

XI. The British Epics of Quintus and Marcus Cicero

WALTER ALLEN, JR.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

The prominent Romans, including Cicero, had scant interest in Caesar's Gallic campaigns except as they influenced home politics or touched upon the activities of their own circle of friends.¹ Yet P. Terentius Varro wrote a *Bellum Sequanicum* and M. Furius Bibaculus (or a Furius Alpinus!) was the author of a poem on Caesar's Gallic wars. Schanz-Hosius state that Varro's poem described Caesar's campaign of 58 against Ariovistus and that we learn of it from a single reference in Priscianus (Keil, *Grammatici Latini* 2.497.10); their comment on Furius Alpinus is that he wrote *Annales Belli Gallici*, while his name and identity remain problematical.² The recent work of H. Bardon specifies that Varro wrote the *Bellum Sequanicum* about 55 B.C., that Furius Alpinus is properly Furius Bibaculus, and that there was a prose work on Caesar's British expedition by L. Aurunculeius Cotta.³

It should not be forgotten, moreover, that Britain likewise supplied Quintus Cicero with inspiration for poetic composition, although his epic died aborning. We shall also note that Marcus Cicero completed an epic on Caesar's British expedition of 54 B.C.; but not a single verse of it is extant.

Quintus went to Britain, not as a peaceful tourist, but as a general officer in Julius Caesar's army. He had previously been *legatus* of Pompey in connection with the latter's superintendence of the grain supply. The fact that he was now serving as legate to

¹ F. F. Abbott, "Roman Indifference to Provincial Affairs," *CR* 14 (1900) 355 f.; J. Wells, "Cicero and the Conquest of Gaul," *The Quarterly Review* vol. 230, no. 457 (Oct. 1918) 361-79.

² M. Schanz-C. Hosius, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* (Munich 1927) 14.312 f., 162 f. The identification with Furius Bibaculus is accepted by J. W. Spaeth, Jr., who has a sound discussion of the poem in "Caesar's Friends and Enemies Among the Poets," *CJ* 32 (1936/37) 550-52. The most familiar allusions to Furius Alpinus are in Hor. *Serm.* 1.10.36 f., 2.5.40 f. Cf. T. W. Dickson, "Unwritten and Lost Epics of the Augustan Poets," *CJ* 30 (1934/35) 278-86, who reached back into the Ciceronian Period as well, although he did not take notice of the subject of my paper.

³ H. Bardon, *La Littérature latine inconnue*, tome I: *L'Époque républicaine* (Paris 1952) 368, 349 f., 281; cf. Schanz-Hosius (above, note 2) 14.350 on Cotta.

Caesar is an indication that the two Ciceros, after the reestablishment of the First Triumvirate by the Conference at Luca, had decided that it was necessary to cultivate Caesar as well as Pompey. As for Marcus, he was now *legatus* of Pompey, who had added to the superintendence of the grain supply the governorship of the Spains, whither he never went; it is highly probable that Marcus remained at Rome at Caesar's request.⁴ Marcus' letters indicate that, while he and his brother regarded it as imperative to remain on good terms with Caesar, Marcus was also very pleased by the great honor and respect which Caesar showed them.⁵

It therefore follows, as has been generally noted, that Quintus thought of writing a poem on Caesar's British invasion of 54 B.C. for more than simply literary reasons. We shall also find that such a poetic work would have had a political value to Caesar which is not immediately apparent.

⁴ *Q. fr.* 2.14(13).2: "quod mihi tempus, Romae praesertim, ut iste me rogat, manenti, uacuum ostenditur?" This point is developed by L.-A. Constans in his Budé edition of the correspondence, 34.249 f.

I have not here tried to solve the problems relative to these legateships, a topic which has not been completely illuminated by T. R. S. Broughton, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*. Many of the pertinent passages are assembled and explained in W. Drumann-P. Groebe, *Geschichte Roms* (Leipzig 1899-1929) 2.259-61, 5.649, 6.21 f., 648-50. When Pompey was put in charge of the grain supply shortly after Cicero's return from exile in 57, he immediately chose Cicero as a *legatus* (*Att.* 4.1.7), but in December we find Quintus sailing for some place (*Q. fr.* 2.1.3), and it is a reasonable inference that he is taking Marcus' place. Quintus served with Pompey in 57-56, returning from Sardinia to Italy in June of 56, and it is assumed that he gave up the legateship at that time; yet Pompey, although consul in 55, remained proconsul in charge of the grain supply. It is perfectly clear that Quintus became *legatus* of Caesar in 54, but Marcus' status is by no means so clear. In the letter recommending Trebatius to Caesar (*Fam.* 7.5.1), the language is such as would lead one to think that Cicero was legate to Pompey, as would *Fam.* 7.17.2 (to Trebatius). Yet in *Q. fr.* 3.1.18 Cicero is surprised to learn of the rumor that he is to be Pompey's legate and in *Att.* 4.19.2 Cicero announces the news that he is appointed legate to Pompey, a passage of which Broughton does not seem to take cognizance. We need not try to solve these minor problems here, however; all we need note is that by 54 Marcus and Quintus were dividing their efforts, with Marcus devoting his attention more particularly to Pompey while Quintus served under Caesar.

⁵ *Q. fr.* 2.11(10).4 f.; 2.12(11).1; 2.14(13).1 f.; 2.15(14).2; 2.16(15).1; 3.1.9 & 17 f. & 25; 3.5(5 et 6, 7).3; 3.6(8).1 f. (in Sjögren's numbering). I accept these expressions of good will at face value despite the fact that in *Q. fr.* 3.1.21; 3.6(8).2; 3.7(9).3, Cicero says that he is cautious about what he writes in letters ordinarily dispatched (*quas vulgo ad te mitto*) and that he urges Quintus to be cautious too. My reason for thus accepting such passages is that in *Q. fr.* 3.6(8).1, which just precedes the passage in which he admonished Quintus, Cicero had written that the main reason that Quintus was serving in Gaul was to win the good will of Caesar. In *Q. fr.* 3.5(5 et 6, 7).4 Cicero felt free to write about his pleasure in Caesar's friendship and about his grief that the Republic was no more.

This topic first attracted my attention because of Cicero's use of the word *mutuaris* in one letter in which he was writing to Quintus about the poem. In that connection, in a footnote of a paper on Sallust,⁶ I assembled what evidence I could on the meaning of the word, and promised this full discussion. This paper will also deal with a diversity of topics arising from Quintus' poem: the nature of the poems; Quintus' reasons for contemplating his poem, Quintus' reasons for not completing his poem, Marcus' expected assistance to Quintus in versifying; also Marcus' reasons for composing a poem on Caesar's British exploits, whether the brothers were each intending a separate epic or whether there was only one poem; and Caesar's political circumstances which rendered the potential epic or epics of value to him.

Few scholars have been fair about this pair of epics. Drumann of course took his usual line when he wrote of Marcus Cicero: "Das Epos, in welchem er Caesars Siege in Gallien verherrlichte, wurde ihm von der Furcht eingegeben. . . ."⁷ The same author was gentler with Quintus Cicero: "Wenn er als epischer Dichter sich versuchen, den zweiten britannischen Feldzug seines Imperators besingen wollte, an welchem er teilnahm, so kam es doch nicht zur Ausführung."⁸ T. Rice Holmes dismissed the idea of a British epic as a transitory fancy on the part of Marcus.⁹ One would not expect fairness to Cicero from Carcopino, who wrote of Marcus' poem: "Whether in earnest or slyly poking fun at Cicero's poetic chariot, Caesar — who was no doubt shown this, like other letters — took Cicero at his word and on several occasions made enquiries about the promised 'poem'."¹⁰ It is more surprising to find the blunt statement by H. Bardon that M. Cicero's epic was a mediocre work.¹¹ The same author wrote (333 f.) that, in *Q. fr.* 2.16(15).4 "Quintus Cicero, outre ses tragédies, glorifiait en une épopée

⁶ "Sallust's Political Career," *Studies in Philology* 51 (1954) 1-14; note 33 on p. 11.

⁷ Drumann-Groebe (above, note 4) 6.602; cf. 3.290, where it is stated that Marcus' epic was on Caesar's exploits in general and that, although completed, it was never dispatched.

⁸ *Ibid.* 6.665.

⁹ T. Rice Holmes, *Ancient Britain and the Invasions of Julius Caesar*² (Oxford 1936) 329; cf. the same sentiment in his *The Roman Republic and the Founder of the Empire* (Oxford 1923) 2.107, although on pp. 285 f. he quotes and translates part of *Q. fr.* 2.16(15).4.

¹⁰ J. Carcopino, *Cicero: The Secrets of his Correspondence*, transl. by E. O. Lorimer (London 1951) 2.283, note 2.

¹¹ Bardon (above, note 3) 367.

l'expédition à laquelle il prenait part. Bienveillant et, peut-être, sincère, son frère le félicite pour ses descriptions et la manière dont il campe l'Imperator."

My procedure will be to quote the text of each pertinent passage, and to give what commentary is necessary. Our complication is really caused by the fact that Cicero was writing about the two poems at the same time, not troubling to keep the distinction between the two very clear because Quintus would know what was meant. I shall use the Latin text and the numbering of H. Sjögren's Göteborg edition of 1911. I also follow Sjögren's dating, which is of course according to the uncorrected pre-Julian calendar.¹²

The first pertinent passage occurs in *Q. fr.* 2.14(13).2 (early in June, 54):

. . . quoniam in isto homine colendo tam indormiui diu te me hercule saepe excitante, cursu corrigam tarditatem cum equis, tum uero — quoniam ut scribis poema ab eo nostrum probari — quadrigis poeticis. modo mihi date Britanniam, quam pingam coloribus tuis, penicillo meo. sed quid ago? quod mihi tempus, Romae praesertim, ut iste me rogat, manenti, uacuum ostenditur? sed uidero; fortasse enim, ut fit, uincet unus amor omnes difficultates.

The idea of a poem apparently occurred to Cicero as a consequence of his learning of Caesar's at least partial approval of the *poema nostrum*,¹³ by which Cicero meant his own already completed *De temporibus meis*.¹⁴ The *iste* of the passage cited is Caesar. From

¹² For efforts to determine the exact dates with regard to Caesar's invasion of Britain in 54 see Holmes, *Ancient Britain* (above, note 9) 726–35; cf. Drumann-Groebe (above, note 4) 3.774–79, 801–3; Holmes, *Roman Republic* (above, note 9) 1.339–44. It is perhaps enough for literary purposes to state that one should subtract about a month from all the dates given in the text in order to approximate the Julian dating of these letters.

¹³ We learn from *Q. fr.* 2.16(15).5, a later letter, that Caesar was unimpressed by some portions of the poem, a situation of which Cicero was unaware at the time of writing of *Q. fr.* 2.14(13).2. Surely this later letter serves to prove that the *poema nostrum* of the passage cited above is incorrectly identified by Tyrrell and Purser 2².144 as "Probably a poem addressed to Caesar, in which doubtless Cicero intended to treat of the expedition into Britain." Cf. also the passage from *Q. fr.* 3.6(8).3, which will be quoted later in my text and which proves that Cicero had not finished writing his poem to Caesar late in November.

¹⁴ The *nostrum* is meant to signify only Marcus. I take this to be the sort of *nos* which R. S. Conway calls the "Plural of Dignity": *New Studies of a Great Inheritance* (London 1921), chap. 1: "The Inner Experience of Cicero." Conway published the full discussion as "The Use of the Singular *Nos* in Cicero's Letters," *Trans. Cambridge Philol. Soc.* 5, 1 (1899) 7–79 (reviewed in *CR* 14.138–40 by L. C. Purser); on p. 33 he writes of "The Plural of Authorship."

this passage it is clear that Cicero had not yet begun to write, that he alone was to write a poem based on information from Quintus, and that the poem was to be about Britain.

In *Att.* 4.15.10 (July 27, 54) Cicero thought that his brother was now in Britain. In *Q. fr.* 2.16(15).4 (end of August, 54) we learn that he has received a letter from Quintus in Britain and that Quintus was to write a poem himself, but with the help of verses composed by Marcus:

o iucundas mihi tuas de Britannia litteras! . . . te uero ὑπόθεσιν scribendi egregiam habere uideo. quos tu situs, quas naturas rerum et locorum, quos mores, quas gentes, quas pugnas, quem uero ipsum imperatorem habes! ego te libenter, ut rogas, quibus rebus uis, adiuuabo et tibi uersus, quos rogas, hoc est Athenas noctuam, mittam.

In addition to the definite statement about the composition of verses by Marcus to be incorporated in Quintus' poem, there are two other points to be observed. The first is that Marcus regarded Quintus as a better poet than himself, a subject to which he thrice returns in later letters (*Q. fr.* 3.1.11; 3.4.4; 3.5[5 et 6, 7].4). The other point is that we can tell what type of epic poetry Quintus had in mind, a matter which will be treated at the end of this paper.

We might here think that we had misread the first passage and that Marcus had never intended to write a poem himself, except for *Q. fr.* 3.1.11 (a letter written in installments and finished on Sept. 28, 54): "poema ad Caesarem, quod institueram,¹⁵ incidi; tibi quod rogas, quoniam ipsi fontes iam sitiunt, si quid habebo spatii, scribam." Here we learn that Cicero was having difficulty in fulfilling his promise of sending verses for Quintus' poem. But there remains this *poema ad Caesarem*, which is the poem referred to in *Q. fr.* 2.14(13).2, Cicero's own British epic, now dropped after some sort of beginning. It appears probable that he began his poem shortly after the date of that letter (early in June, 54) and before he had heard from Quintus in Britain, for, when Cicero says that he had had word from Quintus in *Q. fr.* 2.16(15).4 at the end of August, 54, he mentioned only Quintus' poem and did not refer to his own at all.

¹⁵ There is some question about the reading *institueram*, but it seems to be correct, especially in view of *Q. fr.* 3.6(8).3: "institutum ad illum poema." The alternative reading is *composueram*, which I take to be impossible in the light of subsequent letters in which Marcus speaks of completing the poem later. In the question of this reading I am indebted to the comments of Em. Ciaceri, "De Ciceroniano poemate ad Caesarem quaestiuncula," *Rivista di storia antica e scienze affini* 1.4 (1895/96) 88, note 1.

In a letter written by Marcus on Oct. 24, 54, we learn that Quintus was demanding verses once more, although Quintus could hardly have in the interim received and answered his brother's letter of Sept. 28.¹⁶ It also seems probable that Quintus' letter, to which the letter of Oct. 24 is the reply, was written before the army returned to Gaul. At any rate, Quintus' letter had been insistent upon Cicero's living up to his agreement to write verses (*Q. fr.* 3.4.4; Oct. 24, 54):

De uersibus, quos tibi a me scribi uis, deest mihi quidem opera, quae non modo tempus sed etiam animus uacuum ab omni cura desiderat; sed abest etiam ἐνθουσιασμός. non enim sumus omnino sine cura uenientis anni, etsi sumus sine timore. simul et illud — sine ulla me hercule ironia loquor — : tibi istius generis in scribendo priores partes tribuo quam mihi.

Cicero's protests of incapacity were unavailing. In a letter written at the end of October or in November we find him replying to another of this battery of letters which Quintus had apparently aimed at him without waiting for Cicero's replies. Marcus' letter is *Q. fr.* 3.5(5 et 6, 7).4:

quod me de uersibus faciendis rogas, incredibile est, mi frater, quam egeam tempore, nec sane satis commoueor animo ad ea, quae uis, canenda. † ΑΜΠΩΕΙC uero ad ea, quae ipse ego ne cogitando quidem consequor, tu, qui omnes isto eloquendi et exprimendi genere superasti, a me petis? facerem tamen, ut possem, sed, quod te minime fugit, opus est ad poema quadam animi alacritate, quam plane mihi tempora eripiunt.

In this passage *poema* is used for composing poetry, but it also means the final product as well. We may therefore note that here Cicero calls Quintus' epic a *poema*, which helps us to realize that, when he spoke of his own *poema ad Caesarem* in *Q. fr.* 3.1.11, he had in mind the same sort of work as Quintus was contemplating.¹⁷

It is noteworthy that the passage quoted in the preceding paragraph is the last one in which we hear about Quintus' poem in the extant letters. We should like to know just when he abandoned this project. Or perhaps we might put it that we should like to know

¹⁶ Holmes, *Ancient Britain* (above, note 9) 728 and note 6 maintains that letters from Britain to Rome took about 27 days, and that they took longer to reach Cicero if he was away from Rome. On pp. 726, 734 f., he remarks that Caesar on Sept. 25 wrote Cicero that he was on the point of bringing the army back to Gaul, which he did about two weeks later. L.-A. Constans, *Cicéron, Correspondance* 34.46, thinks that Caesar returned from Britain about Oct. 10.

¹⁷ J. G. Baiter-C. L. Kayser in their edition of Cicero use the title "Poema ad Caesarem de Expeditione Britannica" (Leipzig 1869, 11.135 f.).

just when he decided not to renew his interest in the project, for the activities of Ambiorix and the Nervii, shortly after the army went into winter quarters (Caes. *B.G.* 5.26–52), would certainly have been enough to account for a lapse of interest in the project. But we are anticipating, for it is in *Q. fr.* 3.6(8).2 (late Nov., 54) and in *Att.* 4.19.2 (in late Nov. or in Dec., 54) that we find that Cicero knew that Quintus was in winter quarters. T. Rice Holmes points out that *Q. fr.* 3.6(8).1 (after Nov. 23) refers to probably the first letters which Quintus had written to Marcus after his return from Britain.¹⁸

In *Q. fr.* 3.6(8).3, which Cicero wrote to Quintus at the end of November, we learn that Cicero had yielded to urging to complete his own poem. It was Caesar who urged the completion of the poem, and it should be recalled that in this letter Cicero showed that he knew that Quintus was in winter quarters. It is reasonable to assume that Caesar urged the completion of the poem after his return from Britain, although the passage is not specific enough to rule out an earlier date:

quod me institutum ad illum poema iubes perficere, etsi distentus cum opera tum animo sum multo magis, tamen, quoniam ex epistula, quam ad te miseram, cognouit Caesar me aliquid esse exorsum, reuertar ad institutum idque perficiam his supplicationum otiosis diebus, quibus. . . .¹⁹

We cannot speculate on the length of this poem²⁰ because Cicero's speed of composition was rapid and because we cannot surmise the amount he had already written in the summer. One would like to draw conclusions *ex silentio*, but there is no reason for us to believe that Quintus had already abandoned his poem just because Marcus did not mention it in this letter.

In the last letter of the correspondence between the brothers,²¹ in *Q. fr.* 3.7(9).6 written in December, Marcus states that he has finished the poem and only waits until it will be safe to send it:

¹⁸ Holmes, *Ancient Britain* (above, note 9) 734 f.

¹⁹ Cicero found it difficult to resume a work once laid aside (*Leg.* 1.9): “. . . et ego animi pendere soleo, cum semel quid orsus <sum>, si traducor alio, neque tam facile interrupta contexo quam absolvo instituta.”

²⁰ I trust to have adequately demonstrated elsewhere the non-existence of the term and the genre of the “epyllion”: W. Allen, Jr., “The Epyllion: A Chapter in the History of Literary Criticism,” *TAPA* 71 (1940) 1–26; J. F. Reilly, “Origins of the Word ‘Epyllion,’” *CJ* 49 (1953/54) 111–14; cf. L. Richardson, Jr., *Poetical Theory in Republican Rome: An Analytical Discussion of the Shorter Narrative Hexameter Poems Written in Latin During the First Century Before Christ* (New Haven 1944).

²¹ That is, the last letter of the collection *Ad Quintum fratrem*, for in *Fam.* 16 we have Quintus' letters relating to Tiro.

Quod me hortaris, ut absolvam, habeo absolutum suaue, mihi quidem uti uidetur, ἔπος ad Caesarem sed quaero locupletem tabellarium, ne accidat, quod Erigonae tuae, cui soli Caesare imperatore iter ex Gallia tutum non fuit.

Again we should draw no conclusion from the fact that Quintus' poem is not mentioned, for a variety of alternative explanations will immediately occur to the reader. I assume that Cicero means precisely what he says, that his poem is completely finished and that he will send it off as soon as possible. The word he uses to describe it (ἔπος) tells us only that it was in dactylic hexameter and the epic manner. We have to assume from *Q. fr.* 2.14(13).2 that the subject was largely, if not entirely, the British expedition of 54: "modo mihi date Britanniam, quam pingam coloribus tuis, penicillo meo."

Cicero had also not had time to learn of Quintus' desperate experience with the Nervii, for *Q. fr.* 3.7(9).6 was written in December. The preceding letter to Quintus, *Q. fr.* 3.6(8) dated late in November, also gives no hint that there was any reason for Marcus to have been concerned about Quintus.²²

Before we take up some scholarly opinions as to the meaning of the passages I have quoted, I wish to go back to the passage I have quoted as the last one in which we hear about Quintus' poem, *Q. fr.* 3.5(5 et 6, 7).4, the passage in which Cicero begged off from his promise to write verses for Quintus' poem and in which he said he yielded to Quintus as a poet. We must add to our consideration some remarks made by Cicero in paragraph 7 of that same letter, for the various editors are certainly correct in regarding that paragraph as a continuation of *Q. fr.* 3.5 rather than as an individual subsequent letter:

Quattuor tragoedias sedecim diebus absoluisse cum scribas, tu quidquam ab alio mutuaris? et πάθος quaeris,²³ cum Electram et Troadas scrip-

²² Holmes, *loc. cit.* (above, note 18), called attention to the fact that paragraph 1 of this letter (after Nov. 23) referred to letters which Quintus had written just after his return from Britain. The attack on Quintus' camp did not occur until over two weeks after the legions were settled into winter quarters. It would then be some time before letters about Quintus' plight could reach Marcus. I agree with L.-A. Constans' assertion that there is an allusion to the revolt of Ambiorix in *Fam.* 7.10.2 (to Trebatius in Dec., 54): *Cicéron, Correspondance* 34.47; but I should add that there Cicero mentioned concern only about Trebatius' safety.

²³ The Greek word *pathos* is the emendation suggested by H. Usener, "Ein 'graecum' in Cicero's Briefen," *RhM* 22 (1867) 459 f. Usener made out a good palaeographical case for *pathos*, but I think he was in error in relating the *mutuaris* and the *quaeris* both literally to the sentences in which they occur. W. Wiemer, *Quintus Tullius Cicero*

seris? cessator esse noli et illud γνῶθι σεαυτὸν noli putare ad adrogantiam minuendam solum esse dictum, uerum etiam ut bona nostra norimus.

In this passage I believe that Cicero is returning to the topic with which he had dealt earlier in the same letter, the verses which Quintus had requested for his epic. Cicero says, in referring to the rapidity and pathos with which Quintus was able to versify tragedies, that there should be no need for him to solicit poetical assistance from Marcus in the composition of the poem on the British expedition. Both the *mutuaris* and the *quaeris* are intended to be allusions to the *petis* of paragraph 4; they are meant to indicate that Quintus did not stand in need of literary loans when he had been able to complete by himself four tragedies in sixteen days.

Such a usage of *mutuaris* is not usual, but it is by no means impossible. The verb is of course used of borrowing ideas from well-known writers, such as Plato (*De or.* 1.224, 3.72; cf. 1.55),²⁴ but this is not the case here. The cause of our difficulty of interpretation here is that Cicero's remark is in proximity to his comment about Quintus' tragedies. But he does not mean the remark to apply to the tragedies, but rather to support his refusal, earlier in the same letter, to write verses for Quintus' epic. It is a neat conjunction of ideas if we place ourselves in the situation of the writer and the recipient of the letter; it is not especially neat if we forget that we are reading a letter between brothers²⁵ and if we try to insist upon absolutely clear literary transitions of thought and expression.²⁶

(Halle 1930) 8, 12 consequently drew the conclusion, as did Tyrrell and Purser in their commentary, that Quintus lacked pathos in his tragedies; Wiemer also thought that Quintus asked help of Marcus in this respect. Wiemer will not be discussed later in connection with the epics since he devoted less than one paragraph to the topic, on pp. 12 f., speaking only of Quintus' poem and not of Marcus' poem at all.

²⁴ I should also add the use of *mutuatus* in the passage where Africanus was reputed to be the author of some writing under Terence's name (Suet. *Ter.* 3): "P. Africanus, qui a Terentio personam mutuatus, quae domi luserat ipse, nomine illius in scenam detulit."

²⁵ The colloquial tone which the *mutuaris* strikes for us is confirmed by a passage from *De or.* 1.256: "Reliqua vero etiam si adiuvant, historiam dico et prudentiam iuris publici et antiquitatis memoriam et exemplorum copiam, si quando opus erit, a viro optimo et istis rebus instructissimo, familiari meo Congo mutuabor." Here Antonius is stating that he will borrow information from his friend, but the fact that *Congo* is an emendation allows me to state only as an opinion that Antonius did not mean that he would draw upon any writings of Junius Congus (cf. Schanz-Hosius 14.235 f.).

²⁶ As I mentioned above, I first came across the problem of the meaning of *mutuaris* in this passage in connection with a paper on Sallust (above, note 6). There I was dealing with a passage from a letter of Fronto to Verus (2.1, p. 123 N.) which mentioned that Ventidius borrowed a speech from Sallust to praise his victory over the

But it seems perfectly reasonable in a letter of this sort to refer allusively back to an earlier portion of the letter, the more so as Cicero in both passages tries to beg off from his promise by stressing Quintus' own talents.

To return to our main subject. Thus far, by a reëxamination of the evidence, I trust I have rendered it clear that both brothers intended epics, the one by Marcus undoubtedly finished and the one by Quintus probably never more than just begun.²⁷

We can begin a short history of the problem with Ciaceri,²⁸ who in 1896 published a separate little note in commentary on the literary histories of Teuffel and Schanz which maintained that there were two distinct epics. He wrote that there was only one poem on Britain and that Marcus wrote it but did not complete it. In spite of citing *Q. fr.* 3.7(9).6 Ciaceri doubted that Marcus finished the poem. He suggested two complementary reasons as to why Cicero never published the poem, and as to why we have no fragments from it nor references to it aside from this correspondence. One reason was that Quintus was not in favor with Caesar after the episode of the attack by the Nervii (Caes. *B.G.* 5. 48–52, 6. 32 & 37),

Parthians: "Ventidius ille, postquam Parthos fudit fugavitque, ad victoriam suam praedicandam orationem a C. Sallustio mutuatus est, et Nerva facta sua in senatu verbis rogaticis commendavit." In that passage I took it, as did Funaioli and Schanz-Hosius, that Sallust wrote a speech for Ventidius to deliver, not that Ventidius took a speech from Sallust's writings: Funaioli, *RE* s.v. "Sallustius" (10) 1914; Schanz-Hosius (above, note 2) 14.362, 377, 622. My interpretation is supported by the fact that in the rest of the sentence Fronto goes on to say that Nerva had to praise his own deeds to the senate in words which he had requested from someone else, a statement which would not have been a parallel if Fronto had meant in the earlier part of the sentence that Ventidius had taken a speech from Sallust's writings. Schanz-Hosius drew up a list of persons who upon occasion wrote speeches for others to deliver, among them Cicero, who wrote a *laudatio funebris* for an apparently less oratorical friend: Schanz-Hosius 14.622, 447; *Q. fr.* 3.6(8).5.

Tacitus thought it remarkable enough to warrant observation that Nero was the first of the rulers to require the aid of another in composing his speeches, for Seneca wrote the *laudatio* for Nero to deliver for Claudius (*Ann.* 13.3), and other speeches later as well (*Ann.* 13.11). The point is well taken in the Furneaux edition of the *Annals* 23.[51], note 6 that Nero was young at the time of *Ann.* 13.3, but that Nero was still using Seneca's literary assistance five years later in 59 A.D. (*Ann.* 14.11) and perhaps afterwards, although in 62 A.D. he could manage by himself without preparation (*Ann.* 14.55).

²⁷ It seems unlikely that this poem could be meant by the frequently cited comment of *Schol. Bob.* on the *Pro Archia* (175.31 f., ed. Stangl): "Fuit enim Q. Tullius non solum epici, verum etiam tragici carminis scribtor." It is so taken by Wiemer (above, note 23) 13.

²⁸ Ciaceri (above, note 15) 86–89. He maintains the same opinion in *Cicerone e i suoi tempi*² (1939/41) 2.116, note 3.

a fact which Quintus communicated to Cicero. The other reason was that Marcus was therefore having second thoughts about his expectations from Caesar, with the idea that it might be as well not to favor Caesar openly by publishing such a poem.

These epics have naturally been mentioned by many scholars in the course of longer studies on related topics. In some instances they have omitted pertinent passages, in others they have erred in interpretation. In the several cases in which I regard as accurate the citation and the interpretation of the relevant passages, the necessary brevity of the exposition, as well as the omission of consideration of attendant circumstances, resulted in a lack of complete clarity for me until I had examined the problem in detail myself. I therefore cite in the footnotes a large selection of the bibliography, listing first the authors with whom I essentially agree,²⁹ and secondly the authors with whom my account disagrees in some measure.³⁰

The political situation in Rome also enters into our understanding of the motivation of these epics since the Ciceros were obviously trying both to help and to please Caesar. C. E. Stevens has published three lively and suggestive articles which will at least urge us to think in the proper direction about Caesar's status in the mid-50's. In the first article Stevens wrote that Caesar turned to the attack on Britain because in Rome his enemies thought that he should give up Gaul now that his task there was completed, as it seemed.³¹ The invasion of 55 was a popular success in Rome and

²⁹ Wells (above, note 1) 375; E. Koch, *Ciceronis carmina historica restituta atque enarrata* (Greifswald 1922) 56–59, although he thought *Q. fr.* 3.4.4, 3.5 (5 et 6, 7).4 referred to Marcus' poem; Schanz-Hosius (above, note 2) 14, 535, 537, 551 f., with the slur on p. 349: "An der britannischen Expedition versuchte M. Cicero seine geringe poetische Kraft, von dem Bruder unterstützt, der, Legat Caesars in Gallien, ihm die Materialien lieferte und auch selbst sich mit dem gleichen Gedanken trug"; E. Malcovati, *Cicerone e la poesia*, "Annali d. facoltà di lettere e di filosofia d. Univ. di Cagliari" 13 (Pavia 1943) 264–66; H. Willrich, *Cicero und Caesar: Zwischen Senatsherrschaft und Gottkönigtum* (Göttingen 1944) 129–31, who appears to agree with me about *mutuarius*.

³⁰ Tyrrell and Purser, *The Correspondence of Cicero* 2² (various notes in the commentary); Drumann-Groebe (above, note 4) 3.290; J. Stinchcomb, "Literary Interests of a Roman Magnate: Quintus Tullius Cicero," *CW* 26 (1932/33) 5; W. W. Ewbank, *The Poems of Cicero* (London 1933) 19–22; Spaeth (above, note 2) 554 f.; K. Büchner, *RE* s.v. "M. Tullius Cicero (Fragmente)," 1256; M. Gelzer, *Caesar der Politiker und Staatsmann*³ (Munich 1941) 157; F. Münzer, *RE* s.v. "Tullius" (31) 1305; L.-A. Constans, *Cicéron, Correspondance* 3⁴ (Paris 1950) (some points in the translation); M. Rambaud, *L'Art de la Déformation historique dans les Commentaires de César*, "Annales de l'Univ. de Lyon," 3^{me} sér., Lettres, fasc. 23 (Paris 1953) 14 f.

³¹ "55 B.C. and 54 B.C.," *Antiquity* 21 (1947) 3–9. I have not seen C. E. Stevens, "Britain between the Invasions (54 B.C.–A.D. 43); a Study of Ancient Diplomacy,"

led to the much larger expedition of 54, with the idea of conquering Britain. Caesar had to abandon the idea of conquest because Gallic affairs demanded attention. Stevens thinks that Quintus did not perceive that the expedition was a failure (*Q. fr.* 3.1.10; *Att.* 4.17.3 [18.5]: *confecta Britannia*) since Caesar had accomplished all that he had intended to do by keeping aid from going eastward over the Channel.

In his second article³² Stevens again noted that the expedition to Britain was to be Caesar's new project, now that Gaul was fairly well in hand. He observed that the expeditions to Britain needed some popular justification among the Romans, despite the fact that they were fascinated by the thought of the conquest of Ocean. In his third article³³ Stevens suggested that the Lex Pompeia Licinia was not passed until late in 55 B.C., with the further suggestion that it was passed after the first British expedition, a belated and risky venture which Caesar had embarked upon in order to demonstrate to Pompey that Britain existed and that it was a project which would keep him adequately occupied in a portion of the world sufficiently distant from Rome for five years.

T. Rice Holmes³⁴ observed that the British campaign of 55 was not a great success, although it fired the Roman imagination. There were consequently great expectations aroused by the expedition of 54, in which, while the expedition was not actually a failure, Caesar barely saved his reputation. Public expectation suffered marked disappointment in its hope of conquest of Britain.³⁵

The latest discussion of the topic is that of M. Rambaud, *L'Art de la Déformation historique dans les Commentaires de César*.³⁶ Rambaud states that both crossing the Rhine and crossing the Channel were intended to justify Caesar's retention of his great armies (pp. 123 f.), and he adds his personal opinion that Caesar crossed the Rhine and went to Britain in order to impress the senate

Aspects of Archaeology in Britain and Beyond. Essays Presented to O. G. S. Crawford (London 1951) 332-44; the book is reviewed by J. v.d. Waals and R. J. Forbes in *Antiquity* 27 (1953) 110-15.

³² "The 'Bellum Gallicum' as a Work of Propaganda," *Latomus* 11 (1952) 3-18, 165-79, of which only 8-16 concern us.

³³ "Britain and the Lex Pompeia Licinia," *Latomus* 12 (1953) 14-21.

³⁴ *Ancient Britain* (above, note 9) 323-28, 349 f., 355 f.

³⁵ *Ibid.* 355. In note 2 Holmes appropriately refers to Strabo 4.5.3; Plut. *Caes.* 23; Tac. *Agr.* 13; Suet. *Iul.* 25; and to Lucan 2.572 in his text.

³⁶ See above, note 30: reviewed by R. T. Bruère in *CP* 50 (1955) 142-46; by E. T. Salmon in *AJP* 76 (1955) 201-3.

by his bulletins (p. 366). He considers that Caesar acted rashly in both British invasions, that he was at pains to conceal his rashness, that he exposed his fleet to danger and made no appreciable gain, and that both times Gaul proved rebellious (pp. 167 f., 262). The first British expedition was really a failure (p. 98), and Caesar went to some pains to conceal his own contribution to the failure (pp. 99 f.). With respect to the second expedition, Caesar understressed the disaster he nearly experienced from the strategy of Cassivelaunus (p. 100).

Hence, in regard to the composition of these two epics, perhaps the meaningful item to observe is the chronology, remembering always the time lag between the occurrence of the events and Cicero's learning of their occurrence. Cicero's epic, originally thought of in June, was put to one side by late September after some work had been done on it. Caesar returned from Britain to Gaul probably early in October. In late November Cicero knew that Quintus was in winter quarters, and it was at that time that Cicero yielded to Caesar's urging, transmitted by Quintus, that he should complete his poem.

We therefore know that Cicero's epic was (well?) begun before he could have heard from Quintus of the modest success of the expedition, and it is to be remembered that Quintus may have been better satisfied with its outcome than was Caesar. Since Caesar was informed of the proposed work, Cicero was compelled to complete it, willy nilly.³⁷ Cicero's own comments seem to me to indicate clearly that he then completed the poem and that he did intend to dispatch it to Caesar, even though we have no statement that he did so.

Probably Cicero's poem was never published, if we may use such a formal term as publication for what in antiquity was often little more than the wide circulation of a poem among a large group of friends. Caesar may not have been too well satisfied with the poem, for he had even felt free to criticize unfavorably part of

³⁷ In *Q. fr.* 3.6(8).3, at the end of November, Cicero wrote that he felt compelled to complete his poem because Caesar had learned of it from the letter sent by Marcus to Quintus. The letter in question could have been earlier than *Q. fr.* 3.1.11 (finished Sept. 28, 54) in which Cicero said he had abandoned his poem after making a start. There must of course have been earlier references in letters not in our collection, for there seems to be a tone of allusion when Cicero writes "poema ad Caesarem, quod institueram, incidi," an allusion which could hardly be all the way back to a letter written in June.

Cicero's poem *De temporibus meis* (*Q. fr.* 2.16[15].5). It appears to me that we should seek the main reason for not publishing the poem among the rapidly changing political factors of the time and also in the fact that the results of the expedition were so meagre. Perhaps too the unsettled condition of affairs in Gaul, in addition to the troubles caused by Ambiorix and the Nervii, took the center of the stage and rendered it less desirable that Caesar should have attention called to the British expedition.

Again the chronology enters into the matter. Caesar may have urged Cicero to complete the poem before the expedition was over, for Cicero's letter in which we learn that Quintus had been urging Cicero on to the work was written in the latter part of November (*Q. fr.* 3.6[8].3). This would presuppose that the work had come to Caesar's attention some time earlier, possibly even before Caesar had left Britain.

It rather appears that Caesar would have had to urge Cicero to the poem as a matter of courtesy even though he may have come to feel that its composition was not so desirable as when he had first heard of it. One almost gains the impression that Marcus, having his poem begun before he received accurate news (which would have been the slower to reach him because Quintus was satisfied with the expedition even if Caesar was not), decided that he might as well complete the poem and send it along anyway, which would gain for him from Caesar at least gratitude for good intentions. Cicero in that case would not himself have been anxious to give the poem general publicity after he discovered the true conditions.³⁸ While the first British expedition had been followed by a *supplicatio* of twenty days (*Caes. B.G.* 4.38.5), L.-A. Constans may well be right in asserting that the *supplicationes* during which Cicero intended to complete his poem (*Q. fr.* 3.6[8].3) were probably because of the recent flood of the Tiber (*Cicéron, Correspondance* 3⁴.257, cf. 45, note 5) rather than in honor of Caesar.

Since Quintus Cicero, on the other hand, was actually a participant in the expedition, he consequently, although he was satisfied that Caesar had accomplished his purpose, should have known much earlier than Marcus that it was not worth while to attempt to versify

³⁸ Marcus Cicero was not impressed even earlier: *Q. fr.* 3.1.10 (the letter completed on Sept. 28, 54): "de Britannicis rebus cognoui ex tuis litteris nihil esse, nec quod metuamus nec quod gaudeamus"; *Att.* 4.18.5 (17.3) (Oct. 54): "confecta Britannia, obsidibus acceptis, nulla praeda, imperata tamen pecunia exercitum ex Britannia reportabant."

that subject in the epic manner. While the evidence shows that Quintus still had it in mind to write his poem up to the return from Britain, he was pressingly occupied by military matters soon after the army went into winter quarters, and it was probably never worth his while to resume the project.

While we are on the topic of the military matters which pressingly occupied Q. Cicero, it may be well briefly to recapitulate the events and some of the chronology of 54/53 in Gaul.³⁹ In *B.G.* 5.22.4 Caesar admitted that he decided to return from Britain to Gaul for winter quarters in 54/53 because of possible disturbances there. Ambiorix started open trouble some two weeks after the legions went into the various winter quarters (*B.G.* 5.26.1). After he had succeeded in killing Titurius and Cotta, he proceeded to Quintus' camp, where just the first part of the siege occupied a week (*B.G.* 5.43.1). We can thus see why this news had not reached Rome by the time Cicero wrote his last letter.

Another distraction for Quintus from literary matters is that he was in delicate health at the time of the attack by Ambiorix (and the Eburones and the Atuatici) and the Nervii (*B.G.* 5.40.7). According to Caesar (*B.G.* 5.53–58) there was great unrest in Gaul throughout the whole winter of 54/53. And then in the summer of 53 Quintus' command was attacked by Germans (*B.G.* 6.32–42).⁴⁰ Quintus stayed with Caesar at least until the end of the campaign of 52 (*B.G.* 7.90), but we can only surmise that he felt that the occasion for the poem had passed.

We may in conclusion consider the nature of the poem which Cicero wrote. Certainly there is a great temptation to disparage

³⁹ Cf. Drumann-Groebe (above, note 4) 3.276–81, 298 f.; Constans, *Cicéron, Correspondance* 34.46 f.

⁴⁰ On this occasion Caesar was perhaps angry with Quintus because his failure to obey orders exposed his command to serious danger from the Germans (Sugambri): Holmes, *Roman Republic* (above, note 9) 2.142; Münzer (above, note 30) 1299. The crucial passage is in Charisius (Keil, *Gram. Lat.* 1.126.11): "Itaque Caesar epistularum ad Ciceronem: 'Neque' inquit 'pro cauto ac diligente se castris continuit'." When the passage is mentioned in the edition of the correspondence by Tyrrell and Purser, 6².351, the commentary does not even suggest that the passage refers to Q. Cicero, while dating it much later.

This stricture of Quintus by Caesar in a letter to Marcus is not emphasized in the present paper because its date is in 53, whereas our problem is really confined to 54. In addition, it is perfectly possible that the passage from Charisius is meant to apply, not to Q. Cicero, but to Q. Titurius Sabinus: F. Adami, "Ueber ein Caesarfragment," *Hermes* 78 (1943) 281–85 (an article which I know only at second hand).

an historical poem on a subject of which the author had neither first-hand knowledge nor probably any proper second-hand account.

The answer to this little riddle is that Cicero was not trying to write an historical work of scientific purport. While Cicero is himself our authority for the fact that in his day there was no separate *ars* for history (no *technê* which specified how history should be composed),⁴¹ recent research shows that he understood well enough the demands of true scientific history.⁴² Similar research also shows that he did not think that some forms of historical writing, such as the monograph which he requested of Luceius (*Fam.* 5.12), needed to obey those rules of accuracy.⁴³

There is an added complication in the fact that it is a *poem* with which we are dealing. But in antiquity there was not always the clear distinction between poetical and historical composition which we expect in modern times. Of Quintus' poem Cicero said in *Q. fr.* 2.16(15).4: "quos tu situs, quas naturas rerum et locorum, quos mores, quas gentes, quas pugnas, quem uero ipsum imperatorem habes!" Those are essentially the same materials as Cicero would specify as going into the *narratio* of an oration (*Partit. orat.* 34): "Ea sunt in personis, in locis, in temporibus, in factis, in eventis, in rerum ipsarum negotiorumque naturis." The same materials comprise Cicero's (Antonius') definition of plain annalistic history (*De or.* 2.53): "monumenta . . . temporum, hominum, locorum gestarumque rerum." Essentially those same four items were the ones whose absence Tacitus deplored in his own *Annals* (4.32 f.).⁴⁴

It should be observed that such items as these four would not be regarded as necessarily the most historical portion of any historical composition. They were also appropriate to *ekphrasis* (*descriptio*), and then they are of an epideictic nature.⁴⁵ Since one of the most

⁴¹ *De or.* 2.62; cf. *Leg.* 1.5, where Atticus says that down to his time history had been neglected in Latin literature.

⁴² M. Rambaud, *Cicéron et l'Histoire romaine*, "Coll. d'Études latines," Série scientifique 28 (Paris 1953).

⁴³ B. L. Ullman, "History and Tragedy," *TAPA* 73 (1942) 25-53.

⁴⁴ In *Ann.* 4.32 Tacitus speaks of some of the subjects of earlier authors of Roman history: "Ingentia illi bella, expugnationes urbium, fusos captosque reges"; and in 4.33 he remarks that his own subject matter does not give pleasure, i.e., is not in the proper style of his predecessors: "Ceterum ut profutura, ita minimum oblectationis adferunt. Nam situs gentium, varietates proeliorum, clari ducum exitus retinent ac redintegrant legentium animum." Cf. Ann Fleming Deagon, "The Influence of Hellenistic and Contemporary Greek Historical Theory on Tacitus" (unpublished University of North Carolina dissertation, 1954, written under my direction), especially pp. 21-25.

⁴⁵ T. C. Burgess, *Epideictic Literature* (Chicago 1902) 200 f. Ullman (above, note 43) 52 points out that Cicero grouped "history with encomia and such works as Iso-

frequent uses of epideictic writing is encomium, Cicero was trying to praise Caesar, not to write a serious historical account of his second British expedition. Such a laudatory poem would have been of the utmost interest to Caesar while he had high hopes of the expedition, or even before the trouble with the Eburones and the Nervii carried with it the implication that he had gone off to Britain before affairs were settled in Gaul, but it would also be the sort of poem he would not be anxious to have broadcast once it was clear that the expedition was not a glorious success and that there was rebellion in Gaul.

crates' *Panegyric* under the head of epideictic oratory (*Or.* 37; cf. 66, 207; *De or.* 2.62; *Leg.* 1.5). . . . Therefore he wants history written after the manner of Isocrates and Theopompus (*Or.* 207)."

I have had the benefit of some suggestions made in conversation by Prof. Harry M. Hubbell, but of course I take the sole responsibility for my remarks.