

## The City in Epistolography\*

Anna Clark

The importance of the city of Rome in late Republican oratory has been made increasingly clear in recent decades. The locations in which speeches were delivered formed much more than a backdrop to the orations. They, and other parts of the city visible (in fact or imagination) to audience members often played an integral part in the orator's performance.<sup>1</sup> The buildings and monuments that made up Rome's public and private spaces could serve as evocative touchstones in public speeches in ways which suggest that they, and the various stories they cued, were familiar and significant to a range of inhabitants of the city. A persuasive case has now been made for a high degree of 'civic knowledge' among contional audiences, as well as speakers, in this period.<sup>2</sup> Our attention has also been drawn to the broader ways in which Roman identities were rooted, among other factors, in Roman topography—even for those who did not live in the city or participate in the political institutions of the Roman state.<sup>3</sup> The relevance of locations was not restricted to rhetorical performances: theatrical spectacles, too, were tied in a variety of ways to cult nodes in the City, like the temples of Apollo and of the Magna Mater. They thereby provided plays with a framework that could intersect with their content or shape their reception.<sup>4</sup> Locations were also carefully chosen in the debates 'staged' for the discussion of a variety of topics in philosophical works by Cicero, Varro and others—works in which the authors presented themselves, their peers, or in some cases men of earlier generations as interlocutors. Usually set in Italy, often in villas, but not infrequently in Rome itself, the surroundings were chosen to provide a suitable setting for the theme of the discussion. Although the importance of setting and some of the very connections made by the locations chosen are best viewed in the light of Platonic models (e.g. the setting of Cicero's *De Oratore* and *De Legibus*), the precise settings chosen did more than merely imitate those of earlier dialogues. The Villa Publica in the third book of Varro's *De Re Rustica*, for example, gave the polymath opportunities to play on the meanings of 'villa'.<sup>5</sup>

That place mattered will not surprise. But how far, and in what ways, was this knowledge and attention to surroundings part of the cultural repertoire of City inhabitants, or at least of those to whose words—if not thoughts—we have some access?

---

\* This paper was presented in the Ancient History research seminar series in the University of Oxford in June 2007. I am grateful to the audience for lively discussion, especially to Neil McLynn, Fergus Millar, Nicholas Purcell and Jo Quinn for particularly useful questions and comments, to Jon Prag for discussion of elections, and to Chris Pelling and two anonymous readers for very helpful remarks on a written version.

<sup>1</sup> Vasaly (1993) is fundamental on the ways in which Cicero represented the city and drew on its monuments in his oratory.

<sup>2</sup> Morstein-Marx (2004), esp. ch.3 for the extent of 'civic knowledge'.

<sup>3</sup> Dench (2005) 4 and passim. Cf. Woolf (2003), on which below.

<sup>4</sup> On the sites of plays see esp. Saunders (1913); Hanson (1959b) esp. 9–26; Rawson (1991) ch.26; Duckworth (1994) 78–9, Goldberg (1998), and Wiseman (1998) esp. ch. 3.

<sup>5</sup> On the setting of Ciceronian and Varronian dialogues, see esp. Linderski (1989), Becker (1938), also Green (1997). Platonic models: e.g. the settings of Cic. *De Orat.* and *Leg.*. Roman settings for Cic. *Rep.* (Scipio's Roman villa and *horti*), *Brut.* (Cicero's house), *Nat. D.* (house of C. Aurelius Cotta), *Sen.* (house of Cato the Elder), *Amic.* (house of Laelius), and books 1 (temple of Tellus) and 3 (Villa Publica) of Varro's *De Re Rustica*. Full list in Linderski (1989) esp. 107–8.

Did the spaces and monuments in the City form reference points in less explicitly performative contexts, real or written, for the men who made the kinds of speeches or penned the dialogues discussed above? Was this use of settings more than a carefully crafted part of public performances before audiences? How far did this knowledge and its application in the course of public or political life in particular seep into broader ways of thinking, outside these contexts?

The temptation to turn to the letters of Cicero or Pliny for straightforward answers to these questions is obviously to be avoided. Such letters provide no simple index, for the period in which either man lived, of the importance of topographical elements, individually or collectively, in the lives even of élite males of the kind whose writing survives. To begin with, it would obviously be misleading to suggest that either Cicero or Pliny was wholly representative of an élite. Each was a *novus homo*, and neither had an ancestral monument in the City. Care for such a monument might have formed a subject of correspondence for those from longer-established families.<sup>6</sup> This was one of the ways in which Cicero (as a ‘new man’) was marked out from many other consulars of his time.<sup>7</sup> By Pliny’s era, the emperor had established his control and that of the imperial family over the public buildings in Rome. The locations where families could make a monumental mark, as Eck showed over twenty years ago, were pushed further out into other parts of Italy. The public buildings we see Pliny dedicating or renovating are at Tifernum Tiberinum or at Comum. In this he is less unusual than Cicero among senators of his time.<sup>8</sup>

Both men were, on the other hand, practising forensic speakers. This was a practice and especially a training which they shared with others of their social stratum. It arguably, among other criteria, marked out an élite. Hutchinson’s assessment of the corpora of Ciceronian letters has done much to open up our ability and willingness to see these letters as carefully crafted pieces of literature, and has shed a particularly helpful light on the connections and intersections of letter-writing with other genres, notably oratory.<sup>9</sup> In a recent paper, Miriam Griffin made a very persuasive case for the prominent use of legal language in Roman philosophical writing illustrating that such language was ‘good to think with’, and argued that it created means for Romans to engage independently with philosophical concepts.<sup>10</sup> This is a further illustration of what we might term ‘seepage’ of one genre into another, and one very relevant to letters.

The second factor preventing the letters from providing straightforward answers to the questions outlined above is generic. Epistolography was itself a kind of

---

<sup>6</sup> A point made by Hales (2000), discussing Cicero’s house.

<sup>7</sup> Cicero does, in addition to making clear his concern with acquiring, reacquiring and protecting his house, refer on a number of occasions in his letters to the statuette of Minerva that he had left on the Capitol before his exile. He was also charged with restoring the porticus of Catulus and the temple of Tellus, in which temple, he informs Quintus in *Q. Fr.* 3.1.14, he placed a statue of his brother. The statue is not mentioned again in the extant corpus. Cicero was also later involved in Caesar’s building projects in the City (see esp. *Att.* 4.16.8).

<sup>8</sup> On spaces for senatorial monuments, see Eck (1984). Pliny talks about monuments connected to himself and his relatives in Italy in *Ep.* 1.8 (library), 3.4, 4.1, 5.11 (Calpurnius Fabatus’ colonnade at Comum), 9.39 (restoration of shrine of Ceres), 10.8 (shrine in Tifernum Tiberinum). The shrine to Ceres was on private land, but I use ‘public’ to differentiate the edifices in these letters from Pliny’s villas, for example.

<sup>9</sup> Hutchinson (1998), noting the shared persuasive intent of oratory and a variety of kinds of letter-writing.

<sup>10</sup> ‘Stoicism and Roman Political Life: why Brunt matters’, given at ‘Roman Themes: A Celebration of the Life and Work of Peter Brunt’, at Oriel College, Oxford on 24 March 2007.

‘performative context’. Both men, that is, in writing these letters, shaped their own image in a variety of ways that have been sensitively explored in recent years, including Pliny’s very modelling himself on Cicero.<sup>11</sup> For Cicero, letters were an important medium through which his friendship with Atticus, and other relationships, were not only maintained but actually constituted or ‘performed’. They were also epistles he might often have expected to circulate beyond the named addressee(s).<sup>12</sup> For the most part, the men and women to whom he wrote had at least one residence in Rome and spent part of their lives there.

Many of those to whom Pliny’s letters were (ostensibly) addressed came originally from other areas, especially northern Italy and Cisalpine Gaul, although they too included many to whom the City was familiar. With the publication of nine books of his letters, Pliny’s work also needs to be seen in the broader context of ways in which the City was modelled for a wider readership in his times. In an exploration of such modelling—an investigation of textual representations both of the City and of cultural activities in the City in imperial authors—Woolf sees deliberate cultural alienation of provincial readers on the part of many such writers by a variety of strategies. Among these, he considers Pliny relatively unusual, because he ‘deliberately adopted a more inclusive style ... partly by ostentatious abstention from the devices of routine exclusion’.<sup>13</sup> Although Woolf’s approach is thought-provoking as a potential explanation of the relative paucity of references to public monuments in Pliny’s letters, it does not wholly convince. It does not seem inherently improbable that *recherché* allusions of various kinds might have been valued by provincial readers, whether or not they understood them, as evocative markers of ‘Metropolitan glamour’. A sense of inclusivity can be conveyed to readers, in other words, precisely by reference to specifics in such a way as to *suggest* that these specifics are shared and understood by the readers, whether or not they are in fact so recognised.<sup>14</sup> As we shall see, there is at least one example in Pliny’s letters of a reference requiring knowledge of cult locations and the history of buildings in the City for full appreciation.

Despite, or rather because of, these complexities, to tease out the portrait of the physical city in epistolography seems a worthwhile project in the (interlinked) cases of these two men. To frame the subject of investigation in terms of one of the very genres in which Pliny modelled himself on Cicero is more interesting than the somewhat self-defeating task of trying to gain access to the thoughts of individuals through letters. It allows us rather to chart the degree to which two senators, from backgrounds which were to each a source both of professed pride and of some unease and neither of whom grew up in Rome, chose to display themselves to other readers (whether a single addressee, a

---

<sup>11</sup> Pliny: e.g. Leach (1990), Riggsby (1995), Gibson & Morello (2003), Woolf (2003), Henderson (2002); Cicero: Hutchinson (1998). Morello & Morrison (2007) address a wide range of questions about ancient letter-writing.

<sup>12</sup> See e.g. *Att.* 8.2. Henderson (2007) argues for Caesar being the real addressee of Cicero’s letters to Quintus.

<sup>13</sup> Woolf (2003), quote on p. 208.

<sup>14</sup> Woolf (2003). *Plin. Ep.* 9.11 for explicit allusion to readership in Lyons. I am grateful to Matthew Nicholls for discussion of this point—the term ‘Metropolitan glamour’ is his—and to Chris Pelling for further stimulating suggestions, and in particular for reminding me of similar discussions about the use of parody in drama. Morello (2007) esp. 170–1 helpfully nuances Woolf’s assessment.

wider group or a much broader readership) as paying attention to, and interacting with, places in the City in the epistolary genre.

A passage from a letter written not by Cicero himself but by an imitator constitutes a useful point of entry for our exploration:

*sed quoniam cohortibus circumsaeptus senatus nihil aliud libere potest [decernere] nisi timere—in Capitolio signa sunt, in urbe milites vagantur, in Campo castra ponuntur, Italia tota legionibus ad libertatem nostram conscriptis ad servitum adductis equitatuque exterarum nationum distinetur—cedam tibi in praesentia foro et curia et sanctissimis deorum immortalium templis, in quibus reviviscente iam libertate rursus oppressa senatus nihil consulitur, timet multa, assentatur omnia.*

But the Senate, surrounded by cohorts can decide nothing freely except to be afraid: There are standards on the Capitol, soldiers are roaming around in the City, a camp is in place in the Campus, the whole of Italy is being occupied by legions enrolled to preserve our freedom but brought here to bring about our servitude, and by cavalry from foreign peoples. I shall yield to you for the moment the Forum and the Senate House and the most sacred temples of the immortal gods, in which with reviving freedom once again crushed the Senate is consulted about nothing, fears many things, and agrees to everything.

This extract from the pseudo-Ciceronian letter to Octavian, ostensibly written in the last few weeks of Cicero’s life but in reality probably composed in the third or fourth century AD, owes much to the *Philippics*. It contains enough Ciceronian phraseology to have deceived a number of readers in the past. This passage focuses on a number of key spaces in the city of Rome: the Capitol, Campus Martius, Forum, Curia and temples. It is not difficult to recall appeals to such spaces in Ciceronian oratory<sup>15</sup>—but was inclusion of this passage in a *letter* an inappropriate move on the part of the pseudo-Cicero?

The locations mentioned by Cicero and his correspondents in the surviving letters are baldly tabled in fig. 1. This groups together the letters by the location mentioned and presents them in four categories: general references (in standard type); locations mentioned in ‘antiquarian’ discussions (marked in **bold**); references to buying, renting, and selling of property (underlined—discussions of Cicero’s purchase of his own house in Rome and ensuing wrangles with Clodius are not included in this category); and ‘legal’ references (marked in **bold italic**). The table clearly shows that the areas and monuments in the passage from the pseudo-Ciceronian letter—Curia, Forum, Capitol, Campus Martius and temples—are among the areas and monuments in the city most frequently referred to by Cicero and those writing to him in the totality of his extant correspondence.

Fig. 1. Places mentioned in Ciceronian corpus of letters

Place in or area of Rome	Number of letters in which mentioned	References
Forum	22	<i>Q. Fr.</i> 2.3.6; 2.15.2; <i>Att.</i>

<sup>15</sup> See Vasaly (1993).

		1.16.5; 1.18.1; 2.16.2; 2.18.1; 2.24; 4.1; 4.3; 4.16.8; 5.15; 12.21; 12.23; 14.10; 14.16; <i>Fam.</i> 4.6; 5.15; 8.8; 8.9; 9.2; 9.15; 12.7.
Cicero's <i>domus</i>	36	<i>Q. Fr.</i> 2.4.2; 2.15.2; 3.1.14; <i>Br.</i> 1.3.2; <i>Att.</i> 1.13.6; 1.16.5; 1.16.10; 1.18.1; 2.4.7; 2.6.2; 2.8.5; 2.22.3; 3.20.2; 4.1; 4.2; 4.5.3; 4.7.3; 4.18; 5.12.3; 5.15; 11.2; 12.10; 12.23; 14.10; 15.15; <i>Fam.</i> 5.6; 5.15; 5.21; 6.18; 7.5; 7.28; 9.19; 10.2; 10.25; 11.1; 11.7; 11.27; 14.2.
Campus Martius	8	<i>Q. Fr.</i> 2.2.1; <i>Att.</i> 1.1; 1.18.4; 4.3; 4.16.8; 4.15; 12.8; 13.33a; <i>Fam.</i> 7.30.
Curia	8	<i>Q. Fr.</i> 2.3.2; 2.5.3; <i>Att.</i> 3.15.6; 9.5; 12.21; 12.23; <i>Fam.</i> 4.6; 9.2.
Rostra	7	<i>Q. Fr.</i> 2.3.2; <i>Br.</i> 1.3.2; 1.15.9; <i>Att.</i> 1.14.5; 2.21.3; 2.24; <i>Fam.</i> 12.3.
Capitol, including temple of Iuppiter		<i>Br.</i> 1.3.2; <i>Att.</i> 2.1.7; 4.1; 6.1.17; 13.33; 14.10; 14.14; 15.1a; <i>Fam.</i> 10.2.
Temple of Apollo	3	<i>Q. Fr.</i> 2.3; <i>Att.</i> 15.3; <i>Fam.</i> 8.4.
Temple of Tellus	2	<i>Q. Fr.</i> 3.1.14; <i>Att.</i> 16.14
Temple of Mars	1	<i>Q. Fr.</i> 3.5.8
Temple of Castor	1	<i>Q. Fr.</i> 2.3.6
Temple of Salus	2	<i>Att.</i> 4.1; 12.45
Shrine of Libertas	1	<i>Att.</i> 4.1
Temple of Ops	3	<i>Att.</i> 6.1.17; 14.14; 16.14
(Temple of) Moneta	1	<i>Att.</i> 8.7
Temple of Quirinus	2	<i>Att.</i> 12.45; 13.28
Temple of Vesta	1	<i>Fam.</i> 14.2
<i>via Appia</i>	5	<i>Q. Fr.</i> 1.1.17; 3.5.8; <i>Att.</i> 8.11c; 16.10; 16.13
<i>via Sacra</i>	1	<i>Att.</i> 4.3
<i>domus Paciliana</i>	1	<i>Att.</i> 1.14.7
Quintus' house	4	<i>Q. Fr.</i> 2.3.7; 2.4.2; 3.1.14; <i>Att.</i> 4.3
Caesar's house	2	<i>Att.</i> 1.12.3; 1.13.3

Autronius' house	1	<i>Att.</i> 1.13.6
Atticus' house	2	<i>Att.</i> 3.20.1, 8.2
Tettius Damio's house	1	<i>Att.</i> 4.3
P. Sestius' house	1	<i>Fam.</i> 5.6
Milo's house ( <i>Anniana</i> )	1	<i>Att.</i> 4.3
P. Sulla's house	1	<i>Att.</i> 4.3
Sulla's house	1	<i>Att.</i> 4.3
Clodius' house	1	<i>Att.</i> 4.3
Hortensius' house	1	<i>Att.</i> 11.6
Carinae	1	<i>Q. Fr.</i> 2.3.7
Velabrum	1	<i>Br.</i> 1.1.58
Argiletum	1	<i>Att.</i> 1.14.7
Circus Flaminius	1	<i>Att.</i> 1.14
Porticus of Catulus	3	<i>Q. Fr.</i> 3.1.14, <i>Att.</i> 4.2, 4.3
Piscina publica	1	<i>Q. Fr.</i> 3.5.8
Carcer	1	<i>Att.</i> 1.16.9
Comitium	1	<i>Att.</i> 4.3
<i>inter lucos</i>	1	<i>Att.</i> 4.3
Basilica Paulli	1	<i>Att.</i> 4.16.8
<i>porta Capena</i>	1	<i>Att.</i> 4.1
<i>porta Flumentana</i>	1	<i>Att.</i> 7.3
altar of Accia Larentia	1	<i>Br.</i> 1.15.8
statue of Lepidus	1	<i>Br.</i> 1.15.9
statue of Clodius	2	<i>Att.</i> 11.23; S-B frg. 4.20
statues of Caesar	1	<i>Fam.</i> 12.3; <i>Att.</i> 12.45
statue of Minerva	3	<i>Att.</i> 7.3; ( <i>Fam.</i> 3.1); <i>Fam.</i> 12.25
statue of Africanus	1	<i>Att.</i> 6.1.17
statue of Sarapio	1	<i>Att.</i> 6.1.17
Polycles' Hercules	1	<i>Att.</i> 6.1.17
Quirinal hills	1	<i>Att.</i> 12.10
column/altar of Caesar	2	<i>Att.</i> 14.15; <i>Fam.</i> 11.2
Lupercal	1	<i>Fam.</i> 7.20
Curio's theatre	1	<i>Fam.</i> 8.2
Metellus' muses	1	<i>Fam.</i> 7.23
Atrium Libertatis	1	<i>Att.</i> 4.16.8
sacrarium of Memmius	1	<i>Fam.</i> 13.2
<i>tabula Valeria</i>	1	<i>Fam.</i> 14.2
<i>horti</i> (general)	9	<i>Att.</i> 4.5.3; 8.2; <u>12.12</u> ; <u>12.21</u> ; <u>12.29</u> ; <u>12.37</u> ; <u>12.49</u> ; <u>13.1</u> ; <u>13.27</u> ; <u>13.29</u> ; <u>13.34</u> ; <i>Q. Fr.</i> 3.1.14.
<i>trans Tiberim</i>	2	<i>Att.</i> <u>12.19</u> ; <u>12.23</u> ; 15.15
of Drusus	5	<i>Att.</i> <u>12.21</u> ; <u>12.22</u> ; <u>12.25</u> ; <u>12.31</u> ; <u>12.33</u> ; <u>12.41</u> ; <u>13.26</u> .

of Lamia	3	<i>Att.</i> <u>12.21</u> ; <u>12.22</u> ; <u>12.29</u>
of Cassius	1	<i>Att.</i> <u>12.21</u>
of Silius	3	<i>Att.</i> <u>12.22</u> ; <u>12.27</u> ; <u>12.33</u> ; <u>12.34</u> ; <u>12.41</u>
of Cotta	1	<i>Att.</i> <u>12.27</u>
of Damasippus	3	<i>Att.</i> <u>12.29</u> ; <u>12.33</u> ; 13.26
of Scapula	2	<i>Att.</i> <u>12.37</u> ; <u>13.26</u> ; <u>12.41</u>
of Clodia	3	<i>Att.</i> <u>12.41</u> ; <u>12.42</u> ; <u>12.43</u> , <u>13.26</u> ; <u>13.31</u>
of Otho	2	<i>Att.</i> <u>12.42</u> ; <u>12.43</u> ; <u>13.31</u>
<i>ambulatio</i> of Crassipes	1	<i>Q. Fr.</i> 3.5.8
<i>horti</i> of Crassipes	2	<i>Att.</i> 4.12; <i>Fam.</i> 1.9.21
tomb of Basilus	1	<i>Att.</i> 7.9
Cicero's Argiletum and Aventine property	1	<u><i>Att.</i> 12.32</u>
Campus Vaticanus	1	<i>Att.</i> 13.33a
Mulvian bridge	1	<i>Att.</i> 13.33a
shops	2	<i>Q. Fr.</i> 3.5.8; <i>Att.</i> 14.9
Temple of Strenia	1	<i>Att.</i> <b>15.26</b>

The most prolific instances of City locations occur in the kind of letter in which Cicero recounts an episode of (usually very recent) history, setting up the location of the varied and sometimes swift-moving episodes involved: the richest examples are his account of Milo's trial to his brother Quintus (*Q. Fr.* 2.3), his account to Atticus of his return from exile (*Att.* 4.1) and of the street fight provoked soon afterwards by the attack upon the site of Cicero's house (*Att.* 4.3). The addressees of these letters are significant: references to particular places are much more common in the letters to Atticus and (proportionately) to Quintus than in those *ad Familiares*. A point of interest more clearly illustrated in figs. 2 and 3, which mark the locations mentioned by Cicero and Pliny respectively, is the narrow area or areas within which these locations in the City for the most part fall.<sup>16</sup> Certain other trends can also be discerned.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>16</sup> In fig. 2 the locations mentioned in general discussion are represented in red, and any which occur *only* in the three categories represented in fig. 1 by bold type, underlined type, and bold italic type, are represented in different colours: respectively pink, blue and purple. Many locations are approximate (notably those of the *horti*, mainly *trans Tiberim*, and of the various houses to which Pliny and especially Cicero refer), but accuracy is I hope sufficient for the purpose of showing the restricted area of the City to which reference is made. Not marked because the location is unknown are the houses of Autronius and P. Sestius, the theatre of Curio, the sacrum of Memmius and the statue of Clodius (fig. 2) and the house of Titinius Capito (fig. 3). The houses of P. Sulla and Sulla (the dictator) may well be one and the same, and I have assumed that Milo's house (*Att.* 4.3) lay on the *clivus Capitolinus*, and not in the Cermalus. For discussions of location and full bibliography, see *LTUR* I-VI and Haselberger (2002).

<sup>17</sup> In what follows I shall treat together in the category 'places in the City' temples, statues, and other buildings. Given that the very idea of place is culturally dependant, such a practice might be questioned. I would suggest that the resonance and potential symbolism of temples and (cult) statues are in some ways different from those of other buildings. I would not, however, wish to separate 'religious' resonance (for

## Persuasion

Cicero has a tendency to include the location of incidents he describes, particularly in terms involving temples. This may be connected to his oratorical training, but he clearly did not consider it inappropriate to write in such terms in letters to Atticus and others. The link with oratory is explicit when he recounts to Quintus his defence of Calpurnius Bestia for *ambitus* in the Forum in February of 56. Having set the scene as *in medio foro maximo conventu* ('in the middle of the Forum with a very large crowd in attendance') he chooses to comment in detail on his reference in the speech to the occasion upon which Bestia had saved Sestius' life, when Sestius was lying badly wounded in the temple of Castor. (*A. d. III[1] Id. Febr. dixi pro Bestia de ambitu apud praetorem Cn. Domitium in foro medio maximo conventu incidique in eum locum in dicendo cum Sestius multis in templo Castoris vulneribus acceptis subsidio Bestiae servatus esset. (Q. Fr. 2.3.6)*).<sup>18</sup> The justification for mentioning this particular part of the speech in detail in the letter lies in the incident having laid the foundations for Cicero's subsequent defence of his loyal Sestius, who had himself just been charged with *ambitus*. Cicero writes to let Quintus know of his pre-emptive and public declaration and reminder of Sestius' loyal service. The inclusion of *in templo Castoris* in the letter to Quintus suggests at least that the temple, to which Cicero could no doubt have gestured in making his speech, was a powerful part of his oratorical argument, so much so that he cared to convey this to Quintus in order to show how well he had done for Sestius in advance of the trial.

Similar patterns of association can be found in a letter of April 43, in which the link to oratory, if it exists, is much less obviously direct. Cicero is writing to Munatius Plancus in Gaul to tell him of the reaction to Cicero's proposed vote of thanks for him. He recounts how the prime opponent of the motion, Servilius, had come to the senate the day after the proposal 'prepared to "fight Jupiter himself", in whose temple the debate was to be held' (*venit paratus Servilius Iovi ipsi iniquus, cuius in templo res agebatur*).<sup>19</sup> It is possible that the line was one that Cicero had used, or planned to use, in the senate-meeting. Whether or not this is the case, however, what we find here is a clear example of the location of the debate being drawn on *in a letter* to make a point. The need to persuade Plancus, whom Cicero was trying to keep on the 'right side', that Cicero had fought hard and met stern opposition brought out, if in less elaborate fashion, the kind of connections seen in the rhetorical use Cicero made of the temple of Jupiter Stator in his first Catilinarian oration (*Cat. 1.11, 33*), for example. Here it occurs again when Cicero experiences a pressing need to persuade, but this time in an epistolary context.

Cicero made similar use of an element in the fabric of the city with divine connections in a letter to Q. Cornificius dated to March 43. He again recounted his actions in a senate meeting. The location of the meeting was not at issue in this case: the

---

want of a better term) from 'historical' or 'social', and since a variety of buildings are drawn upon in oratory, I remain convinced that the exercise is a useful one.

<sup>18</sup> *Q. Fr. 2.3.6*. Vasaly (1993) 70 n.60 uses this only as evidence for trials being *in medio foro* and so near the rostra.

<sup>19</sup> *Fam. 10.12.4*, tr. Shackleton-Bailey.

connection was rather with a statue in a central position in the City, and one which had particular relevance for Cicero himself. At the earliest opportunity, he asserted, he had pleaded Cornificius' case to a full senate and the senate had approved Cornificius' actions in resisting Calvisius Sabinus' officers: *Quinquatribus frequenti senatu causam tuam egi non invita Minerva; etenim eo ipso die senatus decrevit ut Minerva nostra, custos urbis, quam turbo deiecerat, restitueretur* ('On the Quinquatrus I pleaded your case to a full senate, not unfavoured by Minerva; for on that very day the senate decreed that my Minerva, the guardian of the City, which a storm had thrown down, be restored').<sup>20</sup> The allusion is to the statue that Cicero had left in Rome, on the Capitol, in 58 to protect the City during his absence in exile. The temporal connection (the Quinquatrus festival honoured Minerva) is heightened through use of the well-known expression *non invita Minerva* to constitute the link with Cicero's success.<sup>21</sup> That the same statue, or at least the same goddess, had been drawn on by Atticus in a letter is shown in Cicero's reply on 9<sup>th</sup> Dec 50. (Precisely how Atticus had written is inevitably now lost, along with his letter, but the statue or goddess seems to have been mobilised in a bid to persuade Cicero to act against his own wishes.) Even if Caesar had been liberal to him, Cicero claims, he would have been compelled by that Minerva to remember the inscription on her statue and to act as he saw fit, and not as Atticus proposed.<sup>22</sup>

The ways in which statues in public spaces could be read and understood by viewers are also Cicero's concern in letters. *Fam.* 12.3 illuminates his epistolary engagement with some very recent additions to the fabric of the city. In October 44 BC he reported to Cassius the addition by Antony of the inscription *parenti optime merito* to the statue of Caesar on the rostra *ut non modo sicarii sed iam etiam parricidae iudicemini* ('so that you are now judged not only to be murders but even parricides'). Ways of 'reading' statues (literally, in this case, which concerns an inscription) and the effect of reading on those who will accept what they read uncritically were considered sufficiently important by Cicero for him to communicate Antony's action to Cassius. Cicero is thinking in terms of impact on audiences, not just on himself or the recipient of his letter, further aligning his epistolary thoughts with oratory.<sup>23</sup>

The same point can be made, if Purser's conjectured restoration *de statua Clodi* in *Att.* 11.23.3 is correct, about Cicero's mention in a letter of Dolabella's (probably) proposed restoration of a statue to Clodius. He remarked upon it in a bid to crystallise for Atticus the now definite rift between himself and Dolabella, whose divorce from Tullia

<sup>20</sup> *Fam.* 12.25.1. Cf. *Ov. F.* 3.809ff. on the Quinquatrus festival.

<sup>21</sup> For temporal connections, see also e.g. *Att.* 2.12, *Fam.* 2.11. In *Fam.* 3.1.1 (end of 53/early 52 BC), a letter currying favour with Appius Claudius, Cicero claims to hope to succeed in pleasing Appius through services to him. *puto non invita Minerva esse facturum. quam quidem ego si forte de tuis sumpsero, non solum Πολιάδα sed etiam Ἀππιάδα nominabo* ('I think that I shall succeed—by grace of Minerva. If by any chance I obtain the goddess from your people, I shall style her not Polias only but Appias'). This statue, which Cicero was hoping to obtain from Appius, or which Appius had offered as a gift or for sale (whether in jest or otherwise) is unlikely to be that already dedicated in 58, but the passage does provide another illustration of a connection between the phrase and a statue of the goddess.

<sup>22</sup> *Att.* 7.3. See further below for the meeting in 49. See also the well-known *Fam.* 7.23 for gentle chastising of M. Fabius Gallus in terms we might associate with oratory—pointing out the unsuitability of the statues Fabius Gallus has purchased for Cicero's house or villa in terms of the associations evoked by the gods who are the subject of those statues.

<sup>23</sup> I owe the last point to Chris Pelling. Cf. *Hor. C.* 3.24.25-30 for other literary interactions with similar inscriptions on statues.

Cicero was now determined to initiate. *nunc quidem ipse videtur denuntiare; audimus enim de statua Clodi. generumne nostrum potissimum vel hoc vel tabulas novas?* ('Now indeed he [Dolabella] seems to be declaring his intentions—for I have heard about the statue of Clodius. To think that my son-in-law of all people should be proposing either this or abolition of debts!'). He mentions the statue in this part of the letter even before referring to Dolabella's proposed cancellation of debts (to which has already alluded earlier in the letter). Both the personal and the visual nature of the example may explain this preference.<sup>24</sup> He also reports to Brutus, in an example of post-eventum justification, his own involvement in attempting to prevent Lepidus' treason by setting up a statue to Lepidus on the Rostra—a statue which had then to be torn down. Cicero remarks sanguinely that the harm done by putting it up was less than the good done by pulling it down (*nec tamen in statuenda Lepidi statua factum est mali quantum in evertenda boni*).<sup>25</sup> Again, reading between the lines of self-protection and group-justification, we find clearly communicated the almost physical and intellectual engagement with the City fabric (in voting to put up the statue, again to tear it down, and the explanations and claims made in the letter about aim and effect, where public reaction is his concern). Again, this is a bid to persuade. The statue and Cicero's own role in its erection were actions that he felt the need to justify. He paid attention to them, as to the statue of Clodius, re-erection of which would be among other things a calculated insult to Cicero himself.

Before we move further away from various kinds of connection with oratory, it is worth noting that at *Att.* 4.1.4 Cicero chooses to include information that we know he also went on to present to the jurors in the trial of Sestius. On returning to Rome from exile, he landed at Brundisium on 5<sup>th</sup> August 57, which was Tullia's birthday and, as he puts it to Atticus, 'by chance ... was the birthday both of the colony of Brundisium and of your neighbour *salus*; this coincidence was observed and celebrated with much rejoicing by a crowd of the people of Brundisium' (*casu ... natalis erat et Brundisinae coloniae et tuae vicinae salutis; quae res animadversa a multitudine summa Brundisinorum gratulatione celebrata est*). I have discussed elsewhere the consequences of this passage for our understanding of the connections made by Brundisians between Cicero's return and the cult of *salus*.<sup>26</sup> It is also interesting from the perspective of references made to monuments in letters. The temple of *salus* on the Quirinal was the focus of a Ciceronian joke twelve years later, in which he described Caesar to Atticus as 'your neighbour' (*vicinus*) because he had learned of a proposal to place Caesar's statue in the temple of Quirinus. He commented that he preferred this to the idea of Caesar sharing a temple with *salus*. The term *vicinus* echoes *tua vicina salus* of *Att.* 4.1.<sup>27</sup> It is not surprising that both Cicero and Atticus knew the location of these temples near Atticus' house on the

<sup>24</sup> In a fragment of a letter to Octavian (frg. IV.20 in Shackleton-Bailey's Loeb edn.) Cicero also reported Antony's involvement in the restoration of what is likely to be the same statue. The nature of the engagement is less clear in this case, however, because of the fragmentary nature of the citation.

<sup>25</sup> *Br.* 1.15.10, with *Cic. Phil.* 5.41 for the justification given by Cicero for the honour in a setting of openly public persuasion, and *Phil.* 9 passim for more extensive justification, in a similar context, of honours, including a statue, to Sulpicius (See Manuwald (2007), vol. 2, ad loc.).

<sup>26</sup> Clark (2007), ch. 5.

<sup>27</sup> *Att.* 12.45 (May 45). Cf. *Att.* 13.44 (July 45): *populum vero praeclarum, quod propter malum vicinum ne victoriae quidem ploditur!* ('The people are behaving splendidly in refusing to applaud *victoria* because of her undesirable neighbour.')

Quirinal. Two points are, however, worth noting: firstly, that the very fact that proximity to Atticus' residence was a link that Cicero chose to flag in a letter to his friend, and secondly, and of more interest, that in this letter, written in September 57, he drew on all these links (the coincidence of Tullia's birthday with his arrival, and of the festival day of *salus* to which attention was drawn by the Brundisians) months before he used them in his defence of Sestius. At the very least, then, he here not only recounted what had happened upon his arrival in Brundisium but did so in terms relevant to the immediate recipient of his letter, who lived near the temple. In the *pro Sestio* he made the same points, obviously leaving out the adjective describing the temple, calling the *natalis* that of 'my dearest daughter... and of the colony of Brundisium itself, and also, as you [jurors] know, of the temple of *salus*' (*carissimae filiae... etiam ipsius coloniae Brundisinae, idem ut scitis, aedes salutis*).<sup>28</sup> We may be able to go further than simply seeing Cicero talking about a monument near the house of his friend and the recipient of this letter, and to suggest that this way of presenting events in Brundisium to Atticus tells us something about mental and more official maps of the City, as well as about how Cicero applied his own map, outside his oratory, in other persuasive contexts and genres.<sup>29</sup> Temples in particular appear to have served as markers for navigation.

### Navigation by temples

Cicero navigates by temples in a variety of contexts in his letters. In one of the very few epistles in which he mentions City monuments in the course of antiquarian discussion, he uses *ad opis* (if the text has been correctly restored) to describe the location of a statue in the letter to Atticus in which he remarks on Scipio's apparent lack of sufficiently accurate knowledge of his own ancestors.<sup>30</sup> In more general discussion of recent floods, he describes for his brother the location of the flooding in the autumn/winter of 54 as *maxime in Appia ad Martis* ('especially on the *via Appia* near the temple of Mars').<sup>31</sup> This form of location by monument is not confined to temples: the spot where the man carrying a letter from Atticus to Cicero was robbed is termed *ad bustum Basili* ('near the tomb of Basilius')—a spot on the *via Appia* (according to Asc. *Mil.* 49, who notes its notoriety as a site of robberies) that Cicero expected Atticus to know.<sup>32</sup> In letter of July 44 a house, of which an eighth part was to be conveyed to Caerellia by Atticus, is referred to as *ad Streniae* ('near the temple of Strenia').<sup>33</sup> The

<sup>28</sup> *Sest.* 131. Another coincidence with birthdays is noted in *Br.* 1.15.8 (July 43)—that of the day of D. Brutus' liberation and Decimus' birthday—against which day on the calendar Cicero proposed the entry of Brutus' name: *in eoque sum maiorum exemplum secutus, qui hunc honorem mulieri Larentiae tribuerunt, cuius vos pontifices ad aram in Velabro sacrificium facere soletis* ('in this matter I followed the example of our ancestors, who granted that honour to a woman, Larentia, at whose altar in Velabrum you *pontifices* are accustomed to sacrifice'). Again, what is reported is a proposal made in the public domain, but even if the comparison with Accia Larentia were one on which Cicero had drawn in making his proposal, the explicit association with the sacrifice to Larentia by the pontiffs makes the point particular to (M.) Brutus in this epistolary account.

<sup>29</sup> For the practicalities of finding one's way in an unknown city, see Ling (1990). For mental maps, see Larmour and Spencer (2007).

<sup>30</sup> *Att.* 6.1.17.

<sup>31</sup> *Q. Fr.* 3.5.8.

<sup>32</sup> *Att.* 7.9 (Dec. 50).

<sup>33</sup> *Att.* 15.26.4 (2<sup>nd</sup> July 44).

monuments here all serve as guides to location. While the first three examples suggest that Cicero, Atticus and Quintus were indeed familiar with the location of the temples of *ops* and Mars and the tomb of Basilius, the same cannot necessarily be said of the shrine to the less well-known goddess Strenia. Her temple, according to Varro, lay at the head of the *via Sacra*.<sup>34</sup> The house may well have been identified in this manner in the legal transactions surrounding it in which Cicero and Atticus are involved, but this does not necessarily imply anything about people's knowledge of it or its location. It does support the idea that navigation 'by temples' and other monuments was part of more widespread practice, both in ways suggestive of topographical knowledge and in ways that suggest that topographical markers could be used to provide directions to those unfamiliar with their surroundings—those needing directions, for example. The *locus classicus* is Terence's *Adelphi* 572–84, in which, in comic vein, the slave Syrus outlines to Demea a deliberately long-winded route to find his brother (in an attempt to get him lost), a form of navigation involving a *porticus apud macellum*, a *sacellum*, an alley called *caprificus* [goatfig], the house of a rich man Cratinus, the temple of Diana, the city gate, a small mill and a workshop.<sup>35</sup>

Although houses of known men are also clearly part of Cicero's mental map of the City of Rome, he does not, at least in the extant letters, use them to navigate by, perhaps because of rapid changes of ownership. They feature rather in accounts of buying and selling of property and in the vivid accounts of recent events mentioned above. The only occasions upon which Cicero mentions non-monumental buildings, other than the private houses of rich men, in his letters, do not concern location either—except perhaps when he is distressed by the recollection of Terentia being taken from the temple of Vesta to the *tabula Valeria*. The terms in which he describes this route make it clear that his informant, Publius Valerius, had described it or its termini to Cicero in a letter. Valerius no doubt found both ends significant, the former because Terentia had taken refuge with her half-sister, the Vestal, during Cicero's exile and the financial difficulties this entailed; the latter for a reason still disputed. Whether the *tabula Valeria* was a bank (an idea now much discredited), or more likely, a site connected with the tribunes and so named because of the proximity either of the publicly displayed *leges Valeriae Horatiae*, or of an old painting of the victory over Carthaginians and Hiero II by M. Valerius Maximus Messala and displayed on the side of the *curia Hostilia*, it is interesting that Cicero's informant of the precise end-point of Terentia's ordeal, the *tabula Valeria*, is a P. Valerius.<sup>36</sup> Coincidence? Very possibly, but not inevitably.

<sup>34</sup> Varro *Ling.* 5.47: *Carinae pote a caeri<m>onia, quod hinc oritur caput Sacrae viae ab Streniae sacello quae pertinet in arce<m>...* ('*Carinae* comes perhaps from *caerimonia* because the head of the *via Sacra* starts from here, extending from the shrine of Strenia to the citadel...')

<sup>35</sup> Although navigation by monuments obviously does not presuppose knowledge of those monuments on the part of e.g. a stranger needing directions, it does say something about the topographical knowledge of the speaker. Ling (1990), in his investigation of how to find one's way in an ancient city, uses only oratorical, not epistolary evidence from Cicero. The epigraphic evidence he collected to back up his claim that in many cases streets had no name—for example *CIL* X 4660, X 1698, IX 5438 (AD 119), IX 375 ll. 15–16 from Capua, Puteoli, Caes and Ostia, commemorating the paving of streets—further suggests that Cicero was not unusual in navigating by monuments: the inscriptions, from a range of periods, name the building or monument at either end of the paving stretch. For locations in letters on papyri, see Parsons (2007) esp. 125–6.

<sup>36</sup> *Fam.* 14.2.2. For the *tabula Valeria* see Coarelli (1999) with bibliography and Shackleton-Bailey's Cambridge commentary on *Fam.* 14.2.

The other references to non-monumental buildings are the well-known allusion to two of Cicero's shops having collapsed and the mice as well as tenants having taken refuge elsewhere, and the details of the effects of heavy floods and the sweeping away of Crassipes' *ambulatio* together with *tabernae plurimae* ('very many shops') in the passage discussed above, in which the location of the heaviest flooding on the *via Appia* is pinpointed *ad Martis* and the extent of the flood is described: *magna vis aquae usque ad piscinam publicam* ('the great stretch of water reaches as far as the Piscina Publica').<sup>37</sup> We might suspect on the basis of the rest of the corpus that, had his son-in-law's *ambulatio* not been a victim of the floods, Cicero might well not have bothered writing to Quintus about the flooding of shops.

The locations of senate meetings are sometimes included in letters for reasons we might term practical or exegetical. Cicero explicitly tells Quintus, for example, that the senate met in the temple of Apollo during the events surrounding Milo's trial in 56 because this allowed Pompey to be present, the temple being located outside the *pomerium*.<sup>38</sup> Atticus, too, may well have included the location of the meeting in 49 when he attempted, five years later, to find a parallel in order to persuade Cicero to accede to Antony's request to attend the senate. The reference must be to one of the meetings in the second week of January 49, held outside the *pomerium* again so that Pompey could attend. That Atticus did include this information seems a reasonable inference from Cicero's *nam illa quae recordaris Lentulo et Marcello consulibus acta in aede Apollonis, nec causa eadem est nec simile tempus* ('as for those points you recall about what happened in the temple of Apollo in the consulship of Lentulus and Marcellus, neither the case nor the circumstances are the same').<sup>39</sup> The consular dating is easy to understand. The location may have been sufficient to trigger memory of the occasion, given the particular reason for the senate meeting there. Alternatively, we may see an echo, intentional or not, of the official reporting of senate meetings.<sup>40</sup>

On some occasions, the addition of location seems to add vividness to the account, by triggering a visual association, just as in oratory. Other explanations, not incompatible with this addition of vividness, can also be found. Including the information that election of consuls by the *comitia centuriata* took place on the Campus seems one example of apparent redundancy, given that the *comitia centuriata* always met in the Campus Martius. In a fascinating remark to his brother about the power of Sardinia to trigger dormant memories, Cicero comments that when Gracchus the Augur (the father of the Gracchi) arrived in Sardinia, he remembered what had happened to him when he held consular elections in the Campus Martius contrary to the auspices (*nam ut ille Gracchus augur, postea quam in istam provinciam venit, recordatus est quid sibi in campo Martio comitia consulum habenti contra auspicia accidisset...*). The location may be included here to add vividness and/or because Gracchus' mistake was to forget to auspicate as he

<sup>37</sup> Att. 14.9; Q. Fr. 3.5.8. The *piscina publica* lay near the *porta Capena*.

<sup>38</sup> Q. Fr. 2.3.2. Caelius mentions that the same location was used for a meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> July 51 (*Fam.* 8.4).

<sup>39</sup> Att. 15.3.

<sup>40</sup> See e.g., from the early empire, *SCPP* 1.1: *A(nte) d(iem) IIII eid(us) Dec(embres) in Palatio in porticu, quae est ad Apollonis* and the *tabula Hebana* 1.1: *... in Palatio in porticu quae est ad Apollinis...* Temple locations are frequently introduced in the letters and elsewhere by this form, *ad* followed by the genitive of the divinity, which is elliptical for *ad aedem* or *templum* of the god. Speeches: e.g. Cic. *Quinct.* 17 (*ad Castoris*): *Clu.* 101 (*ad Juturnae*); official designations: e.g. *CIL* VI.8688, the seal of a freedman procurator, *actor Caesaris ad Castor(is)*.

crossed the stream into the Campus. In *Att.* 1.1.1 Cicero tells Atticus that he is thinking of beginning to canvass just at the time when Cincius has told him that Atticus' slave will be leaving with the letter he is writing, that is on the 17<sup>th</sup> July at the tribunician elections in the Campus (*in campo comitiis tribunicis a.d. XVI Kal. Sext.*). Although the tribal assemblies did meet in a number of venues, it again seems unlikely that Atticus needed to be told where these elections would take place, however useful such snippets prove for historians now. The inclusion of *in campo* here both helps to create a more visual image and provides the necessary first element for a kind of tricolon crescendo, so that the aural as well as the visual qualities of the writing are both balanced and enhanced.

In certain cases the evocation of background in order to enhance the reader's understanding is more clearly evident. In *Att.* 1.14 (13 Feb 61), Cicero recounts Pompey's being called upon by Fufius to address the assembly: *res agebantur in circo Flaminio, et erat in eo ipso loco illo die nundinarum πανήγυρις* ('this was taking place in the Circus Flaminius, and there was on that very spot on market day just where the holiday crowd was gathered...'). Since the fact of a *contio* being called would not inform Atticus of its location, and since the nature and size of the gathered crowd is important for his story, Cicero pens in the scene in a few words.<sup>41</sup>

There is also a sense in which places in the City serve for Cicero as summarising symbols for something bigger, or for activities that took place in them. On a number of occasions, places, notably the Forum or Curia, represent the activities taking place inside them, or, still further, stand for or sum up 'Rome' for Cicero. Certain places, for example, clearly sprang to mind as obvious *points de repère* both for immediate recipients and broader readership. Advising Quintus on how slaves should behave during his governorship of Asia, in the letter that has so much in common with a treatise of advice, he says *ut ita se gerant in istis Asiaticis itineribus ut si iter Appia via faceres* ('let them behave during travels in Asia as though you were travelling down the via Appia'). Writing to Atticus from Laodicea during his governorship of Cilicia, he summarises what he misses about Rome, in one of many pleas that his year away not be extended, as *lucem, forum, urbem, domum, vos*. 'forum' here no doubt represents both the location itself and especially the activities Cicero practised and enjoyed there.<sup>42</sup> A Plinian parallel

<sup>41</sup> Sometimes the individual recipient's knowledge of a location signalled without explicit label may exceed ours. In the first Verrine (*Verr.* 1.19.1), Cicero names the *fornix Fabianus*, on the *via Sacra*, at the eastern entrance to the Forum Romanum, as the much-frequented location where Verres' acquittal was predicted to him when the election results for 69 were announced: *ad ipsum fornicem Fabianum in turba*. Compare his description in a letter of Bibulus' edicts posted against Pompey in 59: again, the location is described for Atticus as so crowded with readers that one can't get past the place (... *ut eum locum ubi proponuntur prae multitudine eorum qui legunt transire nequeamus...*), just as earlier in the letter the Rostra are referred to without name—Cicero mentions Pompey's *contio* about Bibulus' edicts and recalls *qui antea solitus esset iactare se magnificentissime illo in loco summo cum amore populi...* ('how magnificently he used to show himself off in that place, with an adoring crowd'). Where the edicts were posted and where Pompey postured does not have to be spelled out explicitly to Atticus (*Att.* 2.21.4). Cf. *Att.* 3.15.6.

<sup>42</sup> *Q. Fr.* 1.1.17; *Att.* 5.15. See also *Q. Fr.* 2.5.3 (Curia for public affairs); *Att.* 12.8 (Campus Martius for Rome and elections—*fenicularium* for Spain); *Att.* 12.21 (lack of law courts and senate house mean the Forum is meaningless for Cicero); *Q. Fr.* 2.15.2 (house, Forum, and demonstrations at theatre: locations stand for people at them); *Att.* 7.13 (attitude to temples and roofs standing for attitude to the City); *Att.* 14.10 and 14.14 (lingering on the Capitol standing for actions after murder of Caesar), cf. *Fam.* 9.15 (Forum); *Fam.* 4.6 (home, Forum and Curia summing up private and public life); *Fam.* 8.8 and 8.9 (Forum standing for people and activity within it).

can be found in Pliny's description of Verginius Rufus' funeral as doing credit to the emperor, the times, the Forum and the Rostra: in one sense this can be taken literally, since the Rostra in the Forum were the location for Tacitus' funeral speech, but once again the places are also shorthand for their history and all that happens there: *Huius viri exsequiae magnum ornamentum principi magnum saeculo magnum etiam foro et rostris attulerunt.*<sup>43</sup>

Routes pay a role in Cicero's letters as in Pliny's, where movement to or through places is very prominent. Cicero frequently recounts, and thereby recreates in a letter, how he is escorted by large numbers of people. Perhaps the best example is to be found in *Br.* 1.3.2, where Cicero's escort to the Capitol in 43 from his house, conveyed in ringing tones, clearly evokes the triumph (which Cicero never had). This terminates at the same point, although Cicero was then escorted onto the Rostra.<sup>44</sup> Such a cortège was inevitably open to triggering historical memory, however recent. In 61 BC all that was required was the size of the crowd gathering at Cicero's house for him to make an association (in light of his presentation in the letter of the failure to convict Clodius in the Bona Dea scandal as a kind of success for Cicero himself) with the crowd that escorted him to his house when he laid down his consulship (another day of failure cast as triumph by Cicero).<sup>45</sup> In claiming that the *equites* have deserted the senate in 60, he thinks of a time when they were as one, with Atticus prominent among them, and describes the *equites* in 63 as *equitatus ille quem in clivo Capitolino te signifero ac principe collocaram* ('the *equites* whom I set on the *clivus Capitolinus* with you as their standard-bearer and chief').<sup>46</sup> Again, as well as subtly praising Atticus while leaving himself the overall glory, he chooses a direct and positive association for the recipient of his letter, rooted in terms of location for immediacy.

The ways in which Cicero mentions areas and monuments in the City, then, can be grouped into a number of different categories. Most interesting, perhaps, is the role of monuments in persuasion, and particularly the frequency with which what is involved is often related to the gods or a god. Cicero explicitly compares oratory and epistolography in *Fam.* 9.21, emphasising the variety of styles that can and must be adopted in both, and commenting, *epistulas vero cottidianis verbis texere solemus* ('we are accustomed to weave letters from everyday language'). In topographical terms, what emerges from the letters either reveals a greater degree of overlap between the two genres, or suggests that by *verba cottidiana* Cicero is referring to the range of languages and linguistic strategies he himself uses in the full range of his various activities. It seems then, that what might 'give away' pseudo-Cicero is not the similarities in his letter to Octavian to oratory *per se*, nor the inclusion of prominent and central topographical features, including temples, but rather the straightforward replication of an oratorical situation rather than the tailoring, modification or application of techniques familiar from speech-making in an epistolary context. Also striking is the circumscribed range of (usually central) monuments referred to (see fig.2), with some surprising omissions, at least in the surviving corpus of letters. Cicero appears, like others, to use buildings, and, in his case, particularly temples, as markers by which to navigate or locate other places. Buildings

---

<sup>43</sup> Plin. *Ep.* 2.1.6.

<sup>44</sup> e.g. *Att.* 1.18.1, 2.1.5, 4.1, *Fam.* 9.19, 10.2, 14.2.

<sup>45</sup> *Att.* 1.16.5.

<sup>46</sup> *Att.* 2.1.7.

(both monuments and houses) also have a role in the vignettes drawn, especially for Atticus, and, in earlier years at least, for Quintus, of events in the City which they have not witnessed. As we shall see, however, similarities to historiography evoked by this are more marked in the Plinian corpus, which more closely resembles Cicero's letters to friends (see above) and where historiography appears to play a role not dissimilar to that of oratory in Cicero's letters.

In making such a claim, we cannot forget that in Cicero's case we have no shortage of speeches with which to compare his epistolary output, whereas Pliny's extant oratorical corpus is obviously much smaller, comprising only one speech and that of a particular 'type'. There are references to his speeches in the letters, however, which, together with the *Panegyric*, offer a slightly broader base on which to assess the place of monuments and areas in the City in his oratory.

We know that topographical description (although not, in the preserved allusion, of the City of Rome) had a place in Pliny's speeches, or at least in the versions prepared for later recitations. Letter 2.5 sees Pliny talking in a letter about a speech. Referring to a political or forensic speech (*actio*) that he was sending to Lupercus, Pliny claimed it right for the descriptions of places that would be found rather often in the speech in question to be treated in the manner not only of the historian but also of the poet, as a concession to the ears of the young. The descriptions, as may be inferred from a remark earlier in the letter, were probably of the area (around Comum) from where Pliny came. Topographical depiction, then, is described as not inappropriate for oratory, but it is flagged up by Pliny as more immediately associated with a different genre. In letter 8.4 he connects it with history-writing, when praising Caninius Rufus' decision to write about Trajan's Dacian wars in terms of the opportunities for description that this would offer. Topographical description was similarly added by Cicero in at least one case after (first) delivery of the speech.<sup>47</sup>

Particularly suggestive in terms of a potential way of approaching the corpus of letters is the claim that Pliny makes at the beginning of letter 8.20: *Ad quae noscenda iter ingredi, transmitters mare solemus, ea sub oculis posita neglegimus, seu quia ita natura comparatum, ut proximorum incuriosi longinqua sectemur, seu quod omnium rerum cupido languescit, cum facilis occasio, seu quod differimus tamquam saepe visuri, quod datur videre quotiens velis cernere. Quaecumque de causa, permulta in urbe nostra iuxtaque urbem non oculis modo sed ne auribus quidem novimus, quae si tulisset Achaia Aegyptos Asia aliave quaelibet miraculorum ferax commendatrixque terra, audita perlecta lustrata haberemus.* ('We are used to embarking on a journey and crossing the sea to discover the kind of things that we neglect when they are right in front of our eyes, whether we are by nature prone to be indifferent to what is close by while we pursue distant objects, or because the desire for anything decreases when it is easily available, or because we put off seeing them as if we shall often see what is there for us to see whenever we so wish. Whatever the reason, there are very many things in our City and near the City which we have never seen nor even heard of, which if they happened to be

---

<sup>47</sup> Cic. *Verr.* II.iv.117ff. for extensive description of Syracuse and *Att.* 1.13.5: *τοποθεσίαν quam postulas Miseni et Puteolorum includam orationi meae* ('I shall include in my speech the topographical description you demand of Misenum and Puteoli'). The speech was probably, as Shackleton-Bailey surmises, one in reply to Metellus Nepos in 62 and being edited in January of 61.

in Greece, Egypt or Asia, or anywhere else that advertises itself as abounding in marvels we should have heard and read about them and observed them.’) Saylor has shed light on the composition of this letter, in which Pliny’s comments on human nature are illustrated through his description of the landscape of Lake Vadimon in the rest of the letter, as will be noticed by ‘the reader . . . , if not as oblivious to Pliny’s art as tourists to things nearby’.<sup>48</sup> But what of the claimed failure to notice *permulta in urbe nostra iuxtaque urbem*? Such a statement from Pliny would usually lead an alert reader to expect Pliny to go on to show (or already to have shown) himself to be the kind of person who does in fact take notice. He certainly does so when it comes to Lake Vadimon. He also makes a point, in *Ep.* 6.24, of including a tale of a little-known woman who had jumped into Lake Comum with her terminally-ill husband. This tale is ostensibly cued for the friend with whom Pliny was sailing on the lake by seeing the villa and the *cubiculum* from which the jump took place. He justifies telling such a story because the woman’s bravery is like Arria’s but less famous:<sup>49</sup> we note that it is tied closely to place (and to a place important to Pliny). Can the same be said of places in Rome itself in the Plinian self-presentation that was his corpus of letters?

Moving from Italy to Rome itself, let us turn first to the panegyric to Trajan, delivered in front of the senate in the autumn of AD 100 and also, according to letters 3.13 and 3.18, at the kind of *recitationes* with which Pliny fills his letters.<sup>50</sup> Although it is unlikely to be representative of Pliny’s oratory as a whole, it will repay attention to consider the engagement with the City within this speech of praise and the kinds of tropes Pliny uses. We might compare the panegyric elements in Cicero’s earlier *pro Marcello*.<sup>51</sup> The changing fabric of the City under Caesar played little part in Cicero’s speech of thanks to the dictator in 46, although he did draw on the Curia in which he had delivered the speech, personifying its walls and claiming that even they wished to thank Caesar for Marcellus’ expected return.<sup>52</sup> By Pliny’s time, of course, the pervasive influence of works like Augustus’ *Res Gestae* in shaping accepted ways of describing the emperor had brought a new prominence to building and to buildings. This is clearly visible in Suetonius, for example, in whose work on the Caesars ‘building’ is a category according to which assessment is made.<sup>53</sup> For Pliny, whose *gratiarum actio* was first delivered in only the third year of Trajan’s reign and circulated more widely probably only a year or two afterwards, it was clearly important to devote a section to Trajan’s

---

<sup>48</sup> Saylor (1982) 143.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 15.67 on the dying words of Subrius Flavus.

<sup>50</sup> For *recitationes*, see Woolf (2003) on which further below. As Durry (1938), 5 points out, September and October were vacation months for the senate, perhaps precipitating his need to reach a wider audience.

<sup>51</sup> On the panegyric tradition, see Braund (1998). Other potential models in extant literature include Tacitus’ *Agricola* and perhaps Seneca’s *de Clementia*.

<sup>52</sup> Cic. *Marc.* 10. See also 13. According to Dio, Caesar was commissioned in 44 to rebuild the Curia that had burned down in 52—although this may have been the ratification of a project already underway. On plans for Curia and Forum Iulium, see Ulrich (1993).

<sup>53</sup> Elsner (1996), although the prominence may be slightly less of an Augustan creation than he suggests. Some ‘prototypes’ for the *Res Gestae* such as the *elogia* of Marius, Appius Claudius and others from the Forum Augustum are also Augustan, and may well bear traces of his influence, but Scipio’s having dedicated a temple to the *Tempestates* features on one of the Scipionic *elogia* (*ILLRP* 310) from the 3<sup>rd</sup> cent. B. C. to illustrate his piety. Suet. *Tib.* 47 is the clearest illustration (because a negative one) of public building as a category for assessment. *Opera* feature prominently from the first Suetonian ‘life’, of Caesar, in which they are part of the building, rather than the exercising, of power—a point I owe to Chris Pelling.

public building projects. The (still mysterious) ‘temples’ raised to his father are praised to illuminate his piety (*Pan.* 11). In keeping with the theme of the whole speech, he contrasts Trajan’s public works with the over-bearing and disruptive nature of Domitian’s private building (claiming that people’s houses and temples were now safe; 51), and casts Trajan as a preserver and as frugal in private building. With little in the way of specific projects to praise at length, he talks in general terms of colonnades and shrines built swiftly, and then focusses in on the changes (including additional seating) in the Circus Maximus. This offers him the opportunity to compare the physical structure with temples in terms of beauty, and to describe the edifice itself, as well as what was staged in it, as a spectacle.<sup>54</sup> The spectators are themselves a focus of attention because Trajan sits on the same level as the people (*aequatus plebis ac principis locus*).<sup>55</sup>

Even before mentioning public building and the Circus Maximus as a *locus* in which all strata of society come together, Pliny praises Trajan’s attitude in terms of its effects on the houses of the *nobiles*, which are no longer neglected and decaying, or falling into the hands of the undeserving, but are now tended by one at least as worthy as those who built them. Properties are no longer coveted by the emperor; owners are sought for them, even for *horti* long in the possession of the imperial family (50). Like Cicero with the walls of the Curia in the *pro Marcello*, Pliny ascribes feelings of pleasure (*sentire ... et laetari videntur*) to the old, noble houses (50) at gaining worthy owners.

Pliny also uses buildings, particularly private buildings, as a visual illustration of Nerva and Trajan’s openness and accessibility, again in contrast with Domitian’s failed attempts to hide behind walls through which vengeance, in the shape of his assassins, broke.<sup>56</sup> The adoption of Trajan *in templo ... ante pulvinar Iovis optimi maximi* (‘in the temple ... before the seat of Jupiter Best and Greatest’) is likewise distanced from one taking place *in cubiculo*. The inner room of the palace is both setting and shorthand for improper imperial behaviour, evoking a whole trope of unsuitable (from a senatorial perspective) influences on ‘bad’ emperors, exemplified by the *intra cubiculum* trials of the reigns of Claudius and others. Pliny further highlights Trajan’s restraint by talking about his statues, and their location—outside temples, or, in the vestibule of the temple of Jupiter, in bronze rather than gold or silver. These will last much longer than the more ostentatious, over-reaching and now joyfully smashed images of Domitian (52). What is stressed is the process of active (in this case, very active) engagement by the populace with the statues.<sup>57</sup>

Alongside these tropes we find an emphasis on routes in the city, particularly the ascent of the Capitol, which is repeatedly evoked, again with an emphasis on the presence of participant spectators—whether those crying out ‘imperator!’ on the opening of the doors of the temple of Jupiter for Trajan’s entrance on his adoption and thereby serendipitously portending his rule (5), or those recalling that happy event on viewing his

---

<sup>54</sup> Feldherr (1998) for an excellent treatment of related themes. Cf. *Pan.* 34 in which Pliny praises the attitude to informers in Trajan’s day compared to that under Domitian by conjuring up two contrasting spectacles in the minds of his listeners. He heightens the horror inspired by the Domitianic *delatores* by contrasting desolate, rural locations usually associated with brigands with the central locations in the City (*templum* and *forum*) that these men had ‘besieged’ (*insederant*).

<sup>55</sup> *Pan.* 51, and cf. Suet. *Aug.* 45.

<sup>56</sup> *Pan.* esp. 47, 49, 83.

<sup>57</sup> See p.10 above for Cicero’s discussion of the erection and pulling down of a statue to Lepidus. On representations of statues, see Stewart (2003) esp. ch. 4 (127 on this passage) and Henderson (2002).

ascent of the same path on the day he entered the City in 99 (23). Houses and streets on that occasion were so lined with cheering crowds (*referta tecta ac laborantia ... opletas undique vias*) that, Pliny claims, the only space visible aside from the very narrow passageway left for Trajan himself was that underneath any foot poised to take a step: The emperor's trajectory, in other words, is the only visible part of the City. The 'triumphal' route is not made up of 'bricks and mortar', or 'marble and tile' but rather of people (22). Scenes and routes evoke others, both happy (Trajan literally follows in his father's footsteps) and unhappy (the Capitoline way can also trigger memories of animals being diverted to be sacrificed to Domitian's statue, rather than to Jupiter (52)).<sup>58</sup>

In his letters, Pliny uses places in the City with a closer focus on himself and his friends, to create a picture of their movement through the City (and elsewhere). He not only emphasises the *recitationes* on which Woolf focuses—with the men rushing between *recitationes* in the City, gathering in *domus* and *villae*, 'generalizing from the locations employed by Cicero in his philosophical dialogues'.<sup>59</sup> He also draws attention to politics and the courts. In letter 2.9, Pliny outlines a generalised route for himself, one made up of both people and places, when he describes his canvassing on behalf of Sextus Erucius: *itaque presso amicos, supplico, ambio, domos stationesque circumeo* ('and so I catch hold of my friends, implore them, canvass, and go around private houses and public places'). A few letters later, in a discussion of paid applause in the centumviral courts, he tells Maximus *si quando transibis per basilicam et voles scire, quo modo quisque dicat, nihil est quod tribunal ascendas, nihil quod praebeas aurem* ('if you are ever passing through the basilica and you wish to know how each man is speaking, there's no need to climb the rostrum, no need to lend an ear').<sup>60</sup> His theme in another letter is the respect paid to intellectual life, which he illustrates by an episode, only a few days old, in which he had been unable to use his usual route to his place in court, so thronged was the court.<sup>61</sup> The sluggishness of audiences is criticised in 1.13—those listening to recitals *in stationibus sedent* ('sit around in resting places'), asking what point the reader is up to, and only going in once he is a fair way through his material, even then *lente cunctanterque* ('slowly and reluctantly'). This forms a stark contrast with the brisker movements of Pliny and his friends, to highlight and represent their contrasting attitudes. In this Pliny and his friends are tied to the kind of representation of the active emperor that Pliny saw fit to portray in the *Panegyric*. Pliny perhaps even sought to enhance his modest boast of the gauntlet he (allegedly) ran, as praetor, to visit the philosopher Artemidorus, when Domitian had banished philosophers when he notes the location of Artemidorus' residence as *in suburbano*, creating a vision in the mind of the reader of the length of the 'perilous' journey.<sup>62</sup>

<sup>58</sup> Places (ground, trees, rocks, houses) associated, however briefly, with Trajan the soldier, outside the city, are placed into the same framework in ch.15, in which Pliny claims that these will in time be pointed out just as the *sacra vestigia* of great generals of the past were shown to Trajan. For an excellent perspective on the place of the City as character in Tacitean historiography, see Ash (2007).

<sup>59</sup> Woolf (2003) 216.

<sup>60</sup> *Ep.* 2.14.

<sup>61</sup> *Ep.* 4.16.1. See also 5.9.1.

<sup>62</sup> *Ep.* 3.11.2. It is difficult, on the other hand, to imagine a location closer to Rome than the *suburbanum*! Sherwin-White (1966) *ad loc.* assumes that Artemidorus was preparing to leave Italy at the time of the visit.

Movement, and movement from early in the day, is to be found in the fifth letter of the first book, which in some ways anticipates the first letter of the fifth book. In the former, Pliny refuses to accede to Regulus' wish that Vestricius Spurinna meet Pliny at Pliny's own house early in the morning, and, portraying himself as an early riser (like his uncle), sets off towards the approaching Spurinna. They converge at the Porticus of Livia (*Coimus in porticum Liuiiae, cum alter ad alterum tenderemus.*) The location is evocative: Hoffer points out the connotations evoked by the *porticus* as stoa and hence as a symbol of the noble political philosophy of Rusticus, on whom Pliny's disagreement with Regulus hangs. Augustus and the origins of the principate are evoked, reaching back beyond intervening 'bad' emperors. Also implicit is Augustan clemency, since the porticus of Livia is, in Hoffer's neat formulation, an 'anti-monument to the notorious ... Vedius Pollio'.<sup>63</sup> There is another potential association, and one that creates the link with letter 5.1. That association is *concordia*, recipient of cult in the complex in which, on this occasion, a clear lack of harmony was to be addressed. In 5.1 Pliny has considered Asudius Curianus' claim not to have deserved to have been disinherited by his own mother. It was in the temple to *concordia* that Pliny and Asudius met (*conuenimus in aedem concordiae*) for Pliny to deliver his verdict that Asudius' mother had been right. The episode culminates, of course, in Pliny's presentation, in Curianus leaving a legacy to Pliny—the subject of letter 5.1. It is striking that on these, the only two occasions on which Pliny mentions a specific public monument in his letters, other than the *basilica Iulia* where he spends so much time professionally, he presents each as a place where two people converge, and chooses to present the resolution of discord in such settings. He presents himself as arbiter or conciliator. Here, then, we do find examples of the conscious use of symbolically charged locations as a backdrop to Pliny's own personality as presented in the letters.

Pliny, like Cicero, was an orator, writer, writer of letters, augur and consul—all of which he carefully draws to the attention of his readers, setting himself up as a point of comparison with Cicero through a variety of strategies.<sup>64</sup> In letter 4.2.5, however, Pliny describes Regulus' excesses in mourning his son, including the slaughter of his ponies, dogs, nightingales, parrots and blackbirds around the funeral pyre and how Regulus himself *tenet se trans Tiberim in hortis in quibus latissimum solum porticibus immensis, ripam statuis suis occupauit* ('keeps to his *horti* across the Tiber, in which he has filled a massive area with vast colonnades, and filled the river-bank with his statues [probably including some of his son]'). Given the explicit parallels with Cicero to which Pliny draws attention within his epistolary corpus and by the very act of 'publishing' his letters, it seems initially surprising that he should criticise excessive mourning of progeny in such terms. By mentioning the location of Regulus' excessive mourning of his child—in Trastevere *horti*—he strikes a potentially subversive note. Cicero, after all, famously wished to construct a shrine to Tullia in such *horti*, and discussed the location at length in the well-known series of letters to Atticus, although he was eventually dissuaded from the project. If Pliny was conscious of allusion to the Ciceronian corpus here was he perhaps thinking rather in terms of the letter in which Cicero complains about the arrogance of Cleopatra when she was living *trans Tiberim in hortis*?<sup>65</sup>

<sup>63</sup> Hoffer (1999), 79 and n.53.

<sup>64</sup> For explicit allusions to Cicero, *Epp.* 1.2, 1.5.11–12, 1.20, 3.15.1, 4.8, 5.3.5, 7.4, 7.17.13, 9.2.2, 9.16.8.

<sup>65</sup> *Att.* 5.15.

A desire for vivid setting, which I inferred for some of the Ciceronian passages discussed above, can also be found in Pliny, and is indeed explicitly signalled in letter 6.33.3–4, although here there is no need to assume deliberate imitation of the late-Republican epistolographer. Pliny sketches the scene for the speech he has given for Attia Viriola, a copy of which was enclosed with the ‘original’ letter to Romanus. He paints a picture of the busy court, including the *subsellia*, the tribunal and the upper galleries of the basilica (Iulia) and overtly claims that he has explained the case and the setting to allow Romanus to experience the speech as if present.

Just as the connection between domicile and reputation is made very clear in Cicero’s letters about buying, losing and regaining his house, so in the letters mourning Junius Avitus and commemorating Martial(’s praise of Pliny), Pliny uses his own house in Rome to as a kind of extension of himself and of his position and influence. As well as advertising the house’s Esquiline location in the latter, in which Martial summons his/the Muse and sends her to that location (*adloquitur Musam, mandat ut domum meam Esquilis quaerat, adeat reuerenter*), in the former he makes very clear what he himself had done for the young Avitus by envisaging, twice in the one letter, Avitus donning the *latus clavus* there.<sup>66</sup> Again, despite the prevalence of Cicero’s house in his letters, there is no need for Pliny directly to be emulating Cicero here: the importance of one’s townhouse extends far beyond either man and is reflected both by the taxonomy of buying and selling found in Cicero’s letters and by the use made of the connection by Pliny in respect not only of himself but also of Titinius Capito.<sup>67</sup>

Pliny, like Cicero, was also explicitly ‘not a writer of history’. Ash has shown very clearly, however, how the discussions in the letters about the difference between letter-writing and history-writing, and Pliny’s explanations of why he (like Cicero, but allegedly with even more justification) is put off writing history, are accompanied in his mosaic of letters by a number of demonstrations of his abilities in this genre. Place is often mentioned to introduce such passages. The real ‘point’ of letter 4.11, for example, as Ash has shown, is Pliny’s narrative of the death of the chief Vestal Cornelia. This is ostensibly cued in epistolary terms by the introductory remarks about Valerius Licinianus teaching rhetoric in Sicily, but the main passage of the letter allows Pliny to dabble in the history-writing genre.<sup>68</sup> Location is twice signalled. Specific locations are used when Pliny points out that the pontiffs were summoned by Domitian to his Alban villa, not to the Regia (... *reliquos pontifices non in Regiam sed in Albanam uillam conuocauit*). This vilification of Domitian echoes the public/private: Rome/country *topoi* drawn on by Pliny in the *Panegyricus*. The descent, when Cornelia’s robe famously snags, is also located in

<sup>66</sup> *Ep.* 3.21.5, on which see Woolf (2003) 211-12; *Ep.* 8.23.2, 23.6. In 7.5, in which Pliny writes to his wife and presents himself missing her greatly, he describes his feet taking him, unconsciously as it were, into her *diaeta*. This smaller, internal space represents Calpurnia for him in her absence, in a kind of gendered (female/private) version of the idea of the house representing Pliny’s public persona.

<sup>67</sup> See *Epp.* 1.17.3 and 8.12.2 (cf. 8.21.2). Pliny also refers to the houses of others in order to show his own close relationship to their owners: see e.g. *Ep.* 7.16.3. Pliny does, however, only mention the location of his house (on the Esquiline) in 3.21.5, in paraphrase of Martial. This opens up interesting questions about the contrast between satire and Pliny, who may well be deliberately setting himself off from the animated physical detail of metropolitan life in order to emphasise the life of literature. The emphasis on crowds in many of Cicero’s letters on recent events is itself intrinsically important for creating general atmosphere. The marker in Att. 1.14 (above, p. 14), which mentions the Circus Flaminius, is more specific than for crowds playing a related but distinct role e.g. in Sen. *Ep.*56 .

<sup>68</sup> Ash (2003).

more general terms as *in illud subterraneum* ('into that underground chamber'), keeping the focus on the immediate surroundings of the 'heroine'.<sup>69</sup>

Pliny opens his account of Larcius Macedo's death at the hands of some of his slaves in the main part of letter 3.14 by flagging up the subject-matter as *rem atrocem nec tantum epistula dignam* ('a dreadful business and worthy of more than a letter'). History-writing would be an obviously suitable genre. At the end of the letter Pliny adds a description of an event which, in retrospect, seems to have portended the murder. He claims to append this anecdote simply because he had time and paper left for writing in and on, but, marking it as occurring 'in Rome' (to distinguish it from the setting of the death already recounted in the main part of the letter, which occurred *in villa Formiana*) he creates thematic unity by presenting baths (one extra-urban and private, one urban and public<sup>70</sup>) as the common setting for both episodes. He thereby adds to his vivid account of the death another vignette, drawing on a motif (...*ut exitus docuit, ominosa res...*; 'as his death has taught us, it was an omen') that we might readily associate with the genre of history-writing: the portent.<sup>71</sup> In letter 1.13, mentioned above, in which Pliny praises poets and criticises audiences, he goes on to introduce the tale of the emperor Claudius as a salutary contrast with the fairly recent past ('within our parents' recollection'). Claudius is immediately located, walking on the Palatine (presumably in the palace grounds: *cum in Palatio spatiaretur...*), when he hears voices, asks their source, learns that Nonianus was giving a reading, and hurries off to listen.<sup>72</sup>

A negative reference to Claudius' time is found in Pliny's extensive quotation from and comment on the *senatus consultum* about Pallas. Just as the senate made provision for the display of the text of the emperor's speech and of their decrees, on bronze, on the statue *loricata* of the Divine Julius (probably in the Forum Iulium)<sup>73</sup>, so Pliny too is concerned with the consequences of that location, *in celeberrimo loco*.<sup>74</sup> Both senate and Pliny were aware of how conspicuous a location this was, and Pliny makes his disapproval in the case of Pallas clear, showing his concern both for readers at that time and for those who were envisaged, when the text was to be engraved, as future readers (Pliny clearly has not found the decree on a prominently placed statue, however, suggesting it was no longer so displayed). He also personifies the Curia, representing it as witness of the *dedecora* in giving such honours to Pallas, lamenting that exposure to

---

<sup>69</sup> *Ep.* 4.11.6 and 4.11.9.

<sup>70</sup> 3.14.1: *Lauabatur in uilla Formiana...*; 3.14.6: *Cum in publico Romae lauaretur...*

<sup>71</sup> *Ep.* 3.14.6. See Henderson (2002) 134-5 for a more detailed discussion of the similarities with Tacitus on the *acta diurna* and the murder of Pedanius Secundus. Cicero also used the language of portents in describing, in his letter to Cornificius (*Fam.* 12.25.1, discussed on pp.8-9 above), the decree to restore his statuette of Minerva. For another account introduced by Pliny's route to the setting, see *Ep.* 5.9.1: *descenderam in basilicam Iuliam...*

<sup>72</sup> *Ep.* 1.13.3. On the letter in general, see Hoffer (1999) 161-76.

<sup>73</sup> See Corbier (1997), arguing in favour of the identification of the statue mentioned here by Pliny with that referred to by his uncle (*HN* 34, 18) as put up to Caesar *in foro suo*, rather than by the temple of the Divine Julius in the Roman Forum.

<sup>74</sup> *Ep.* 8.6. Cf. *Ep.* 2.7.5, in which Pliny lists at length the positive advantages of putting up a statue of Vestricius Spurinna's son Cottius *in celeberrimo loco*, despite the young man not having been old enough to attain the achievements usually qualifying one for such an honour. In this case the private: public relationship is presented as one of degree—the beneficial effect of statues *domi* is increased still further when they are placed *in celeberrimo loco*. See also 1.17.3.

these was not limited to the Curia alone, in stark and possibly deliberate contrast with Cicero's personification of the Curia walls as joyfully anticipating Marcellus' return.<sup>75</sup>

It is clear that Cicero at least in many of his letters 'talked about the City'—the places and monuments within it, that is, rather than the idea of the City, which is a rather different topic. On a number of occasions the ways in which he mentions monuments and buildings can be connected to the need to persuade—that is, a seepage of 'the oratorical' into 'the epistolary'. It might be rather more useful to think of it as a language, a set of stories, or rather a way of conceptualising and thinking that was used in a variety of ways, but particularly in contexts where the need to cajole, persuade, or even to joke the recipient into receiving and reading the letter in the desired frame of mind was very important. Such situations necessarily have much in common with oratory, and it would no doubt be foolish to suggest that training as an orator on the part of the letter-writer and an inculcated receptivity to the art of oratorical technique on the part of the reader had no effect on the use of such 'ways of conceptualising' in letters. Nonetheless, it is worth entertaining the idea that there was something broader on which both speech-making and letter-writing could draw. To think in this way, rather than in terms of 'seepage', would allow us to bring in other contexts, like drama, and to see the social operations of the City as an interconnected whole.

In Pliny's case, it seems that although there are many parallels, often very deliberate ones, with Cicero, in his letter-writing in books 1 to 9, the ways in which he draws on the City are somewhat different. There are relatively few references to individual monuments, except for those forming the setting for Pliny's forensic work. When individual monuments are mentioned, notably in letters 1.5 and 5.1, they are the location in which two individuals come together for private conversation. This too forms a contrast with Cicero's usually more crowded settings. It is worth returning at this point, to Woolf's ideas about the relative accessibility of Pliny's work. One effect of excluding routes to and from villas from this study is to downplay the parallels, real and deliberate, between the sets of letters.<sup>76</sup> Nonetheless, in the episode in the porticus of Livia at least, the connotation on which I chose to place emphasis—the link with *concordia*—and similarly the porticus' location on the site of Vedius Pollio's house are not explicitly signalled. They would be familiar only to a reader who knew the cult in the porticus or the history of the site. The explanatory value of Woolf's theory remains questionable, then, although it must be conceded that the reference is not presented in such a way as to induce 'anxiety' in diffident readers, whether provincials or from that posterity which must also be borne in mind as part of Pliny's intended audience.

The 'generic blurring' or 'seepage', so far as use of the City's monuments and public spaces is concerned, seems in Pliny to have less in common with oratory than with historiography. Tropes found in the *Panegyric* do of course recur: it is mark of the times, for example, that when Pliny, like Cicero in *Q. Fr.* 3.5.8, discusses the Tiber flooding, he cannot couch the extent of the damage simply in terms of what has been affected, but must first point out the provisions of the *providentissimus imperator* against

---

<sup>75</sup> *Ep.* 8.6.14; *Cic. Marc.* 10, on which see p.17 above.

<sup>76</sup> We should note, however, that in books 1 to 9 of Pliny details do tend to be eliminated from descriptions of routes (cf. 10.15 and 10.16).

such destruction.<sup>77</sup> Whereas Cicero, however, recounts a number of recent events in his letters for readers who have missed them, in which the locations of the rapid action (in the fight over his house) or of the stately and much-cheered progress back to Italy from exile are a vital part of the account, in Pliny anecdotes from a range of ‘pasts’ are more common. This may tell us less about interaction with the City itself than about the role of urban space, movement through that space, and location in it, as a backdrop for self-representation and for performance of the writer’s role, and performance of the relationships between letter writer and recipient.<sup>78</sup> This self-representation and ‘performance’ are generically linked to other types of activity taking place in the City (oratory, history, drama), to the performance of which the urban fabric is essential. Rather than thinking of any one of these as informing the other, we should perhaps see a cultural repertoire made up of them and by them, on which many of those involved in them drew.<sup>79</sup>

#### Bibliography:

- Assman, J. (2000), *Religion und kulturelles Gedächtnis: Zehn Studien* (Munich: Beck).
- Assmann, J. & Hölscher, T. (1988), *Religion und Gedächtnis* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp).
- Ash, R. (2003), ‘*Aliud est enim epistulam, aliud historiam ... scribere*’ (*Epistles* 6.16.22): Pliny the Historian?, *Arethusa* 36/2: 211–25.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2007), ‘Victim and voyeur: Rome as a character in Tacitus’ *Histories* 3’, in D. H. J. Larmour & D. Spencer (eds.), *The Sites of Rome: Time, Space, Memory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), ch. 5.
- Bartsch, S. (1994), *Actors in the Audience: theatricality and doublespeak from Nero to Hadrian*, (Harvard: Harvard University Press).
- Becker, E. (1938), ‘Technik und Szenerie des ciceronischen Dialogs’ (Diss. Münster).
- Braund, S. M. (1998), ‘Praise and Protreptic in Early Imperial Panegyric: Cicero, Seneca, Pliny’ in M. Whitby (ed.), *The Propaganda of Power: the Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity* (Leiden: Brill), 53–76.
- Bruère, R. T. (1954), ‘Tacitus and Pliny’s *Panegyricus*’, *CPh* 49 161–79.

---

<sup>77</sup> *Ep.* 8.17.1: *Tiberis alveum excessit et demissioribus ripis alte superfunditur; quamquam fossa quam providentissimus imperator fecit exhaustus, premit valles, innatat campis...*

<sup>78</sup> Chris Pelling suggests that the Tacitus of the *Dialogus* might say it was rather the changing nature of the times that made interaction with the City different—that what for Cicero was a matter of living history was now a question of historiography, when one could only live in the past. Such an assertion certainly dovetails with the arguments about oratory in the *Dialogus*. It is also true that Pliny’s engagement with places and monuments in his province in book 10 (an engagement that is detailed for obvious and practical reasons) makes clearer his more static approach to Rome in books 1-9, in heightened contrast to Cicero’s treatment of building projects in a City constantly changing around him. What is less clear to me is how far we can map these claims onto the actuality of (other) physical and intellectual engagements with the City in the two periods. That the changes were not confined to the ways in which one could write about the City—themselves forms of engagement—is clear. That is not to say, however, that imperial appropriations of and in Rome (see p. 2 above) entirely closed off any route, monument or location to others. See Clark (2007) ch.7.

<sup>79</sup> The bibliography on collective or ‘cultural’ memory is vast, with notable contributions by Nora, and more recently Assmann and, on specifically Roman issues, Hölscher. See e.g. Hölkeskamp (2006). I have learned a great deal from their work, but feel they tend on occasion to overplay the consensual nature of these forms of memory. See Clark (2007), esp. ch.1.

- Clark, A. J. (2007), *Divine Qualities: Cult and Community in Republican Rome* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Coarelli, F. (1999), 'Tabula Valeria', in E. M. Steinby (ed.), *LTUR* 5: 16.
- Corbier, M. (1997), 'Pallas et la statue de César. Affichage et espace public à Rome', *Rev. Num.* 152: 11–40.
- Dench, E. (2005) *Romulus' Asylum: Roman Identities from the Age of Alexander to the Age of Hadrian* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Eck, W. (1984), 'Senatorial self-representation; developments in the Augustan period', in F. Millar & E. Segal (eds.), *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects* (Oxford: Clarendon Press), 129–67.
- Edwards, C. (1996), *Writing Rome: textual approaches to the city* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2005), 'Epistolography', in S. Harrison (ed.), *A Companion to Latin Literature* (Blackwell), 270–83.
- Elsner, J. (1994), 'Constructing decadence: the representation of Nero as imperial builder', in J. Elsner & J. Masters (eds.), *Reflections of Nero: Culture, History and Representation* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press), 112–27.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1996), 'Inventing imperium: texts and the propaganda of monuments in Augustan Rome', in idem (ed.), *Art and Text in Roman Culture* (Cambridge, New York, NY: Cambridge University Press), 32–53.
- Fedeli, P. (1989), 'Il Panegirico di Plinio nella critica moderna', *ANRW* II.33.1: 387–514.
- Feldherr, A. (1998), *Spectacle and society in Livy's History* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press).
- Gibson, R. & Morello, R. (eds.) (2003), *Re-Imagining Pliny the Younger*, *Arethusa* 36.2
- Green, C. M. (1997), 'Free as a Bird: Varro *de re Rustica* 3', *AJPh* 118: 427–48.
- Hales, S. (2000), 'At Home with Cicero', *G&R* 47: 44–55.
- Haselberger, L. (ed.) (2002), *Mapping Augustan Rome* (JRA Suppl. 50).
- Henderson, J. (2002), *Pliny's Statue: the Letters, Self-portraiture and Classical Art* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press).
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2007), '... when who should walk into the room but...: Epistoliterarity in Cicero, *Ad Qfr* 3.1', in Morello and Morrison, 37–85.
- Hoffer, S. E. (1999), *The Anxieties of Pliny the Younger* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press=American Philological Association American Classical Studies no. 43).
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2007), 'Cicero's 'Stomach': Political Indignation and the Use of Repeated Allusive Expressions in Cicero's Correspondence', in Morello and Morrison, 87–106.
- Hölkeskamp, K.-J. (2006), 'History and Collective Memory in the Middle Republic', in N. Rosenstein & R. Morstein-Marx (eds.), *A Companion to the Roman Republic* (Blackwell), 478–95.
- Hölscher, T. (1967), *Victoria Romana: Archäologische Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Wesenart der römischen Siegesgöttin von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 3. Jhs. n. Chr.* (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern).
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1980), 'Die Geschichtsauffassung in der römischen Repräsentationskunst', *JDAI* 95: 265–321.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1980), 'Römische Siegesdenkmäler der späten Republik', H.A. Cahn & E. Simon (eds.), *Tainia, Roland Hampe zum 70. Geburtstag am 2 Dezember 1978* (Mainz: P. von Zabern), 351–71.

- \_\_\_\_\_ (1982), 'Die Bedeutung der Münzen für das Verständnis der politischen Repräsentationskunst der späten römischen Republik', T. Hackens & R. Weiller (eds.), *Actes du 9<sup>e</sup> Congrès International de Numismatique* Berne septembre 1979 i (Luxembourg & Louvain-la-Neuve: Association internationale des numismates professionnels, 7), 269–82.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1994a), 'Gli inizi dell'arte di rappresentanza romana', id., *Monumenti statali e pubblico* (Rome: l'Erma di Bretschneider), 17–51 [= 'Die Anfänge römischer Repräsentationskunst', *MDAI(R)* 85 (1978)].
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1994b), 'Monumenti statali e pubblico dal tramonto della repubblica fino al consolidamento dell'impero a Roma', id., *Monumenti statali e pubblico* (Rome: l'Erma di Bretschneider), 137–73 [= *Xenia: Konstanzer Althistorische Vorträge und Forschungen*, 9 (1984)].
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2004), *The Language of Images in Roman Art* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, tr. A. Snodgrass & A. Künzl-Snodgrass, with foreword by Jás Elsner).
- Hutchinson, G. O. (1998), *Cicero's Correspondence: A Literary Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Larmour, D. H. J. & Spencer, D. (2007) (eds.), *The Sites of Rome: Time, Space, Memory* (Oxford: OUP).
- Leach, E. W. (1990), 'The Politics of Self-Presentation: Pliny's *Letters* and Roman Portrait Sculpture', *ClAnt* 9: 14–39.
- Linderski, J. (1989), 'Garden Parlors: Nobles and Birds', in R. I. Curtis (ed.), *Studia Pompeiana et Classica in honor of Wilhelmina F. Jashemski* vol. 2: 105–27.
- Ling, R. (1990), 'A Stranger in Town: Finding the Way in an Ancient City', *G&R* 37: 204–14.
- Manuwald, G. (2007), *Cicero, Philippics 3-9* (ed. with introduction, commentary, and translation) (Berlin: de Gruyter).
- Millar, F. G. B. (1989), 'Political Power in Mid-Republican Rome: Curia or Comitium?', *JRS* 79: 138–50.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1998), *The Crowd in Rome in the Late Republic*, (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press).
- Morstein-Marx, R. (2004), *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Morello, R. (2007), 'Confidence, *invidia*, and Pliny's Epistolary Curriculum', in Morello and Morrison, 169–89.
- Morello, R. & Morrison, A. D. (eds.) (2007), *Ancient Letters: Classical and Late Antique Epistolography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Murgia, C. E. (1985), 'Pliny's Letters and the *Dialogus*', *HSCP* 89: 171–206.
- Nora, P. (ed.) (1984–1992), *Les lieux de mémoire* (Paris: Gallimard).
- Parsons, P. (2007), *The City of the Sharp-Nosed Fish: Greek Lives in Roman Egypt* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson).
- Radice, B. (1968), 'Pliny and the *Panegyricus*', *G&R* 15: 166–72.
- Riggsby, A. (1995), 'Pliny on Cicero and oratory: self-fashioning in the public eye', *AJPh* 116: 123–35.
- Roche, P. A. (2002), 'The Public Image of Trajan's Family', *CPh* 97: 41–60.
- Saylor, C. (1982), 'Overlooking Lake Vadimon: Pliny on Tourism (*Epist.* 8.20)', *CPh* 77: 139–44.

- Scivoletto, N. (1989), 'Urbs, municipia, villae e studia nell'epistolario di Plinio', *GIF* 41: 179–95.
- Sherwin-White, A. N. (1966), *The Letters of Pliny: A Historical and Social Commentary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Stewart, P. (2003), *Statues in Roman Society: Representation and Response* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Ulrich, R. B. (1993), 'Julius Caesar and the Creation of the Forum Iulium', *AJA* 97: 49–80.
- Vasaly, A. (1993), *Representations: Images of the World in Ciceronian Oratory* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, CA, & London: University of California Press).
- Wiseman, T. P. (1998), *Roman Drama and Roman History* (Exeter: Exeter University Press).
- Woolf, G. (2003), 'The City of Letters', in C. Edwards & G. Woolf (eds.), *Rome the Cosmopolis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 203–21.