other verse should be *laudi* or *linguae*.

[35] J. W. Spaeth, Jr., noting reflections of this verse in Ovid, the elder Pliny, *Laus Pisonis*, and Juvenal, suggests that this verse received more sympathetic treatment after Cicero's death than did *O fortunatam natam*: "Cedant Arma Togae," *CJ* 31 (1935/36) 442. For a collection of ancient criticisms of Cicero's poetry see W. W. Ewbank, *The Poems of Cicero* (London 1933) 27–29.

when he was writing a most cordial letter to Cicero in June of 43 B.C. (*Fam.* 12.13.1), made a flattering allusion to this verse as well as to what Cicero had often said about his own safety's being inextricably bound up with Rome's:

Cum rei p. vel salute vel victoria gaudemus tum instauratione tuarum laudum, quod maximus consularis maximum consulem te ipse vicisti, et laetamur et mirari satis non possumus. Fatale nescio quid tuae virtuti datum, id quod saepe iam experti sumus. Est enim tua toga omnium armis felicior;[36] quae nunc quoque nobis paene victam rem p. ex manibus hostium eripuit ac reddidit.

The only actual passage in his poetry for which Cicero was compelled to enter an extensive defense is what I presume, perhaps incorrectly, to be a single passage in the poem on his consulship, in which he described Minerva as his mentor and Jupiter as his sponsor in a council of the gods, the passage which, I presume, had allowed Clodius to maintain that Cicero portrayed himself as Jupiter and Minerva as his sister:[37] "Hic tu me etiam gloriari vetas; negas esse ferenda quae soleam de me praedicare, et homo facetus inducis etiam sermonem urbanum ac venustum, me dicere solere esse me Iovem, eundemque dictitare Minervam esse sororem meam." Extravagant as this poetical flight of Cicero at a council of the gods may appear to us, it evoked no other contemporary amusement, and it is referred to most prominently by Quint. *Inst.* 11.1.24 and in the probably post-Ciceroniam Ps. Sall. *In Cic.* 2.3, 4.7. We should bear in mind that all these criticisms of Cicero's poetry are of quite a different nature from the passage in *Har. resp.* 17 with which this paper opened and which is a direct attack on Cicero for the sort of attitude which we mean when we speak of vanity.

Petersson was correct when he wrote that objections to Cicero's acts and conduct were voiced only by his enemies. Cicero rather oversimplified matters in *Phil.* 2.11 when he said that no one except Antony and Clodius had ever reviled his consulship: "Quis autem meum consulatum praeter te et P. Clodium qui vituperaret inventus est?"[38] Other passages in this paper will indicate that other enemies had had something to say about the year 63 and about Cicero's remarks concerning it and his subsequent career, to which we may

[36] Parallels to this are supplied by Tyrrell and Purser, 6^2.278.

[37] *Dom.* 92; cf. the commentary in the edition by R. G. Nisbet (Oxford 1939). I have in hand a paper in which I am trying to unravel this puzzle.

[38] There is perhaps some confirmation of this fact in *Ad Brut.* 1.17.1: ". . . meliore condicione Cicero pulcherrimum factum vituperabit quam Bestia et Clodius reprehendere illius consulatum soliti sunt?"

add *Prov. cons.* 44, where it was said that some unspecified persons objected to his boasting: "Ego vero, si mihi non licet per aliquos ita gloriari, me dolorem atque inimicitias meas rei publicae concessisse. . . ."

It is rather more surprising to discover that Marcus Brutus wrote to Cicero upon occasion in the vein which one would expect of Cicero's enemies. He was, as nearly as we can tell, a very difficult man, a trying person for Cicero to know and one who usually made Cicero feel wanting in the social graces. Marcus Brutus was as blunt and unsympathetic as his uncle Cato, with the frankness which takes pleasure in wounding. When he and Cicero differed on theories of oratory, for instance, Brutus had no hesitation about saying that he preferred his own brand (*Att.* 14.20.3).

After Cato's death Brutus wrote a *Cato* in which he gave Cato more credit than Cicero for the Nones of December, 63. Cicero was angry, and it is not right for us to berate Cicero for conceit on this occasion (*Att.* 12.21.1), for we could hardly expect him to be pleased when his greatest accomplishments were being filched from him. The best evidence that Brutus was working Cicero real harm is that it was Brutus' version of the final debate about the Conspiracy, or some similar version, which influenced Sallust and which rendered Cicero's actions on that occasion less significant in Sallust's narrative than they actually were.[39]

Two of the letters *Ad Brut.* in 43 show us the harsh things which could be written to Cicero, but the observation of the particular circumstances will also show that they were not necessarily standard accusations. Certainly Brutus took a very lofty tone when he wrote to Cicero that he knew that Cicero was waiting for praise of two of his *Philippics*, and when he granted the orations cool praise and allowed them the title of Philippics which Cicero had jokingly applied to them (*Ad Brut.* 2.3.4):

> Legi orationes duas tuas, quarum altera Kal. Ian. usus es, altera de litteris meis, quae habita est abs te contra Calenum. Nunc scilicet hoc exspectas dum eas laudem. Nescio animi an ingeni tui maior in his libellis laus contineatur; iam concedo ut vel Philippici vocentur, quod tu quadam epistula iocans scripsisti.

In *Ad Brut.* 1.17 we have a letter from Brutus to Atticus, written because Cicero had expected congratulations from Brutus on the

[39] T. R. S. Broughton, "Was Sallust Fair to Cicero?" *TAPA* 67 (1936) 34–46, especially 43 f.

raising of the siege of Mutina. Brutus wrote to Atticus in what is almost the tone of invective because he was so angry that Cicero had sponsored Octavian (*Ad Brut.* 1.17.1–6). Hence we can regard it as a sign of anger that, among other things, Brutus wrote a slur against Cicero's praise of the Nones of December (*Ad Brut.* 1.17.1): "An quia non omnibus horis iactamus Idus Martias similiter atque ille Nonas Decembris suas in ore habet, eo meliore condicione Cicero pulcherrimum factum vituperabit quam Bestia et Clodius reprehendere illius consulatum soliti sunt?" He even declared that Cicero was harming the state and disgracing his own treatises and public services for the sake of advantage and praise from "Octavius" (§§ 4–6).

Plutarch, who seems to me often less favorable to his Roman subjects than to his Greek, definitely objects to Cicero's vanity, but an examination of the precise way in which his remarks are put will incline the reader to be less influenced by them. For example, after narrating the story of Cicero's chagrin upon discovering that the fame of his quaestorship had not reached Rome and that the Romans on holiday in Campania were not even aware of where Cicero had been, Plutarch added the moral that Cicero throughout his life retained an inordinate desire for praise which often confused his judgment (Plut. *Cic.* 6.5). Yet we know that when Cicero had told the story of himself, it was with the moral that it was wiser to seek one's political fortune at Rome than by service in the provinces; and we also know that he told the story as an illustration particularly applicable to the circumstances of the speech in which he narrated it (*Planc.* 63–67).

In *Cic.* 24.1 Plutarch says that after 63 Cicero made himself hateful to many by always praising himself. In 24.1 f. he adds that Cicero was tiresome in speaking of Catiline and Lentulus in the courts, in the senate, in the assembly, even going to the extreme of writing of himself excessively. Then in 24.4 Plutarch betrays the academic quality of his sources when he disagrees with those who thought Cicero ungenerous in his praise of Demosthenes.[40]

In *Cic.* 33.5 Plutarch, in speaking of Cicero's claim that Italy

[40] A. Gudeman, *The Sources of Plutarch's Life of Cicero*, "University of Pennsylvania Series in Philology and Literature" 8.2 (Philadelphia 1902) 10, 38–41, believed that Plutarch used post-Livian or post-Augustan sources rather than the works of Cicero, Sallust, Tiro, and Livy. In 14–16 Gudeman observes that Plutarch in *Cic.* 6 demonstrates that he had the story from *Planc.* 64 f. only indirectly.

brought him back from exile to Rome on its shoulders, admits that the enthusiasm for Cicero's return was even greater than Cicero's hyperbolic phrase.[41] I cannot imagine how he knew.

In his *Comparison of Demosthenes and Cicero* Plutarch seems a trifle eager to decide that Demosthenes was the greater man. He objects (2.1) to Cicero's boundless speaking of himself, especially referring to the verse *Cedant arma togae* etc. In 2.2 f. Plutarch observed that the statesman had to seek power through oratory, but that it was ignoble to admire one's own speeches; for that reason he preferred Demosthenes in this respect, because he did not marvel at his own oratorical talents.

These passages from Plutarch seem to be of little or no value in our effort to appraise Cicero's conceit. Plutarch appears to be biased, and his statements do not represent independent judgments or a point of view contemporary with Cicero. In addition, as we shall discover in regard to Quintilian likewise, the persistent comments upon a couple of Cicero's verses arise from Cicero's enemies rather than from some careful contemporary estimate — it became fashionable to object to Cicero's verses about himself. I also find no value in the speech Dio Cass. in 46.1–28 puts in the mouth of Fufius Calenus when he is made to defend Antony against Cicero. That speech is a better example of rhetorical invective than of historical evidence.[42]

The proper place to conclude is with quotations from Quintilian, the ardent and sympathetic student of Cicero. In *Inst.* 11.1 he had occasion to consider several of the points which have already been treated in this paper, and he came to much the same conclusions. My only objection would be that Quintilian's remarks have a little of the atmosphere of the professor's study, that he had not entirely preserved the feeling of the hurly-burly in which Cicero had lived, that after all he lived in a different century and under a different constitution than had Cicero.

It is further remarkable that Quintilian should have mentioned Cicero's boastfulness as if it were a common subject, because that actually does not seem to have been the case.[43] We may probably

[41] *Red. sen.* 39; cf. also 28: "equis insignibus et curru aurato reportati."

[42] W. Süss described both Calenus' speech and the Ps. Sall. *In Cic.* as "Cicero-karikatur": *Ethos: Studien zur älteren griechischen Rhetorik* (Leipzig and Berlin 1910) 260–63.

[43] P. Petzold, *De Ciceronis obtrectatoribus et laudatoribus Romanis* (Leipzig 1911), in chap. 1 indicates that little was said about Cicero's vanity even in his lifetime

assume with accuracy that Cicero's boastfulness was a common subject for discussion among students of oratory, who were naturally concerned with the effect of personal remarks upon an audience, but we should also doubtless assume that it was not a topic which engaged the attention of literary men. I should add that there would be less need for discussion of one's own career in the oratory of Quintilian's day than in Cicero's highly political and frequently partisan speeches.

Much of Quintilian *Inst.* 11.1 is more or less pertinent, but a few brief passages are enough to make my point. In 11.1.15 Quintilian assures us that self-glorification, especially for oratorical talents, is not the way to win over an audience: "In primis igitur omnis vitiosa iactatio est, eloquentiae tamen in oratore praecipue, adfertque audientibus non fastidium modo, sed plerumque etiam odium." Later he mentions that some people found Cicero at fault in this respect, although Cicero boasted of his accomplishments rather than his oratory, while Quintilian also noted that Cicero mentioned his deeds when he was compelled to defend his career or his associates in those deeds (11.1.17 f.):

> Reprehensus est in hac parte non mediocriter Cicero, quanquam is quidem rerum a se gestarum maior quam eloquentiae fuit in orationibus utique iactator. Et plerumque illud quoque non sine aliqua ratione fecit. Aut enim tuebatur eos, quibus erat adiutoribus usus in opprimenda coniuratione, aut respondebat invidiae (cui tamen non fuit par, servatae patriae poenam passus exilium), ut illorum, quae egerat in consulatu, frequens commemoratio possit videri non gloriae magis quam defensioni data.

Then Quintilian went on to mention (21) that Cicero did speak in his letters of his oratorical preëminence, but that in his dialogues he had another person speak of it (21), and that he did not claim eloquence excessively while actually engaged in pleading (19 f.).

Every student of Cicero's orations will agree with Quintilian's next remarks about the manner in which Cicero ascribed his wonder-

except when opponents were attacking his politics; in chap. 3 he shows that Cicero was not particularly attacked for vanity after his death. Cf. also R. E. Wolverton, "*Laudatores Temporis Acti:* Knowledge of the Roman Republic as Found in the Silver Age Authors of the First Century A.D." (unpublished University of North Carolina dissertation, 1954, written under my direction), although the author was not concerned with this passage of Quintilian. There are, of course, exceptional and specialized passages like Sen. *Dial.* 10.5.1 (*Brev. vit.* 5.1): "quotiens illum ipsum consulatum suum non sine causa sed sine fine laudatum detestatur."

ful victory in 63 either to the senate or to the gods (11.1.23):[44] "Et M. Tullius saepe dicit de oppressa coniuratione Catilinae; sed modo id virtuti senatus, modo providentiae deorum immortalium adsignat." One should add here that Cicero may not have been play-acting when he saw in himself the agent of the gods, for anyone who had been hailed as *parens patriae* by his fellow citizens had attained such a pinnacle of success as to entitle him to a belief in a divinely inspired mission.[45] If Cicero was play-acting about this, he was certainly consistent, for he referred to the divine outcome of his consulship even in a letter to Atticus (*Att.* 1.16.6). The next part of 11.1.23 reverts to the theme that Cicero was compelled to speak of himself and to defend his deeds: "Plerumque contra inimicos atque obtrectatores plus vindicat sibi."

The last passage from Quintilian to which I shall call attention is *Inst.* 11.1.24, where Quintilian wishes that Cicero had not written *Cedant arma togae* and *O fortunatam natam*, and that Cicero had not made Minerva his mentor and Jupiter his sponsor in the poem on his consulship. In regard to the latter item Quintilian enters the apology that Cicero was influenced by Greek examples. I should also add that Quintilian had forsaken the track of his argument by bringing poetry into his discussion just here. To us this subsection is merely evidence that, when Cicero's conceit was discussed in the schools, his poems were likely to be introduced as evidence for the prosecution. In general the characteristic attitude towards Cicero is more to be found in the handsome praise accorded him by Velleius Paterculus (2.66) and by Pliny the Elder (*H.N.* 7.116 f.).

Some general considerations are in order before we close.

Vanity and conceit are usually defined as a sense of pride, perhaps excessive, in personal qualities or attainments. Are not they

[44] Quintilian seems to think that it was only for the purpose of decorum that Cicero ascribed the suppression of the Catilinarian Conspiracy either to the *virtus* of the senate or to the *providentia* of the gods; Quintilian doubtless had in mind such passages about the gods as *Cat.* 2.29, 3.1, 3.18–22; *Sull.* 40. While Cicero may have wished to make the senate a partner in the execution of the conspirators, he nevertheless seems to have believed in divine agency in *Att.* 1.16.6: "Rei publicae statum illum, quem tu meo consilio, ego divino confirmatum putabam, qui bonorum omnium coniunctione et auctoritate consulatus mei fixus et fundatus videbatur. . . ." It is perhaps correct to accept the word *divinum* in *Leg.* 1.8 in the phrase "illum divinum et memorabilem annum suum."

[45] See above, note 22. We know that Cicero's consulship was generally remembered because on December 20, 44 B.C., Cicero was called Rome's savior a second time (*Phil.* 6.2): "cum vos universi una mente atque voce iterum a me conservatam esse rem publicam conclamastis."

then the wrong words entirely to be applied to the thoughts of gratification for public service well done? Certainly the public man in every age is entitled, even compelled, to be laudatory of his own achievements.[46] In this respect it is not fair to judge a statesman of the first rank by the standards one would apply to a private citizen. Assuredly the politician cannot declare that his own greatest accomplishments were inconspicuous, nor can he always wait for a colleague to praise him.

In modern politics one would expect praise for achievements from someone in the same party; but in ancient Rome there were really no parties in our sense, but more the several followings of individual statesmen. The result was that one might wait rather long before receiving any commendation from a man who was the leader of his own group. One would have to wait until it suited that man's book to issue a laudatory statement, which is exactly what happened to Cicero. Yet a politician is always under the necessity of having the public appreciate his good works.

It is therefore to be stressed that it is a noteworthy fact that Cicero was more compelled to speak at length of his achievements in public than in private. And his private remarks show us that he was perfectly well aware of his purpose each time he spoke of his saving of Rome or of his return from exile.

Aside from his public achievements, the only other item on which Cicero prominently congratulates himself is on his oratorical ability, as in the course of the *Brutus*, and it would have been ridiculous of him to have praised others above himself, especially the Atticists. The *Brutus* and similar works were by way of being personal memoirs (and rhetorical manifestoes) after he had long been acknowledged the premier orator in Rome. One should also remember his fairness in assessing the talents of others, like Caesar (*Brut.* 252–62).

It is inconceivable that an orator and a public man in such a conservative society would have imperiled his career on such a minor point as self-praise. The statement that Cicero was overwhelmingly guilty of vanity or conceit implies that he knew no better, which is certainly far from the case.[47]

[46] Cf. Tyrrell and Purser 1^3.16, note.

[47] While it is possible to present a larger collection of passages than I have here assembled, I have given the passages which I regard as especially pertinent. In a sense, of course, it is possible to arrive at sound conclusions only on the basis of the entire Ciceronian corpus, but it has been my intention to substantiate my opinion without unduly laboring the point.