RhM 162 (2019) 265–291

MAGNUM OPUS: ATTICUS, CICERO, AND ERATOSTHENES' *GEOGRAPHY*[1]

Abstract: This paper considers the implications for Latin literary and intellectual culture of an adaptation of Eratosthenes' *Geography* proposed by Atticus to Cicero in 59 B.C. Atticus was an important figure in the Roman book trade, and this paper explores his potential role in the production of Roman geographical works in the 50s and 40s B.C. But Cicero declined Atticus' project, and the paper also considers the reasons for his refusal, concluding that the rejection can be taken as evidence for his belief that political action and literary production were related projects that simultaneously served the Roman state and afforded him prestige and standing within it.

Keywords: Cicero, Eratosthenes, Titus Pomponius Atticus, geography

In 59 B.C., during a withdrawal from the Senate that lasted through the spring and early summer, Cicero was encouraged by his friend Atticus to compose a text of some kind, and he too was eager to use this period of leisure time productively (Att. 2.4 [SB 24]). Atticus suggested an adaptation of Eratosthenes' monumental *Geography* (Att. 2.6 [SB 26], 2.7 [SB 27]), and Cicero seriously considered taking on the project. But by late summer, he had abandoned the idea to return to political affairs in the city, and when he turned again to the idea of literary production some years later, it was not scientific geography he produced, but philosophical and rhetorical dialogues and treatises.[2]

---

1) The subject matter of this paper was first presented at the Cicero Awayday VIII at the University of Glasgow, and I am grateful to the participants of that conference for their feedback. I also thank Lauren Donovan Ginsberg and Liz Gloyn for their comments on an early draft, the anonymous referees for their useful revisions, and Peter Schenk for his editorial guidance. I am especially grateful to Isabel Köster for suggestions and support that improved this paper a great deal.

2) The use of the term 'literature' and its constellation of related words is always somewhat fraught, especially in the context of antiquity; here I follow the lead of Feeney 2016 in using it, in the case of Rome, for any highly worked text intended for publication.

This episode in Cicero's career, brief though it may be, offers a window onto a literary and intellectual culture in late Republican Rome that was both vibrant in its own right and inescapably imbricated with Greek literary and intellectual culture. This imbrication was, in fact, responsible for the renaissance in geography that occurred in this period. At the time that Atticus proposed a Roman adaptation of Eratosthenes, the genre was also flourishing among Greek authors due to their increased contact with Rome: as the Romans continued to conquer heretofore unknown lands, Greeks felt obliged to update their accounts of the inhabited world, the οἰκουμένη, transforming what had once been a purely scientific genre into essentially a history of Roman conquest.[3]

But Romans of the period had set their sights on more than just military supremacy. Indeed, for almost two hundred years, they had been engaged in Greek-style literary production, in the hopes that their combined military and cultural power would establish Latin as an uncontested language of empire.[4] Yet despite the lofty aims they had for their literature, in the period before Cicero's career, its production was largely the work of lower status individuals under the patronage of men of senatorial rank. The one foray that high status individuals were willing to make into the literary realm was the composition of prose works (in genres such as legal writing, historiography, political memoirs, and later, oratory) that could be used, whether directly or indirectly, to advertise their own actions on behalf of the Roman state.[5] While such works were certainly intended to grow Rome's burgeoning national literature and thus increase Rome's cultural standing, they also served, fairly nakedly, to memorialize their author's own standing as a political actor in that state.

In suggesting that Cicero produce an adaptation of Eratosthenes, Atticus was seeking to expand the range of works considered permissible to high status Romans, and Cicero's literary career is

3) Clarke 1999 emphasizes this element of late Hellenistic geography; cf. Moatti 2015, 55–62 and Nicolet 1991, 29–56.

4) Feeney 2016 discusses the motives behind the birth and growth of Latin literature in the third and second centuries.

5) For the contrast in status between writers of prose and poetry in this early period, see Kaimio 1979, 209–239.

evidence that such an expansion did indeed occur in the late Republic. Even though he took a similar stance towards literary production as that of other high-status individuals (always seeing it, in some respect, as a source for memorializing his contributions to the Roman state), he was also innovative in the genres in which he composed – not just oratory, but also works of poetry, philosophy, and rhetoric that were frequently based on Greek originals.

Cicero's innovation in this regard was only possible thanks to the rapid increase in Greek cultural resources at Rome in the late Republic, when the campaigns of Sulla and Lucullus in the Greek East meant that Greek scholars and Greek books had begun to flow into the city at an unprecedented rate.[6] This material, when combined with the approach that had begun to view literary production in any genre as a high-status contribution to the state, was responsible for a seismic shift in Latin literature. The result was the ambitious project of canon-building along Greek lines that peaked under Augustus.[7]

Within the well-trod terrain of this so-called 'Golden Age' of Latin literature, the case of Eratosthenes' *Geography* represents a road not travelled, one that allows us to see the complex negotiations that went into making Latin literature a suitable object of national prestige. The climate was certainly right for a work of Roman geography: the subject was flourishing among the Greeks, and the Romanization of a foundational work in the genre had become feasible thanks to an increase in Greek resources in Rome. As I will show, these were likely the considerations that prompted Atticus to propose the project to Cicero.

It is noteworthy that Cicero even considered adapting Eratosthenes at all; this is, as far as we know, the first time since the

6) Sulla's sack of Athens in 88 B.C., along with Lucullus' campaigns in the Greek East in the following decades, represented a major turning point for Roman intellectual culture; see Rawson 1985, 3–18 and Hutchinson 2013, 59–64. Sulla and Lucullus both accumulated large book collections through their victories (Sulla's primarily from Athens, Lucullus' from Pontus and other parts of Asia Minor). These collections were made available to well born Romans like Cicero: see Att. 4.10 (SB 84) on Sulla's library and Fin. 3.7–10 on the library of Lucullus.

7) Moatti 2015 discusses the intellectual revolution of this period; on the obsession with canon building in particular, see Horsfall 1993, Goldberg 2005, Citroni 2006.

advent of his political career that he considered adapting a Greek work. But his rejection of the project is evidence that even as the conditions of its production changed, Latin literature remained tightly bound to the imperialistic ambitions of the Roman state and the personal ambitions of its high-status actors. Indeed, as I will demonstrate, in the end geography was not taken up by Cicero because he believed he did not have the skills to handle the topic in a way that would meaningfully increase both the Republic's prestige and his own.

This article will consider each of these aspects in turn. First, I will discuss Greek and Roman intellectual culture in this period, elucidating the reasons Atticus might have thought that a Roman adaptation of the signature work of the Greek father of geography would benefit Roman literature. I will then turn to Cicero, and discuss why the climate at Rome in early 59 might initially have made the adaptation of a Greek geographical work attractive. I will conclude by considering what his ultimate refusal can tell us about the unique circumstances under which Latin prose was produced in the late Republic.

Atticus, Eratosthenes, and geography in Rome

From everything Cicero says about his proposed adaptation of Eratosthenes, it is clear that the project was the brainchild of his close friend, the wealthy, well-educated, and well-connected Titus Pomponius Atticus. As his cognomen suggests, Atticus is a pivotal figure for understanding the way that Greek intellectual culture arrived in Rome in the first century: his nickname was meant to denote, at least according to Cicero, not just his lengthy sojourns in Athens, but also the qualities of *humanitas* and *prudentia* he brought back with him to Rome from his studies there (Sen. 1).[8] In addition to these intangible qualities, Atticus was also responsible for transferring Greek culture to Rome in a very tangible way: his fascination with Greece, interests in Greek literature and culture,

---

8) Cappello 2016 notes that 'Atticus' becomes a speaking name in Cicero's letters, a reminder not just of his geographical connection to Athens, but also the qualities of Greek moral and intellectual wisdom he absorbed there.

vast fortune, and financial and social connections in the Greek East all made him uniquely qualified to identify and acquire valuable Greek libraries for himself and his Roman friends.[9] In fact, the earliest dateable correspondence between Cicero and Atticus involves Atticus' procurement of a library for Cicero in 67–66 B.C. (Att. 1.7 [SB 3], 1.10 [SB 6], 1.11 [SB 7], 1.4 [SB 9]), and Cicero's reference to it as a *bibliotheca* makes it all but certain that this library consisted primarily or entirely of Greek works.[10]

Cicero's references to Atticus' personal library suggest that it too was well stocked in Greek works: he frequently requests specialized Greek treatises from his friend (Att. 2.4 [SB 24], 2.20 [SB 40], 8.11 [SB 161], 12.6 [SB 306], 13.39 [SB 342]), and once asks for permission to use the library while Atticus is away in order to consult references for *De Re Publica* (Att. 4.14 [SB 88]). The seriousness of Atticus' commitment to enriching his book collection is clear from his retention of a dedicated group of well-trained slave readers and copyists (Nepos, Att. 13.3). This was an expensive proposition, but one that allowed Atticus to quickly add volumes to his collection whenever accurate exemplars were found, and also to produce high quality copies of the texts within his library for the members of his circle.[11] A number of imperial Greek authors who lived in Rome speak of editions by Atticus of Plato, Demosthenes, and Aeschines, and both Lucian (Ind. 24) and Galen (Comm. In Tim. fr. 2.107–11) note that these editions were prized for their accuracy.[12] The continued fame of Atticus' books over two hundred years later is a sign of the time and money he devoted to tracking quality Greek texts down and making them more widely available in the city of his birth.

9) For Atticus' financial dealings, see Perlwitz 1992; his access to Greek libraries is discussed by Dix 2013.

10) See Dix 2013, 209–213.

11) The difficulty in antiquity of finding accurate exemplars, and the expense of maintaining a group of trained copyists, are both stressed by Houston 2014 passim. These slaves could also, of course, make copies of the works of Atticus' friends for wider distribution, and Dortmund 2001, Phillips 1986, and Iddeng 2006, 63–68 discuss Atticus' publication of some of Cicero's later works.

12) Jones 2009, 392–393 discusses the ancient evidence for Atticus' editions of Greek authors; see also Houston 2014 passim.

Like most Roman intellectuals of this period, Atticus' interest in Greek culture was not just that of a passive collector; the Greek resources he hunted down were meant to improve Roman literary production. In addition to producing his own works of a historical and antiquarian nature, he also encouraged many of his friends to write, and had a penchant for suggesting compositions in well-established Greek genres that he believed had not yet been satisfactorily Romanized.[13] Cornelius Nepos, Varro, and Cicero all either dedicated works to him or named him as a source of literary inspiration, and his influence on their textual production must have stemmed not just from their trust in his literary instincts, but also from his ability to provide, through his extensive library, the resources they would need to finish their compositions.[14]

With all this in mind, let us consider how Cicero portrays the genesis of his planned adaptation of Eratosthenes. He first mentions the idea in a letter to Atticus from early April 59 (Att. 2.4 [SB 24]), when he is in Antium, though this is clearly not the first time the two men had discussed the possibility.[15] In this letter, Cicero thanks Atticus for sending him – presumably from his own library – an expository treatise on Eratosthenes by Serapio, a mathematician and geographer who had studied with the astronomer Hipparchus of Nicaea. Hipparchus had written a work that criticized Eratosthenes' geographical calculations, and in a subsequent letter (Att. 2.6 [SB 26]), Cicero suggests that Serapio was similarly critical.[16] At the close of the letter, Cicero makes it clear that Atticus is the one who has prompted him to take on the project: 'I'll try to meet your wishes about the *Geography* but I don't promise anything for certain. It's a big undertaking (*magnum opus*). However, I will take

13) For Atticus' own writings, see Rawson 1985, 233–249 passim.

14) For Nepos, see Cat. 3 with the commentary of Rawson 1985, 103. For Varro, whose *De Vita Populi Romani* and *Atticus de Numeris* were dedicated to Atticus, see Rawson 1985, 100–104. Atticus also famously pressed Cicero to write a history (Leg. 1.5, Att. 14.14.5 [SB 368], Att. 16.13ab [SB 424]). Greek intellectuals also dedicated works to Atticus, including one on Greek accents by Tyrannio (Att. 12.6.2 [SB 306]) and the *On Concord* of Demetrius of Magnesia (Att. 8.11 [SB 161]).

15) No epistolary correspondence between them is extant between January and April of this year.

16) Hipparchus' geographical fragments are collected in Dicks 1960. The meagre evidence for Serapio's work can be found in Hübner 2006.

care, as you request, to have some work to show you for this time away from home.'[17]

The same phrase, *magnum opus*, recurs in a letter written only a few days later, where Cicero reports that he has been so taken by the scenery at Antium that he finds himself unable to do anything but count the waves and read.[18] He is in no mood to write, and besides, 'the *Geography* that I had agreed to is a big undertaking' (Att. 2.6 [SB 26]: *etenim* γεωγραφικὰ *quae constitueram magnum opus est*).[19] This recusatio was clearly not to Atticus' liking, for in the next letter Cicero promises to 'think again and again' about the project (Att. 2.7 [SB 27]: *de geographia etiam atque etiam deliberabimus*). Nor did Atticus give up easily: throughout April he continued to demand that Cicero 'attack something big (*magnum*), something that needs plenty of thought and time.'[20]

Yet while Cicero's interest in geography continued in at least a desultory fashion until August of 59 B.C., when he mentions having read a geographical poem by the Greek author Alexander of Ephesus, Eratosthenes is not mentioned again after April.[21] For the majority of the summer Cicero was back in Rome, with little time

---

17) Att. 2.4.3 (SB 24): *de geographia, dabo operam ut tibi satis faciam; sed nihil certi polliceor. magnum opus est, sed tamen, ut iubes, curabo ut huius peregrinationis aliquod tibi opus exstet*. Translation adapted from Shackleton Bailey 2004. Unless otherwise noted, all translations are mine other than those of Cicero's letters, which are taken from Shackleton Bailey 2004.

18) The phrase *magnum opus* is a particularly Ciceronian one, occurring only three times in other Latin prose: the *Bellum Alexandrinum* (6), a letter from Caesar quoted by Cicero (Att. 9.14 [SB 182]), and in Servius' commentary to the *Georgics* (1.160, a prose summary of G. 3.294). These letters to Atticus represent the largest clustering of the phrase, though elsewhere in Cicero's corpus it is also used to describe genres or specific literary works requiring great labour (see, e. g., De Orat. 2.72; Amic. 17; Orat. 33, 75; Acad. 1.2, and Tusc. 3.79,84).

19) Translation adapted from Shackleton Bailey 2004.

20) Att. 2.14 (SB 34): *magnum quid agrediamur et multae cogitationis atque oti.*

21) Heraclitus the Allegorist (12) says that Alexander's poem named Hermes' lyre the source of the harmony of the spheres, and Zetzel 1995, 235–237 considers the poem an important resource for the *Somnium Scipionis*; see further Solmsen 1942, 212. Alexander was a rough contemporary of Cicero, and his poem may well have been written in response to Eratosthenes' didactic poem *Hermes*, which was also an important resource for the *Somnium*, on which see Zetzel 1995, 235–245 passim.

for scholarly pursuits due to the uptick in his legal work (Att. 2.20 [SB 40], 2.22 [SB 42]), and as the summer wore on, his time was increasingly devoted to amassing support for the attack by Clodius that he assumed would commence once he had taken up his tribunate (Att. 2.9 [SB 29]). Henceforth, so far as we can tell, geography proper disappears from Cicero's interests.[22]

Cicero's various attempts to gracefully refuse his friend's proposal – and his apparent abandonment of geography thereafter – point to Atticus as the originator of the plan, and suggest he had a certain enthusiasm for it that Cicero's refusals could not quell. Given what we know about Atticus' penchant for acquiring Greek books and passing them on to friends, this sudden interest points to the possibility of a recent exposure to Eratosthenes' *Geography*, and his whereabouts in the preceding years would have afforded ample opportunity for such exposure: from late 62 to late 60, he was based out of his estate in Epirus, with the ability to travel easily throughout Greece to track down books or to have them brought to him.[23] Furthermore, in the summer of 60, Cicero asked Atticus to secure for him the library of Servius Clodius, the son-in-law of the scholar Aelius Stilo, which had been given as a gift to Cicero by Servius Clodius' heir Lucius Papirius Paetus (Att. 1.20 [SB 20], 2.1 [SB 21]); Servius Clodius had been living in Greece, and Cicero presumably wanted Atticus to bring the library back to Italy with him when he returned at the end of the year.[24] We know, then, that Atticus returned to Rome in 60 with at least one new cache of books, and we can assume that he returned with his own collection enlarged as well. His sudden passion for Eratosthenes suggests that

22) It is worth noting, however, that Pliny the Elder quotes several times from an *Admiranda* of Cicero (Nat. 31.51; cf. 31.12), while Priscian refers to a *Chorographia* (2.267.5): Büchner 1939, 1271 sensibly suggested that both references are to a single Ciceronian work on a geographical topic. It is possible that this work was composed in 59, though Rawson 1985, 103 n. 20 hypothesizes that it was composed in the later 50s, a period for which there is less epistolary evidence. If the work is genuine, it was likely never completed and almost certainly published posthumously.

23) See Shackleton Bailey 2004, 297.

24) Dix 2013, 217–219 discusses this acquisition. Servius Clodius was himself a significant figure in Rome's intellectual revolution; for his scholarly activities, which largely involved the study of Roman comedy, see Rawson 1972, 34; Dix 1986, 101; Goldberg 2005 passim.

the *Geography* – along with works like Serapio's that explicated and corrected the *Geography* – may have been among his new acquisitions.[25]

Atticus was not the only Roman to become enthusiastic about Eratosthenes in this period. While the evidence for Roman geographical works is relatively meagre and Eratosthenes may have appeared in earlier works of which we are now unaware, it is only in the 50s and later that his influence on Roman authors can be securely attested. Moreover, in this period he is mentioned with some frequency: Caesar draws on Book 3 of the *Geography* at B. Gall. 6.24 (= fr. 150 Roller), and Varro (Rust. 1.2.3–4), Vitruvius (De Arch. 1.6.9, 11), and Vergil (Aen. 1.13–14) all also reveal their familiarity with the work.[26] The fact that the two earliest of these authors, Caesar and Varro, were on friendly terms with Atticus, and that Atticus was known to make his library available to his circle of acquaintances, suggests that he may have promoted Eratosthenes to more friends than just Cicero, and that he did so in part by circulating the *Geography* and treatises like Serapio's more widely at Rome than they had been before.

Atticus certainly would not have lacked for interested Romans to whom he could promote the *Geography*: in the decade and a half that followed his proposal to Cicero in 59, Roman geographical works proliferated. The most notable writer to explore the genre in this period is Caesar, whose *Bellum Gallicum* includes geographical elements, but works on geography were also produced by Cornelius Nepos, Varro of Atax, Nigidius Figulus, and Varro.[27] Indeed, the large number of geographical works that can be dated to the 50s and 40s suggests that Atticus' enthusiasm for a Roman version of Eratosthenes presaged a broader trend. He may even have had a hand in this trend through his promotion of certain Greek topics, authors, and resources to appropriate Roman friends.

25) Roller 2010, 32 hypothesizes, in fact, that Atticus made the *Geography* available at Rome for the first time.

26) For the subtle allusion to the *Geography* in the *Aeneid*, see Korenjak 2004.

27) On geographical elements in the *Bellum Gallicum*, see Rambaud 1974, Krebs 2006, and Krebs 2011. For Cornelius Nepos' geographical works, see Schanz / Hosius 1927, 354; Aldo 1988; and Rawson 1985. For Varro of Atax, see Rawson 1985, 265–266. For Nigidius Figulus, see Rawson 1985, 266. For Varro, see Rawson 1985, 264–266 and Moatti 2015, 64–65.

Atticus' position at the forefront of this surge in interest was likely due to his awareness of the state of Greek literary trends, where geography was already experiencing a renaissance.[28] He must have recognized that geography was a genre that could, with the right resources and talent, be successfully and authoritatively co-opted by Roman writers. This is because, as has already been noted, the resurgence of Greek interest in the topic did not occur in a vacuum; rather, it was closely connected to recent Roman activities, most notably Rome's military expansion in the second and first centuries into previously unknown parts of Europe, Africa, and the Caucasus.[29]

A brief survey of contemporary Greek geographical work underscores this point. Polybius, one of the first Romanized Greeks, is also the earliest example of the genre's resurgence: he included detailed geographical information about the western Mediterranean in his *Histories* and also conducted geographical investigations whose findings were reported in specialized treatises.[30] Numerous Greeks followed his example. At the end of the second century, Artemidorus of Ephesus used newly available Roman data to write an account of western Europe.[31] In the following century, Posidonius also wrote a detailed description of western Europe and an ethnography of the Celts, both topics that relied on Rome's presence in these regions.[32] Theophanes of Mytilene, who accompanied Pompey on his campaign against Mithridates, published an account of Armenia and the Caucasus.[33] Tyrannio of Amisus, a well-connected Greek intellectual who was brought to Rome by Lucullus, also at least contemplated a geographical work, according to Cicero (Att. 2.6 [SB 26]).[34] Thus, while the massive *Geography* of Tyran-

28) For Greek geography of this period, see Clarke 1999; Roller 2015, 136–149; Nicolet 1991, 57–84; Dueck 2000 passim; Rawson 1985, 250–257.

29) Both Polybius (3.59) and Strabo (1.2.1) mention the importance of Roman conquest for new geographical material. On Rome's role in Greek works on geography from this period, see Clarke 1999; Moatti 2015, 52–55.

30) For Polybius' geographical work, see Clarke 1999, 77–128 and Roller 2015, 136–139.

31) See Roller 2015, 134–135 and Rawson 1985, 251.

32) Posidonius' geographical works are discussed by Clarke 1999, 129–192.

33) See Roller 2015, 144–145.

34) Tyrannio and Cicero were close enough that Cicero called on him to reorganize his library after his exile; on this aspect of their relationship, see Johnson 2012; Dix 2013, 222–225; Houston 2014, 217–220.

nio's student Strabo represents the culmination of late Hellenistic Greek interest in the topic, it was preceded by numerous works that used the opportunity presented by Roman military expansion to expand the boundaries of Greek geographical knowledge.

If Atticus was aware of the flourishing of Greek interest in the topic (as he presumably was), he must also have recognized that all of these authors were basically engaged in updating Eratosthenes, whose *Geography* was considered foundational for the genre but whose grasp on the western Mediterranean had been shaky at best.[35] Eratosthenes' treatise no doubt loomed large in the genre: it had likely introduced the term γεωγραφία itself in place of the older γῆς περίοδος, and it presented itself as a re-founding of the discipline on a more scientific basis in opposition to the poetic flights of fancy taken by Homer, who had long been considered the expert on the subject (frr. 2–11 Roller).[36] Moreover, the breadth of material the *Geography* covered – from accounts of the measurement of the earth and Greece's place upon it to descriptions of each part of the οἰκουμένη and the societies that could be found throughout it – was unprecedented in a field that had earlier been the province of historians and paradoxographers. And even as Eratosthenes stressed the scientific improvements of his account, he also made it refreshingly accessible; as recent work has shown, he was a linguistic innovator, using non-scientific terms like διαφράγματα ('barricades') and σφραγῖδες ('seals') to describe his division of the οἰκουμένη, which was itself χλαμυδοειδής ('cloak-like') and rotated on a σπόνδυλος ('spindle whorl').[37] The work's accessibility, claims to scientific accuracy, and breadth all played a role in cementing its status as the founding work of scientific geography.

But despite the clear advance the *Geography* represented, Eratosthenes was largely unfamiliar with the western Mediterranean: Strabo claims that he was completely ignorant of Spain, Gaul, Germany, and Britain, and that he was considerably ignorant of Italy and the Adriatic (2.1.41). The work was almost certainly completed

---

35) Roller 2010 is an edition of the work; Geus 2002, 261–288; Roller 2015, 121–135; and Pfeiffer 1968, 164–167 provide analysis.

36) Eratosthenes' treatment of Homer is decried by Strabo 1.1–2 passim. On Strabo, Eratosthenes, and Homer, see Dueck 2000, 31–38.

37) See Geus 2004 and Roller 2015, 124.

before a Roman presence began to be seriously felt in Greece at the end of the third century, and Rome must have been little more than a name to Eratosthenes; in his ignorance, Strabo says, he placed the city on the same meridian as Carthage, significantly to the west of its real location (2.1.40). Within a century, Roman expansion across the Mediterranean and the concomitant fall of Carthage had made Eratosthenes' best-known work obsolete, and Rome's growing empire inspired authors like Polybius, Artemidorus, Posidonius, and Theophanes to fill in his gaps.

Yet Eratosthenes must still have held an honoured place as the father of the discipline. The renaissance in Greek geography meant that Latin was ripe for a work in the genre, and Eratosthenes was a natural model with which to initiate it. In giving Cicero the right of first refusal on this project, then, Atticus was essentially offering him the opportunity to serve as the *primus inventor* for a new Latin genre, a role that Cicero certainly relished when he began to Romanize philosophy in the 40s.[38] Moreover, an adaptation of Eratosthenes' signature work would have required extensive updates precisely because he had not reckoned with Roman dominion. A Roman version of the *Geography* would thus not just have stood at the head of a genre that was growing in popularity at Rome, it would have done so by employing the tools of Greek science to quite literally map Roman military conquest of the known world. It would be surprising if Cicero had not been tempted by this opportunity, and indeed, his many letters to Atticus about the project show that he did ponder an adaptation seriously enough to begin consulting treatises like Serapio's. The fact that Cicero considered adapting Eratosthenes' *magnum opus* at all marks an important step in his literary career, with significant implications for our understanding of his evolution as a literary figure; his decision not to pursue its adaptation is evidence of the complex negotiations that went into fashioning his literary persona.

---

38) Note especially Tusc. 1.1–6, where Cicero obscures the philosophical work being done in his social circle (especially by Brutus and Varro) in order to present himself as the one who will first bring the genre to light for Romans. Baraz 2012, 108–112 and Fox 2007, 37–39 discuss Cicero's strategies to this end. On the centrality of the *primus inventor* trope among Romans in this period, see Citroni 2001 and Hinds 1998, 52–63.

Eratosthenes and Cicero's intellectual and literary turn

In the final decade or so of his life, Cicero embarked upon an ambitious writing programme for which one of the chief organizing principles was the adaptation of Greek works into Latin. This included specific works by classical Greek authors (Plato in *De Re Publica, De Legibus*, and *De Oratore*; Aristotle in *De Oratore* and *Topica*) as well as Hellenistic philosophy and rhetoric more generally (as in many of the dialogues and treatises of the 40s). This writing programme, which Cicero took up after his exile and subsequent loss of political prominence, is presented by him as a substitute for his political career, a way to continue benefitting the Roman state and earning benefits from it in turn.[39] This insistence that the composition of literature in any genre was a contribution to the state equal in importance to political acts was a significant innovation, and one that had much influence on later Latin literature, particularly in the Augustan period.

Before this intervention by Cicero, the composition of literary works – and intellectual labour more generally – had been seen by elite Romans as wholly separate from a political career, and Cicero himself largely abstained from both practices during his ascent up the *cursus honorum*.[40] He claims in correspondence and publications from this period that his studies could only be pursued in his rare free time, and they are represented as a desirable (if often unattainable) refuge from the stresses of political life (see, e. g., Att. 1.11 [SB 7], Cons. 71–78 [Courtney 10 = Div. 1.21–22], and Arch. 12–14).[41]

Yet as Cicero found himself with less to do politically, he turned to these studies, and to the composition of dialogues and treatises, as an alternate form of labour, and argued that they pro-

---

39) Neatly summarized by Dugan 2005, 13: "The ambitions of this cultural intervention increase in inverse proportion to Cicero's actual political influence." See also, e. g., Bringmann 1971, Habinek 1994, Narducci 1997, Baraz 2012.

40) Leisure time slowly evolved in the late Republic to become a time when one could take up literary composition; see Stroup 2010, 37–65. Baraz 2012, 23–43 considers how various late Republican authors reconfigured writing as a positive use of their leisure time.

41) Fox 2007, 29–32 discusses Cicero's configuration of intellectual pursuits in this early period.

vided a benefit to Rome commensurate with political activity. In the *Tusculan Disputations* (1.5), for example, he describes his transfer of Greek philosophy into Latin as a service to the state produced in his leisure time (*otiosi*) that will match his political services (*occupati*).[42] In *De Natura Deorum* he claims that Caesar's accession has made him 'listless with leisure' (1.7: *otio langueremus*) and prompted him to set out philosophy 'for the sake of the republic itself' (1.7: *ipsius rei publicae causa*). In the compositions of the mid to late 50s that were written after his return from exile and general exclusion from political power, he offers a similar, if less advanced, formulation of the same idea. Here there is still some hope that he will produce something directly beneficial to political life; the difference is that this benefit will now be provided not through political action but through works of political philosophy.[43]

Cicero's turn to intellectual labour as a proxy service to the state in lieu of his political career has, accordingly, usually been discussed in light of the political upheavals he faced as a result of his exile, or of Caesar's accession.[44] But while Cicero's views on the benefits his textual production provided for the Roman state certainly did evolve with the evolving political situation, I contend that the proposed adaptation of Eratosthenes' *Geography* was a more noteworthy step for his career as a writer than has previously been recognized – both because he considered taking up the project in the first place, and because he eventually put it aside.

42) See also Div. 2.1–7, Fin. 1.10–11. On this trope in Cicero more generally, see Baraz 2012. Gildenhard 2007, 139–145 discusses the passage from the *Tusculans* in depth.

43) This is especially notable in the authorial prefaces of *De Oratore* (e. g., 1.1–3, 3.13–14), though cf. Rep. 1.7. As Steel 2005, 80–81 notes, in the preface of *De Oratore* Cicero brings writing, typically a product of *otium*, into the realm of political *negotium* in a bid to secure its political importance. On the distinction between these works and the later philosophical writings, see Schmidt 1978, 119–120; Baraz 2012, 9–10.

44) Baraz 2012, 67–73 reads Cicero's correspondence as showing "episodic, but deepening forays into the philosophical sphere" through the 50s; McConnell 2014, 44–55 dates his intellectual turn to 54 B. C.; Fox 2007, 34–35 calls it a thought process fully worked out by the 40s. Stroup 2010, 37–63, however, discusses the gradual evolution of Cicero's views on leisure time from the time of his consulship through to Caesar's dictatorship.

Because Cicero's exile (which lasted from April of 58 to August of 57) provides such a neat way of dividing his active political career from his concerted intellectual labour in the later 50s and 40s, it can be easy to forget that in the early months of Caesar's consulship, the political situation – both for the Republic at large and for Cicero personally – was in a state of deepening crisis.[45] Caesar's willingness to take extra-legal measures to achieve his ends was almost immediately apparent in the machinations he used to pass an agrarian reform bill designed to benefit Pompey's veterans. Cicero was taken aback by the initial proposal of the bill, and reckoned that he had three options in responding to it (Att. 2.3.3 [SB 23]):

> *nam aut fortiter resistendum est legi agrariae, in quo est quaedam dimicatio sed plena laudis, aut quiescendum, quod est non dissimile atque ire in Solonium aut Antium, aut etiam adiuvandum, quod a me aiunt Caesarem sic exspectare ut non dubitet.*
>
> Either I put up a stout resistance to the agrarian law, which means something of a struggle but an honourable one, or I lie low, which is nearly tantamount to retiring to Antium or Solonium, or I actually lend it my assistance as they say that Caesar confidently expects me to do.

Cicero opted for resistance at first: he both opposed the bill itself and, it would seem, openly complained about the alliance between Caesar, Pompey, and Crassus that had prompted its introduction during a defence speech for his consular colleague Antonius Hybrida.[46] This resulted in tension between himself and the three men; Suetonius goes so far as to claim that Caesar granted Clodius permission to become a plebeian mere hours after the defence speech (Div. Jul. 20), and though this timeline is not necessarily to be trusted, it is clear that Cicero's relationship with the three became strained. He had already watched his consular policies crumble over the past two years, and the tacit support of the three men (especially his former ally Pompey) for his enemy Clodius would have driven home the weakness of his position.

This weakness would also have been underlined in the ensuing clash over the bill itself. When Caesar brought it before the people,

45) As Mitchell 1973, 26 puts it, "Cicero found himself, at the beginning of 59, without a place or purpose in Roman politics, and a decade and a half would pass before he recovered either."

46) Thus Dio 38.10. On the nature and import of this trial, see Gruen 1973.

his colleague Bibulus' attempts to block it led to a violent scene, and proper senatorial procedure was so thoroughly ignored in its passage that Bibulus retired from the Senate for the rest of the year in protest.[47] Other traditionally minded senators also withdrew for a time, and Cicero was among them. He now made good on the middle option he had suggested to Atticus in the letter above: namely, lying low in Antium or Solonium. He spent a large part of the spring first in Antium and then in Formiae, and the letters in which he discusses adapting the *Geography* were written during his stay in Antium.

In the letters to Atticus that date from this period of withdrawal (Att. 2.4–2.17), Cicero frequently links the republic's dismal state to his newfound desire to bury himself in his studies. In the first letter from the series, he insists that instead of focusing on affairs in the city, he will 'amuse myself with the Muses in equanimity … and it will never enter my head to envy Crassus or to regret that I have remained true to myself.'[48] After eagerly requesting political gossip in a subsequent letter, he chastises himself, saying 'But why ask about such things when I want to put them aside and devote my whole mind and all my care to the pursuit of knowledge? I mean it, this is my intention. I wish I had done it from the beginning.'[49] In a later letter, he debates the positions of Dicaearchus (who advocated for a public life) and Theophrastus (who advocated for a private one) before deciding that Theophrastus had the right of it: 'so, Titus mine, let me throw myself into my studies,

47) The timeline of events during 59 (including Bibulus' withdrawal from senatorial business) is much disputed. Taylor 1968 argues that Caesar passed the bill in early February, while Bringmann 2007 suggests March. Stockton 1971, 169–170 also suggests an early date for the bill's passage, tying Cicero's withdrawal to Antium to Bibulus' retirement from the Senate. But Shackleton Bailey 2004, 406–408 argues that it was not until the passage of Caesar's second agrarian law, much later in the spring, that Bibulus withdrew, and Richardson 1998 agrees. Regardless of the chronology, Smith 1964, 307 is right to note that by April Cicero had been forced to "silent inactivity", as his letters clearly indicate.

48) Att. 2.4 (SB 24): *interea quidem cum Musis nos delectabimus animo aequo … neque mihi umquam veniet in mentem Crasso invidere neque paenitere quod a me ipso non desciverim*.

49) Att. 2.5 (SB 25): *sed quid ego haec, quae cupio deponere et toto animo atque omni cura* φιλοσοφεῖν? *sic, inquam, in animo est; vellem ab initio …* Translation mine. See also 2.8 (SB 28), 2.13 (SB 33), 2.16 (SB 36).

those noble studies which I ought never to have left and to which I must now at last return.'[50] In the letter that follows, he breaks off from lamenting political developments, lest 'my hard work and the midnight oil of my intellectual pursuits be for nothing.'[51]

While the opposition Cicero draws in these letters between the political pursuits he wishes to abandon and the intellectual ones he wants to take up recalls the traditional Roman separation between the two spheres, there is also an important distinction.[52] Before, Cicero had relegated his studies to periods of respite from his public duties, and portrayed them as a temporary refuge from his taxing career (e. g., Att. 1.10 [SB 6]). As recently as a year earlier, when asking Atticus for help in acquiring the library of Servius Clodius, Cicero explained that 'I badly need both the Greek books and the Latin' because 'more and more the longer I live I find relaxation in these studies in whatever time I have to spare from my legal work.'[53] But in the spring of 59, Cicero has withdrawn from politics under some duress; much as would be the case later in the decade and under Caesar's dictatorship, at this point his leisure time is not really a respite because it is not entirely of his own choosing.[54] Furthermore, twice in his correspondence from this period, Cicero muses on how history will view him (Att. 2.5 [SB 25], Att. 2.17 [SB 37]), suggesting that during this somewhat forced retirement

---

50) Att. 2.16 (SB 36): *qua re incumbamus, o noster Tite, ad illa praeclara studia et eo unde discedere non oportuit aliquando revertamur*. Translation adapted from Shackleton Bailey 2004.

51) Att. 2.17 (SB 37): *ne et opera et oleum philologiae nostrae perierit*. Translation mine. The use of the word *philologia* here is perhaps significant, given Suetonius' assertion that Eratosthenes coined the term to describe his interests (Gram. 10). Cicero uses it elsewhere only in his letters, and always with an eye towards Greek learning: cf. Att. 13.12 (SB 320), Att. 13.28 (SB 299), and Q. fr. 2.9 (SB 12).

52) McConnell 2014, 44–55 brings out well the opposition between politics and study in this run of letters.

53) Att. 1.20.7 (SB 20): *nam et Graecis iis libris quos suspicor et Latinis quos scio illum reliquisse mihi vehementer opus est. ego autem cottidie magis quod mihi de forensi labore temporis datur in iis studiis conquiesco*.

54) Adams 2003, 342–345 provides further evidence for linking the spring of 59 to Cicero's later periods of textual production. Studying the chronological patterns of Cicero's code-switching to Greek in letters to Atticus, Adams notes several rises and falls: the first in the spring of 59 (abating in July of that year), the second in 56–55, and the third in 46–44. In each case Cicero has retreated from politics and has immersed himself in intellectual pursuits that demand extensive reading of Greek.

his thoughts had begun to turn to whether his political accomplishments would be seen favourably by posterity. It can hardly be a coincidence that it was in this very period that, for the first time since he began his political career, he considered producing an adaptation of a Greek work that might provide an alternate accomplishment of potential value for posterity.

Of course, there is no hint that at this stage Cicero had any plans to abdicate his senatorial duties entirely and take up writing full time; indeed, the situation was largely similar to the one he faced in the second half of the decade, when he decided to try his hand at Plato.[55] And much like the politically oriented Platonic dialogues that would soon follow, geography was a topic that could have fit nicely into the writing programme of a still-practicing politician; in fact, Atticus might even have persuasively argued to Cicero that it was an extension of the types of writing that Roman politicians had typically engaged in. After all, the rapid Roman expansion throughout the Mediterranean in the second and first centuries meant that the subject of geography was now thoroughly entwined with Roman military dominance and imperialist expansion. A Roman author who tackled the genre might have been expected to provide first-hand knowledge of the new areas that had been opened up by Roman soldiers, or at the very least to speak authoritatively about Roman military campaigns and provincial governance in these places. This meant that in the right hands, a Roman adaptation of Eratosthenes could easily have glorified both the Roman state and the men who had expanded its borders. In this respect, it would not have been far removed from the memoirs and histories that high-status Romans had traditionally composed.

But what Atticus perhaps failed to realize is that those hands were not Cicero's. He was a man who had little interest in military service and who spent his political career attempting to spin his experience in statesmanship and oratory as a suitable substitute.[56] These efforts reached their peak during the Catilinarian conspiracy,

55) Leeman / Pinkster 1981, 19 note that Cicero's motivation for writing *De Oratore* was primarily dissatisfaction with his role in present senatorial affairs – a situation not unlike the circumstances four years earlier.

56) Steel 2001, 163–173 is a perceptive account of this aspect of Cicero's career.

when he claimed for himself the role of an *imperator togatus*, a sort of civilian general whose success at quelling civil unrest at home could, he argued, be favourably compared with the exploits of the Roman generals who opened up far-flung geographical locales to Roman knowledge (Cat. 4.21).[57] He also famously renounced a post-consular province, even including the speech in which he did so within his published collection of consular speeches.[58] He clearly considered his decision to stay at home and remain involved in civic institutions an important and valuable part of his political narrative.

Given the care that Cicero took in presenting his civic and oratorical expertise as a unique form of authority for his political career, it should come as no surprise that he also argued that his expertise in these fields authorized his literary works, especially those written in the 50s, the period in which he still considered his compositions more a complement to his political career than a replacement for it. *De Oratore*, for example, opens with the promise that it is an update of his youthful thoughts on oratory with ones 'worthy of my age and the experience that I have acquired from so many and such serious cases' (1.5: *hac aetate digna et hoc usu, quem ex causis … tot tantisque consecuti sumus*). *De Re Publica* too begins with an assertion that Cicero is more qualified to write on the topic than philosophers like Plato because he combines his knowledge of political philosophy with practical experience in statesmanship: he is, he says there, 'an authority not only because of my experience but also because of my enthusiasm for learning and teaching' (Rep. 1.13: *non modo usu sed etiam studio discendi et docendi essemus auctores*).[59] Cicero's use of the same term in both passages – *usus* or 'experience' – is a sign of the value he put on this

57) Nicolet 1960 discusses Cicero's construction of the figure of the *imperator togatus*. Cicero returned to the conjunction of orator and general in his literary career, as well: at De Orat. 1.7, he says that while generals are universally placed above the orator, there are far fewer great orators than great generals, and the *Brutus* opens with Cicero laying down the *imperium* he held in Cilicia to return to oratory, suggesting, as Steel 2003, 207 notes, a fundamental incompatibility between the two realms.

58) On the principles of selection involved in Cicero's collection of consular speeches, see Cape 2002, 115–120; Steel 2005, 50–54; Manuwald 2007, 75–77; and Gibson / Steel 2010, 121–122.

59) This passage comes from the fragmentary authorial preface to the work. I have based my text on the edition of Powell 2006.

concept as an authorizing principle for his literary career. Oratory and political philosophy were fields in which he believed that he could make a real contribution to the Roman republic because they were the fields that he had already mastered in service to that republic. Furthermore, emphasizing his practical expertise in these fields allowed him to imply that he was engaged in the traditional writing programme of a high-status Roman, since he was similarly drawing on and memorializing the skills he had gained in political service. From there, it was not difficult to make a further leap and claim that these writings were in fact of the same value to the state as active political or military service on its behalf.

If this principle structured Cicero's compositional practices, then it stands to reason that the converse was also true: that he thought it unacceptable to write in genres that he considered outside his realm of expertise, and his refusal to adapt Eratosthenes' foundational work bears this out. He must have recognized what the works of Eratosthenes' Greek successors suggest: namely, that the genre was now simply too close to the history of Rome's military expansion to be a field in which he could speak with the authority gleaned from practical experience. Sitting at the centre of Rome's empire in 59 B.C. with no provincial governance or military experience to his name, Cicero knew that he was not an expert on a subject that mapped Rome's expansion of the known world. His rejection of the project is a sign of how closely he tied his literary production to the circumstances of his public career. He clearly believed that the *auctoritas* and *dignitas* he had acquired in the latter would only transfer to the former if it centred on the fields in which he had already proven he could provide a valuable service to the state.

That Cicero had these sorts of thoughts in mind while considering the *Geography* is suggested by his most vehement rejection of the project (Att. 2.6 [SB 26]):

> *etenim* γεωγραφικὰ *quae constitueram magnum opus est. ita valde Eratosthenes, quem mihi proposueram, a Serapione et ab Hipparcho reprehenditur. quid censes si Tyrannio accesserit? et hercule sunt res difficiles ad explicandum et* ὁμοειδεῖς *nec tam possunt* ἀνθηρογραφεῖσθαι *quam videbantur …*

> The *Geography* which I had proposed is a big undertaking (*magnum opus*). Eratosthenes, whom I had meant to follow, is sharply censured by Serapio and Hipparchus. What if Tyrannio joins in? And, my god,

> is the subject matter monotonous and difficult to explain, and it cannot be as embellished as it seemed.[60]

Cicero's complaints here suggest a checklist of sorts by which he decided whether to adapt Greek source material. First, would he have enough leisure time to complete the work? Second, had the work been well received by a Greek audience? And third, was the work written in a style that would allow him to showcase his characteristic rhetorical *ornatus*?[61] Each of the three items on the list is suggestive in its own way of the importance to Cicero of *usus* – his unique practical experience – as a decisive factor in taking on a new literary project. The first requirement, that Cicero have adequate leisure time to complete the work, underscores his continued dedication to honing the areas of his practical expertise (oratory and politics) that provided the foundation for his literary works. As for the second consideration, if these compositions were meant to afford Cicero the same *auctoritas* and *dignitas* that he had earned with his practical expertise, then choosing source material with a good reputation was a necessity, since Cicero believed that adaptations largely garnered the same reception as their originals (Tusc. 2.7–8). Finally, any original that did not have the scope for rhetorical 'embellishment' (ἀνθηρογραφεῖσθαι) would have to be rejected, because in the case of Cicero, rhetorical style itself was the most immediate, and tangible, evidence of his expertise.

It may seem, at first glance, as if Eratosthenes' *Geography* should have amply fit Cicero's parameters: it contained many novel linguistic turns of phrase and would have given Cicero free rein to coin new terms in Latin, a prospect that always delighted him in his adaptations of Greek material.[62] Given the turbulent state

60) Translation adapted from Shackleton Bailey 2004.

61) Dugan 2005 passim discusses the centrality of *ornatus* – rhetorical 'polish' or distinction – to Cicero's literary programme. Cicero placed a high value on the stylistic achievement of his various adaptations from Greek throughout his lifetime. I offer a few relevant examples, in chronological order: the pride evinced at Arat. 317–19 in creating an accurate term for the Zodiac in Latin; a letter to Atticus on the *De Re Publica* (4.16 [SB 89]) where Cicero boasts of his subtle transfer of Platonic allusions into Latin; and the importance placed on his stylistic achievements in the composition of the philosophica at Tusc. 2.8.

62) For Cicero's interest in the translation of technical terms as a sort of 'linguistic *aemulatio*', see Powell 1995 (quote at 290) and Bishop 2016.

of the republic, leisure time was plentiful. And despite Eratosthenes' detractors, he was still widely acknowledged as the founder of a flourishing Greek discipline that seemingly did not yet have a Roman counterpart.

But in the end, Atticus' enticements to adapt the *Geography* found no purchase because there was a fourth element that lay behind Cicero's motives when it came to the production of literature, and that was whether the work he produced drew on (and therefore memorialized) the singular expertise he had gained as a decidedly non-military figure in service to the Roman state. An adaptation of Eratosthenes' *Geography* would never have served this purpose, but several years later, Cicero was, in fact, able to adapt Eratosthenes' insights in a work that did: namely, the *Somnium Scipionis*, which constructs an Eratosthenean earth over which the civilian politician – in addition to the military general – could gaze with the satisfaction of having completed tasks of great value to his state.[63]

Conclusion

In Cicero's letters to Atticus about the *Geography*, there is a palpable sense that an intellectual revolution is underway: new Greek resources are coming to Rome every day, and Atticus is eager to see them put to use to enrich the Roman state. Cicero was eager to do the same, as is clear from later works when he talks, for example, of being the first to successfully illuminate philosophy in Latin (Tusc. 1.5–6), or of making available at Rome the philosophical rhetoric of Aristotle, a philosopher he claims is unknown even to many Greeks (Top. 3). No doubt Cicero and Atticus both recognized that this intellectual revolution had been made possible by Rome's military might, which simultaneously expanded the boundaries of the known world while forcibly acquiring from the Greeks the means to study that world.

The intimate link between these two realms of Roman power is most powerfully expressed by Julius Caesar in a passage from the *De Analogia* that underscores the extent to which the liter-

63) On Eratosthenes' role in the *Somnium*, see Solmsen 1942, 212–213 with relevant bibliography; Zetzel 1995, 235–245 passim; and Roller 2010, 14.

ary production of high-status Romans involved the same mixture of calculation and ambition as a military or political career. Caesar wrote this treatise, which was dedicated to Cicero, in 54 B.C. while on campaign in Gaul, and its military origins surely lie behind one of his compliments to its dedicatee: 'you are greater than the laurels of all triumphs, since it is of so much more value to have moved the boundaries of Roman genius than to have moved its physical boundaries.'[64] For Caesar, Cicero's primary achievements in this regard lay in the field of rhetoric, as another fragment preserved in the *Brutus* demonstrates: 'if some have taken pains with study and practice to be able to express their thoughts nobly, we ought to judge you nearly the leader in and discoverer of fullness of speech, well deserving of the name and the standing (*dignitas*) of the Roman people.'[65]

Caesar refers here not just to Cicero's oratory (and the publication of his speeches), but also to *De Oratore*, which was Cicero's first attempt to assert the value of his expertise to the Roman people through the production of texts that naturalized the branches of Greek learning on which he had drawn so successfully as a politician.[66] In other words, Caesar is drawing a clear link between the *dignitas* his military campaigns provide the Roman state (and, by extension, himself) and the *dignitas* Cicero's intellectual labour (in the form of literary compositions) provides. His casual use of such parallelism is a sign of the changing attitudes towards the value of elite literary production that the advent of Greek material at Rome had made possible, and shows how savvy Cicero was to embrace the practice as an alternate source of prestige.

64) Nat. 7.117: *aeque (ut dictator Caesar … de te scripsit) omnium triumphorum laurea maiorem, quanto plus est ingenii Romani terminos in tantum promovisse quam imperii*. For the date of the *De Analogia*, see Garcea 2012, 24–26. In his edition, Garcea 2012, 93–97 follows a tradition that attributes this passage to Caesar's *Anticato*; the reasons for attributing the phrase to the former work have recently been well restated by Volk / Zetzel 2015, 212–220.

65) Brut. 253 (= Garcea F1A–B): *ac si, cogitata praeclare eloqui possent, nonnulli studio et usu elaboraverunt, cuius te paene principem copiae atque inventorem bene de nomine ac dignitate populi Romani meritum esse existimare debemus*.

66) It has long been recognized that the *De Analogia* was composed in response to *De Oratore*; Hendrickson 1906 and Dugan 2005, 177–189 reconstruct the lines of the linguistic debate between the two men, while Gurd 2012, 57–66 considers its political implications.

Caesar, Cicero, and Atticus, all expressing the same themes within the same decade, show that nothing could have been timelier for Roman literature than an update to the Greek οἰκουμένη of Eratosthenes, one that reckoned with the now vast reach of Roman power; such a text would have made concrete this metaphorical linkage of military and intellectual pursuits. It is perhaps ironic, then, that its failure to get made is proof positive of Caesar's claim that the expansion of Roman intellectual culture was now seen as a source of *dignitas*, one that required the same careful strategizing as any other play for *dignitas* in the competitive world of the late Republic. Caesar could likely have adapted Eratosthenes' *Geography* in a manner that would have benefitted both Rome and himself, but Cicero could not.

References

Adams, J. N., Bilingualism and the Latin Language (Cambridge 2003).

Aldo, L., Cornelio Nepote geografo, in: Sordi, M. (ed.), Geografia e storiografia nel mondo classico (Milan 1988) 41–51.

Baraz, Y., A Written Republic: Cicero's Philosophical Politics (Princeton 2012).

Bishop, C., Naming the Roman Stars: Constellation Etymologies in Cicero's *Aratea* and *De Natura Deorum*, CQ 66.1 (2016) 155–171

Bringmann, K., Untersuchungen zum späten Cicero (Göttingen 1971).

Bringmann, K. / Smythe, W. J. (trans.), A History of the Roman Republic (Cambridge 2007).

Büchner, K., M. Tullius Cicero: Fragmente, RE VIIa–1 (1939) 1236–1274.

Cape, R. W., Cicero's Consular Speeches, in: May, J. M. (ed.), Brill's Companion to Cicero: Oratory and Rhetoric (Leiden 2002) 113–158.

Cappello, O., Everything You Wanted to Know About Atticus (But Were Afraid to Ask Cicero): Looking for Atticus in Cicero's *Ad Atticum*, Arethusa 49.3 (2016) 463–487.

Citroni, M., Affermazioni di priorità e coscienza di progresso artistico nei poeti latini, in: Schmidt, E. A. (ed.), L'histoire littéraire immanente dans la poésie latine (Geneva 2001) 267–304.

– The Concept of the Classical and Canons of Model Authors in Roman Literature, in: Porter, J. I. (ed.), Classical Pasts: The Classical Traditions of Greece and Rome (Princeton 2006) 204–234.

Clarke, K., Between Geography and History: Hellenistic Constructions of the Roman World (Oxford 1999).

Dicks, D. R., The Geographical Fragments of Hipparchus (London 1960).

Dix, T. K., Private and Public Libraries at Rome in the First Century B. C.: A Preliminary Study in the History of Roman Libraries, Ph.D. dissertation (University of Michigan 1986).

– 'Beware of promising your library to anyone': Assembling a Private Library at Rome, in: König, J. / Oikonomopoulou, K. / Woolf, G. (eds), Ancient Libraries (Cambridge 2013) 209–234.
Dortmund, A., Römisches Buchwesen um die Zeitenwende: War T. Pomponius Atticus (110–32 v. Chr.) Verleger? (Wiesbaden 2001).
Dueck, D., Strabo of Amasia: A Greek Man of Letters in Augustan Rome (New York 2000).
Dugan, J., Making a New Man: Ciceronian Self-Fashioning in the Rhetorical Works (Oxford 2005).
Feeney, D., Beyond Greek: The Beginnings of Latin Literature (Cambridge, MA 2016).
Fox, M., Cicero's Philosophy of History (Oxford 2007).
Garcea, A., Caesar's *De Analogia*: edition, translation, and commentary (Oxford 2012).
Geus, K., Eratosthenes von Kyrene: Studien zur hellenistischen Kultur- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte (Munich 2002).
– Measuring the Earth and the Οἰκουμένη: zones, meridians, *sphragides* and some other geographical terms used by Eratosthenes of Cyrene, in: Talbert, R. / Broderson, K. (eds.), Space in the Roman World (Münster 2004) 11–26.
Gibson, R. K. / Steel, C. E. W., The Indistinct Literary Careers of Cicero and Pliny the Younger, in: Hardie, P. / Moore, H. (eds), Classical Literary Careers and their Reception (Cambridge 2010) 118–137
Gildenhard, I., Paideia Romana: Cicero's *Tusculan Disputations* (Cambridge 2007).
Goldberg, S. M., Constructing Literature in the Roman Republic: poetry and its reception (Cambridge 2005).
Gruen, E. S., The Trial of C. Antonius, Latomus 32.2 (1973) 301–310.
Gurd, S. A., Work in Progress: Literary Revision as Social Performance in Ancient Rome (Oxford 2012).
Habinek, T. N., Ideology for an Empire in the Prefaces to Cicero's Dialogues, Ramus 23.1–2 (1994) 55–67.
Hendrickson, G. L., The *De Analogia* of Julius Caesar; its Occasion, Nature, and Date, with Additional Fragments, CPh 1.2 (1906) 97–120.
Hinds, S., Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry (Cambridge 1998).
Horsfall, N., Empty Shelves on the Palatine, G&R 40.1 (1993) 58–67.
Houston, G. W., Inside Roman Libraries: Book Collections and their Management in Antiquity (Chapel Hill 2014).
Hübner, W., Serapion (1), Brill's New Pauly (2006). Available online at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e1109440.
Hutchinson, G. O., Greek Into Latin: Frameworks and Contexts for Intertextuality (Oxford 2013).
Iddeng, J. W., *Publica aut Peri!* The Releasing and Distribution of Roman Books, SO 81.1 (2016) 58–84.
Johnson, W. A., Cicero and Tyrannio: *Mens addita videtur meis aedibus*, CW 105.4 (2012) 471–477.
Jones, C., Books and libraries in a newly-discovered treatise of Galen, JRA 22 (2009) 390–397.

Kaimio, J., The Romans and the Greek Language (Helsinki 1979).
Korenjak, M., *Italiam contra Tiberinaque longe / ostia*. Virgil's Carthago and Eratosthenian geography, CQ 54 (2004) 646–49.
Krebs, C. B., 'Imaginary Geography' in Caesar's 'Bellum Gallicum', AJP 127.1 (2006) 111–136.
– Borealism: Caesar, Seneca, Tacitus, and the Roman Discourse about the Germanic North, in: Gruen, E. S. (ed.), Cultural Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean (Los Angeles 2011) 202–221.
Leeman, A. D. / Pinkster, H., M. T. Cicero 'De Oratore' Libri III: Kommentar Band I, Buch I 1–165 (Heidelberg 1981).
Manuwald, G., Cicero: Philippics 3–9 (Berlin 2007).
McConnell, S., Philosophical Life in Cicero's Letters (Cambridge 2014).
Mitchell, T. N., Cicero, Pompey, and the Rise of the First Triumvirate, Traditio 29 (1973) 1–26.
Moatti, C. / Lloyd, J. (trans.), The Birth of Critical Thinking in Republican Rome (Cambridge 2015).
Narducci, E., Cicerone e l'eloquenza romana: retorica e progetto culturale (Rome 1997).
Nicolet, C., 'Consul Togatus': Remarques sur le vocabulaire politique de Cicéron et de Tite-Live, REL 38 (1960) 236–263.
– Space, Geography, and Politics in the Early Roman Empire (Ann Arbor 1991).
Perlwitz, O., Titus Pomponius Atticus: Untersuchungen zur Person eines einflussreichen Ritters in der ausgehenden Römischen Republik (Stuttgart 1992).
Pfeiffer, R., The History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age (Oxford 1968).
Phillips, J. J., Atticus and the Publication of Cicero's Works, CW 79.4 (1986) 227–237.
Powell, J. G. F., Cicero's Translations from Greek, in: Powell, J. G. F. (ed.), Cicero the Philosopher: Twelve Papers (Oxford 1995) 273–300.
– M. Tulli Ciceronis De Re Publica, De Legibus, Cato Maior de Senectute, Laelius de Amicitia, (Oxford 2006).
Rambaud, M., L'espace dans le récit Césarien, in: Chevallier, R. (ed.), Littérature grécoromaine et géographie historique, Mélanges offerts à Roger Dion (Paris 1974) 111–129.
Rawson, E., Cicero the Historian and Cicero the Antiquarian, JRS 62 (1972) 33–45.
– Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic (London 1985).
Richardson, L., Cicero, Bibulus, and Caesar's Agrarian Bills of 59 B. C., in: Schmeling, G. / Mikalson, J. D. (eds.), Qui miscuit utile dulci: Festschrift Essays for Paul Lachlan MacKendrick (Wauconda 1998) 299–312.
Roller, D. W., Eratosthenes' *Geography*: fragments collected and translated, with commentary and additional material (Princeton 2010).
– Ancient Geography: The Discovery of the World in Classical Greece and Rome (London 2015).
Schanz, M. / Hosius, C., Geschichte der Römischen Literatur. Die Zeit der Republik (Munich 1927).
Schmidt, P. L., Cicero's Place in Roman Philosophy: A Study of His Prefaces, CJ 74.2 (1978) 115–127.

Shackleton Bailey, D. R., Cicero: Letters to Atticus (7 volumes) (Cambridge 2004).
Smith, R. E., The Significance of Caesar's Consulship in 59 B. C., Phoenix 18.4 (1964) 303–313.
Solmsen, F., Eratosthenes as Platonist and Poet, TAPhA 73 (1942) 192–213.
Steel, C. E. W., Cicero, Rhetoric, and Empire (Oxford 2001).
– Cicero's *Brutus*: The End of Oratory and the Beginning of History? BICS 46 (2003) 195–211.
– Reading Cicero: Genre and Performance in Late Republican Rome (London 2005).
Stockton, D. L., Cicero: A Political Biography (Oxford 1971).
Stroup, S. C., Catullus, Cicero, and a Society of Patrons: The Generation of the Text (Cambridge 2010).
Taylor, L. R., The Dating of Major Legislation and Elections in Caesar's First Consulship, Historia 17.2 (1968) 173–93.
Volk, K. / Zetzel, J. E. G., Laurel, Tongue and Glory (Cicero, *De Consulatu Suo* Fr. 6 Soubiran), CQ 65.1 (2015) 204–223.
Zetzel, J. E. G., Cicero: De Re Publica (Cambridge 1995).

Lubbock, Texas Caroline Bishop