

Gesine Manuwald
CICERO, *PHILIPPICS* 3–9



TEXTE UND KOMMENTARE

Eine altertumswissenschaftliche Reihe

Herausgegeben von

Siegmar Döpp, Adolf Köhnken, Ruth Scodel

Band 30/1

Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York

CICERO, *PHILIPPICS* 3–9

Edited
with Introduction, Translation and Commentary
by

Gesine Manuwald

Volume 1:
Introduction, Text and Translation,
References and Indexes

Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York

⊗ Printed on acid-free paper which falls within the guidelines
of the ANSI to ensure permanence and durability.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A CIP catalogue record for this book is available from
Library of Congress.

ISSN 0563-3087

ISBN 978-3-11-019325-1

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche
Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet
at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

© Copyright 2007 by Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, D-10785 Berlin
All rights reserved, including those of translation into foreign languages. No part of
this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic
or mechanical, including photocopy, recording or any information storage and re-
trieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Printed in Germany

Cover design: Christopher Schneider, Berlin

Printing and binding: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen

matri et patri
lustris tredecim functis

Contents

Volume 1

<i>Preface</i>	XI
<i>Note to readers</i>	XV
Introduction to the <i>Philippics</i>	1
1. Previous scholarship and the present commentary	3
2. Historical background	9
2.1. Events in 44–43 BCE	9
2.2. People involved	31
3. The corpus of the <i>Philippics</i>	47
3.1. Title	47
3.2. Publication	54
3.2.1. Delivered vs. published versions	54
3.2.2. Size and structure of the corpus	65
3.3. Strategic elements	90
3.3.1. Political strategy	90
3.3.2. Invective strategy	105
3.3.3. Rhetorical strategy	109
3.4. Rhetorical and stylistic aspects	119
3.4.1. Rhetorical character	119
3.4.2. Stylistic features	121
3.5. Relevance of Demosthenes and Atticism	129
3.6. Relationship to contemporary Ciceronian works	138
3.7. Reception in antiquity	140
Text and translation of <i>Philippics</i> 3–9	145
1. Note on text and translation	147
2. <i>Orationes Philippicae/Philippics</i>	164/165
References and indexes	★1
1. References and abbreviations	★3
1.1. Editions, commentaries and translations of the <i>Philippics</i>	★3
1.2. Editions and commentaries of other ancient works	★6

1.3. Secondary literature	★9
1.4. Dictionaries and reference works	★43
2. Indexes	★47
2.1. Persons	★47
2.2. Sites	★50
2.3. Subjects	★52
3. Maps	★57

Volume 2

Commentary on <i>Philippics 3–9</i>	293
1. <i>Philippic Three</i>	295
1.1. Introduction	295
1.2. Outline of structure and contents	309
1.3. Select bibliography	314
1.4. Notes	314
2. <i>Philippic Four</i>	463
2.1. Introduction	463
2.2. Outline of structure and contents	482
2.3. Select bibliography	485
2.4. Notes	486
3. <i>Philippic Five</i>	536
3.1. Introduction	536
3.2. Outline of structure and contents	548
3.3. Select bibliography	550
3.4. Notes	551
4. <i>Philippic Six</i>	736
4.1. Introduction	736
4.2. Outline of structure and contents	742
4.3. Select bibliography	744
4.4. Notes	744
5. <i>Philippic Seven</i>	820
5.1. Introduction	820
5.2. Outline of structure and contents	825
5.3. Select bibliography	827
5.4. Notes	828

6. <i>Philippic Eight</i>	905
6.1. Introduction	905
6.2. Outline of structure and contents	913
6.3. Select bibliography	915
6.4. Notes	915
7. <i>Philippic Nine</i>	1037
7.1. Introduction	1037
7.2. Outline of structure and contents	1044
7.3. Select bibliography	1045
7.4. Notes	1046

Preface

“The *Philippics* deserve to be made available to a modern readership. The tradition of political oratory they represent is now a thing of the past, but their subject-matter, the defence of constitutional government against tyranny, is of perennial importance.” This is what T.P. Wiseman said in his review of D.R. Shackleton Bailey’s bilingual edition of Cicero’s *Philippics* in the *Times Literary Supplement* (26 Sept. 1986; issue 4356, p. 1072). And while the political situation underlying the *Philippics* may be described in more specific terms, the conflict continues to have a paradigmatic value. Additionally, the rhetorical significance of the *Philippics* has just been called to mind by C. Steel (2006, 59): “... in Cicero’s posthumous reputation this set of speeches [i.e. the *Philippics*] becomes emblematic both of Cicero’s personal brilliance and of the place of oratory in Roman life, as well as marking a decisive point at which the speaking orator is overtaken by the written text.” For this reason too the *Philippics* deserve to be read more widely.

However, the availability of this corpus needs to be improved by providing the necessary background information for modern audiences, even though editions of the Latin text and translations of the *Philippics* into modern languages do exist. Fortunately, an edition and commentary of *Philippics* 1–2 was published by John T. Ramsey in 2003, but the rest of the speeches continues to be relatively neglected. Producing a new commentary on further *Philippics*, most of which have not been thoroughly commented upon for more than 100 years, therefore needs no further justification. *Philippics* 3–9, discussed here, form a coherent group, which is essential to the structure of the corpus.

It is intended that the present work will become a useful tool for readers with various interests and needs, including those who are not yet entirely familiar with the text and the topics of the *Philippics*. An attempt has therefore been made to provide relatively full coverage and offer a wide variety of material. Hence experts might come across some information that they regard as superfluous, while at the same time these scholars may miss some aspects crucial in their view. But as such reactions to a commentary are almost unavoidable, it is hoped that the very fact of

engaging with the material assembled here will stimulate further research on these important and interesting orations.

It remains to express thanks to a number of people and institutions who generously offered assistance and encouragement while this commentary was in the making.

First of all, the support provided by the 'Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG)' must be remembered in gratitude: I would not have been able to embark on this project if I had not been awarded a 'Heisenbergstipendium' by this funding body, since that allowed me to pursue independent research for several successive years. The 'Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft' also financed a number of stays abroad.

Most of the work on the commentary was done at my home university, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, where I enjoyed a long period of efficient study and intensive research in the familiar and peaceful surroundings of the Seminar für Klassische Philologie. Warmest thanks to all my colleagues for providing me with such an environment and for their continuous support of my work. The department also allowed me to go away for extended periods and to combine my teaching duties with my research interests. I greatly appreciate having had so much freedom.

In the early stages of the project, I had the chance to spend two terms in 2003/04 as a Visiting Fellow at Corpus Christi College Oxford. The friendly atmosphere at CCC as well as the excellent working conditions in Oxford significantly furthered the initial steps towards this commentary. Bibliographical work was facilitated by two subsequent visits to Oxford. Among all my friends at Oxford, I am particularly obliged to Stephen J. Harrison for arranging my first stay as a Visiting Fellow. But my greatest debt to Stephen concerns the fact that he, although very busy himself, read a draft of the whole book during the summer of 2006 and saved me from a lot of errors both in content and in my use of English. Final revisions were undertaken while I had the opportunity to stay as a Visiting Fellow at Princeton University during the fall semester 2006, benefiting from an environment conducive to pursuing serious research, made all the more pleasurable by a warm welcome. Hence sincere thanks are due to all faculty, staff and graduate students of the Classics Department at PU, and particularly to Harriet I. Flower, for their hospitality and encouragement.

Papers based on various bits of the material presented here were given at Freiburg, Oxford, Princeton, St Andrews and Sydney. I am grateful to the colleagues and friends who invited me to speak and to the respective audiences for their helpful comments.

Besides, I have had the privilege of receiving advice from various scholars working on the Late Republic. Dealing with different sections of the *Philippic* corpus, John T. Ramsey and myself developed a continuing exchange of ideas and questions on these orations. During this process, I have greatly profited from John's expert knowledge; and he was so kind as to take a critical look at some particularly problematic passages in my commentary. Also, I enjoyed several fruitful conversations with Mark Toher, who works on another author relevant to this period, Nicolaus of Damascus; Mark even took the time to check my remarks on Nicolaus. My fellow Ciceronian Henriette van der Blom read an early version of the introduction, and we also had numerous discussions on a variety of Ciceronian problems. Numerous others have contributed information and advice on various specialist areas, of whom I wish to mention the following: Werner Eck (epigraphic evidence), Stefan Faller (geographical and technical matters), Robert Morstein-Marx (information on *contio*), Günter Neumann† (linguistic explanations), Burkhardt Wesenberg (archaeological questions). Grateful acknowledgement is extended to all.

For establishing my own translation, Richard F. Thomas, D.R. Shackleton Bailey's literary executor, allowed me to make use of Shackleton Bailey's English translation of the *Philippics* according to my needs. The University of North Carolina Press granted me their consent to take Shackleton Bailey's version as a guideline for my own and to adopt some of his idiomatic formulations (*Cicero. Philippics*. Edited and translated by D.R. Shackleton Bailey, Chapel Hill / London 1986). I am well aware of the generosity of both, which has certainly made the English translation more readable. Still, it was greatly improved when Robert A. Kaster kindly took the time during a hectic Princeton semester to go through my final version, selflessly sharing his experience as a translator of Cicero.

Finally, I am indebted to the editors of the series 'Texte und Kommentare', Siegmur Döpp, Adolf Köhnken and Ruth Scodel, for commenting upon an earlier draft and for accepting this book for publication. Last, but not least I wish to thank my friend Sabine Vogt, the responsible editor at Walter de Gruyter, for her interest in the project and for her help in seeing it through the editorial process. At this stage I have also greatly profited from the expertise and support of her team, particularly Renate Mannaa.

Note to readers

The commentary comes in two volumes: the first one opens with a general introduction to the corpus of the *Philippics*; it also provides the Latin text with facing English translation of *Philippics* 3–9; and it includes two maps, the bibliography and the indexes (with separate page numbering). The entire second volume consists of a detailed treatment of *Philippics* 3–9.

Crossreferences to complete sections take the following format (consisting of the abbreviated chapter title and the section number): e.g. cf. Intr. 3.3. or Comm. 3.1. References to individual notes are identified by the respective *Philippics* passage and (if applicable) the relevant lemma: e.g. cf. *Phil.* 5.12 n. on ... or *Phil.* 4.9 and n.

All quotations in Latin are spelled without capital letters at the beginning of sentences and with graphic distinction between *u* and *v*, in order to give them a coherent appearance and to make reading easier.

This format is employed for quotations from the *Philippics* as well. All quotations of *Philippics* 1–2 and 10–14 are taken from the edition of P. Fedeli (2nd ed., 1986), who follows a different procedure with respect to both issues. Citations of *Philippics* 3–9 are taken from the Latin text accompanying the commentary.

Names and titles of works of ancient authors are abbreviated according to the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (3rd ed., 1996, xxix–liv).

Cicero's writings are quoted without mention of the author's name; the numbering refers to paragraphs. In cases of multiple references, Cicero's works precede those of other authors, and among Cicero's writings passages from the *Philippics* are given first. To make things completely clear, the abbreviated title (*Phil.*) is always added. Cicero's correspondence is cited according to the vulgate numbering.

Works by modern authors are referred to in abbreviated form (name of author and year of publication); full details are given in the bibliography (at the end of the first volume).

For dates BCE and CE have been adopted. All dates without indication are BCE.

All major ancient sites mentioned in the sketch of the historical background (Intr. 2.1.) and / or in the text of *Philippics* 3–9 are shown on the two maps provided (vol. 1, pp. *58–*59).

Introduction to the *Philippics*

1. Previous scholarship and the present commentary

In the last bibliographical survey of literature on Cicero's speeches and his rhetorical works Christopher P. Craig (2002a; 2002b) gave an overview of the more recent commentaries on individual Ciceronian speeches and concluded (2002a, 509): "This is a very sparse field indeed. A full text and commentary for any Ciceronian speech would be a project of enduring value for any scholar with the training to assay it." Accordingly, Craig presented the following picture (2002a, 508–509): "Since Cicero's speeches invite study as persuasive exemplars, rhetorical and stylistic models, and primary texts for the understanding of Roman political, social, cultural, and legal history, as well as for the study of Cicero the man, scholarship about the speeches serves both as a measure and an instrument of progress in a variety of related fields. The presentation of the text of a Ciceronian speech with a commentary that concurrently informs the reader of the current state of the scholarship in most or all of these fields is a formidable task and perhaps the greatest desideratum of the next decade." This call for commentaries on Cicero's speeches is by no means new; it has been repeated for several decades with different nuances and expectations;¹ but it has only been answered in a limited number of cases so far.

This general description of the available scholarship on Cicero's speeches also holds true for the *Philippics*. The lack of adequate tools is appreciably felt in their case since the complex political developments in this period, which are alluded to in the text, create a particular need for guidance.

Admittedly, nowadays the situation is not as bad as in 1868 / 1878 when John Richard King embarked on his commentary on the whole corpus of the *Philippics*. What he says in the preface (1878, v), should be quoted in full for its historical importance: "Having been asked by the Delegates of the Clarendon Press to undertake the editing of a portion of Cicero's orations, I was induced to choose the series delivered against Antony, partly from finding that as a matter of fact they had come to be more read by Students in this University than any other portion of his works; but even more because I was convinced of their especial value,

1 Cf. e.g. Leeman 1979, 127; Classen 1985, 9–11; Berry 1996a, x.

both as bringing out most strongly Cicero's power as an orator, and his importance in the State at what was perhaps really the most honourable portion of his life, and also as illustrating a period of history concerning which we have so little contemporary information. From these considerations I had for some years past selected them as a subject for lectures with my own pupils; my experience in which both laid the foundation of the present work and convinced me that some new commentary was required. Indeed the Philippic orations of Cicero appeared of late years to have sunk into an obscurity which contrasts strongly with the high esteem in which they were held by ancient writers, and the attention which was paid to them by early commentators. For more than forty years no separate edition of them, with explanatory notes, had been published either in England or on the continent; and the only English commentary on the whole series which had appeared was that of Mr. Long, which embraces all the orations of Cicero."

Obviously, some work has been done since: in the 19th century and the early 20th century research on the corpus of the *Philippics* mainly concentrated on the text as numerous articles on textual problems demonstrate. Besides, some editions with commentaries appeared, most of them being designed for use in schools or for beginning students. The more scholarly commentaries on the whole corpus by G. Long (London 1858), part of a commentary on all the Ciceronian speeches, and by J.R. King (Oxford 1868; 2nd ed., 1878) also date to this period; they are still the most recent commentaries on the whole corpus. The German commentary by K. Halm, G. Laubmann and W. Sternkopf (Berlin 1905; 1912; 1913) came out about the same time and seems to have been intended as a comprehensive work as well, but only covers *Philippics* 1–10.

Since about the middle of the 20th century historical studies have appeared in greater numbers, which use the *Philippics* (as well as other ancient texts) as sources for Roman political institutions, for the decisive transitional phase from the Roman Republic to the Principate or for the people involved in the events of this period. Naturally, these works show less concern for literary and rhetorical questions or for the interrelation between the oratorical and the political spheres; studies on these aspects are relatively scarce.²

2 Cf. Hall 2002, 273 (in an overview of the corpus of the *Philippics*): "The speeches [i.e. the *Philippics*] are thus closely tied to the complex political events of the period, and a knowledge of this historical background is essential to an appreciation of Cicero's rhetorical aims. The study by Frisch [i.e. Frisch 1946]

Since the last decades of the 20th century interest in the *Philippics* as texts and works of literature in their own right seems to have increased; various critical and / or bilingual editions and translations have appeared (cf. e.g. P. Fedeli 1982; 2nd ed., 1986; D.R. Shackleton Bailey 1986; M. Fuhrmann 1982; 1993). More recently, some of the speeches (*Philippics One, Two, Three, Four and Thirteen*) have even been commented on or dealt with in monographs, though with different degrees of comprehensiveness (cf. *Phil.* 1–2: J.T. Ramsey 2003; *Phil.* 2: W.K. Lacey 1986; R. Cristofoli 2004; *Phil.* 3: C. Monteleone 2003; *Phil.* 4: C. Monteleone 2005; *Phil.* 13: C. Novielli 2001). Besides there are now the overview by J. Hall (2002), the studies by C.W. Wooten (1983) and W. Stroh (1982; 1983a; 1983b; 2000), the collection of essays edited by T. Stevenson and M. Wilson (2007) as well as the more general treatments (in dissertations) by B.P. Newbound (1986) and C.J. Burnand (2000).³

The reading of the speeches and their superficial understanding have been greatly improved and facilitated by translations into modern languages, accompanied by introductions and explanatory notes; but the annotations are often restricted to a minimum⁴ and / or to the mere explanation of facts.⁵ Thus, better explanations and interpretations of Cicero's *Philippics* are still called for. Even those who themselves have greatly contributed to making the *Philippics* more widely available emphasize the need for a scholarly commentary: one of the aims pursued

provides excellent guidance in this regard, and textual matters are also well served, with a number of useful editions and linguistic commentaries on the various speeches. Less work, however, has been done on their rhetorical features. Only Wooten [i.e. Wooten 1983] attempts an oratorical analysis of the collection as a whole, and studies of individual literary aspects are relatively few in number."

3 Stevenson and Wilson also note in the introduction to their volume (2007) that the *Philippics* have recently found renewed attention after a period of relative neglect. This tendency is importantly developed by this collection of essays, which covers a wide range of aspects.

4 Cf. Shackleton Bailey 1986, vii, about his edition: "The introductions and explanatory notes aim only at providing a necessary minimum."

5 Cf. Seel 1971, 766 (in a review of M. Fuhrmann's translation): "Die beträchtliche Überlegenheit dieser Neuauflage beruht nicht auf Art und Qualität der Übersetzung allein, sondern mehr fast auf dem insgesamt sehr vernünftig ponderierten, ungemein soliden Beiwerk: Dazu zählen zunächst einmal die genauen, im wesentlichen positivistisch-antiquarischen Anmerkungen, von denen ich selbst allenfalls auf die eine oder andere verzichten würde zugunsten einiger stärker deutenden, wertenden und interpretierenden Verständnishilfen und Denkanregungen; aber das ist wieder ganz und gar subjektiv und nicht als Tadel gemeint, und auf jeden Fall ist es besser so, als wenn es umgekehrt wäre!"

by D.R. Shackleton Bailey's bilingual edition is to provide a basis for such a work (cf. 1986, vii):⁶ "For all their importance as a historical source and their considerable merit as literature Cicero's *Philippics* remain a comparatively neglected area. P. Fedeli in his Teubner edition of 1982 has provided a comprehensive apparatus criticus and bibliography, but not, in my opinion, a really critical text. There exists no satisfactory English translation and no adequate commentary. The latter desideratum should one day be met by a historian and expert on Roman political institutions, and one of the two principal purposes I have had in mind was to provide such a commentator with a textual and interpretative foundation on which to build."

This view is endorsed by Harry M. Hine (1988, 42) in his review: "I concluded my review of Fedeli [i.e. Fedeli 1982] by saying: 'This should become the standard edition, and the basis for future work on the text – for there remains work to be done.' Fedeli's edition has rapidly been superseded by S.B. [i.e. Shackleton Bailey 1986], who has shown just how much work can still be done; though, as I have said, Fedeli is still essential because of his fuller apparatus. S.B. also gives us a superb translation. Let us hope that someone will soon follow with the commentary for which he has prepared the way."

Although the present work cannot aspire to meet fully these criteria for a wholly satisfactory commentary, it comes as an attempt to provide a useful tool and to stimulate further research by covering a significant number of aspects relevant to a better understanding of the *Philippics*. In view of what has already been done, these volumes do not provide a new critical edition, but rather a general introduction and a commentary, accompanied by a Latin text with some textual notes and an English translation for the convenience of the reader. Although the detailed commentary is limited to *Philippics* 3–9, the introduction also takes up some points concerning the whole corpus when these are essential to the speeches selected and / or a consensus on important problems has not yet been reached. The commentary itself tries to present information on all major issues necessary for the comprehension of these speeches. Additionally, it puts special emphasis on the description of the orator's rhetorical strategies, literary techniques and methods of argument in view of the historical background; thereby Cicero's political aims as well as the

6 Cf. also Novielli 2001, 5–6.

relation of the speeches to the political and historical situation may be grasped more precisely.⁷

For it was recognized long ago that the analysis of the rhetoric cannot be separated from a reconstruction of the historical developments and that not every remark can be regarded as a 'historical fact'; one has to bear in mind that Cicero's speeches are the only ones to have been preserved and that they present the situation and the protagonists as Cicero wanted them to be seen.⁸ That means that the rhetorical outline and aim of the speeches as well as the historical circumstances have to be scrutinized in relation to each other as conveniently summarized by A.M. Riggsby (1999, 181): "Thus there are a number of reasons to believe that the published versions of Cicero's speeches correspond closely, at least in outline, with those that he originally delivered. But is this too much to hope for? Much recent progress has been made in the study of Cicero on the basis of the recognition that he did not write with the intention of being a dispassionate source of 'facts' about the Late Roman Republic for later scholars. It is right to be suspicious on these general grounds of the historicity of anything in Cicero, but instead of simply giving up we should rather examine the circumstances of the composition and publication of particular texts (or sets of texts) and judge their value for various historical questions individually."

By looking at the relation between Cicero's rhetorical techniques and his political aims against the historical background, the commentary may provide a basis for assessing both the *Philippics* and the historical situation behind them more appropriately and to find reasons for possible

7 Cf. also the introduction to Stevenson / Wilson (2007). – Cf. the concise statement in Steel 2005, 145: "That is, the *Philippics*' being the record of crucial political debates is not incompatible with their also being self-conscious artefacts.", based on her general approach (cf. Steel 2005, 7): "This book puts Cicero the writer and Cicero the politician together through an exploration of how he uses written texts to exist and operate within the public sphere."

8 Cf. Syme 1939, 146: "The other speeches against Antonius, however, may be counted, for vigour, passion and intensity, among the most splendid of all the orations. But oratory can be a menace to posterity as well as to its author or its audience. There was another side – not Antonius only, but the neutrals. Cicero was not the only consular who professed to be defending the highest good of the Roman People. The survival of the *Philippics* imperils historical judgement and wrecks historical perspective. Swift, confident and convincing, the *Philippics* carry the impression that their valiant author stood in sole control of the policy of the State. The situation was much more complicated than that, issues entangled, factions and personalities at variance."

‘misrepresentation’ of Cicero’s enemy Marcus Antonius (cf. the famous dictum of Sir Ronald Syme [1939, 104]: “The *Philippics*, the series of speeches in which he assailed an absent enemy, are an eternal monument of eloquence, of rancour, of misrepresentation. Many of the charges levelled against the character of Antonius – such as unnatural vice or flagrant cowardice – are trivial, ridiculous or conventional.”). Besides, detailed analysis of the strategies used by Cicero to present himself, his policies and the situation may prove for these speeches the more recent view that Cicero’s picture of himself in his rhetorical works is a sophisticated and purpose-built construct.⁹

9 Cf. Dugan 2005, 3: “Although the Cicero I here present may seem an anachronistically modern one – a self textually constituted and fabricated within literary discourse – the ways in which both Cicero and other Roman writers describe the self, especially that of a ‘new man’, repeatedly emphasize the notion that it is a product of deliberate strategies of fashioning.”; cf. also Dugan 2005, 334.

2. Historical background

2.1. Events in 44–43 BCE

Historically, Cicero's *Philippics* (2 September 44 – 21 April 43 BCE) belong to the very last, turbulent phase of the Roman Republic after Caesar's assassination.¹⁰ The developments of this period relevant to the *Philippics* may be sketched as follows, the signal date serving as an obvious starting point.¹¹

C. Iulius Caesar was assassinated on the Ides of March (15 March) 44 BCE. Cicero seems not to have had prior knowledge of this plan and not

10 In order to prevent confusion with modern notions, the term 'state' as an equivalent of *res publica* is avoided. Shackleton Bailey's (1986) decision to translate *res publica* by 'Commonwealth' (followed by Kaster 2006; cf. 418) also seems misleading in view of modern meanings of this term. Therefore, the Latin *res publica* is kept; or the English word 'republic' as a literal translation of the Latin (indicating the political system of the centuries between the regal period and the Principate) and other paraphrases are preferred (cf. e.g. Bleicken 1998, 22: "Den Staat, von dem sich Caesars Herrschaft distanzierte, nennen wir »Republik«. Das ist die Wiedergabe des lateinischen *res publica*, die »öffentliche Sache«. *Res publica*, »Republik« also, heißt nichts anderes als »die staatliche Ordnung«, ebenjene, in welcher die Römer seit 450 Jahren lebten und welche zur Kennzeichnung ihrer selbst keiner Qualifizierung bedurfte. Erst als Caesar einen anderen Staat, die Monarchie, schuf, erhielt der alte Staat bisweilen den Zusatz »frei« (*libera*), um auszudrücken, daß darin die Nobilität regierte und das römische Volk durch die Volksversammlung in gewissen Grenzen mitbestimmte.").

11 For more detailed historical accounts cf. e.g. Drumann / Groebe 1899–1929 (for chronological questions cf. Groebe 1898); Gelzer 1939, 1030–1090; Botermann 1968; Ortmann 1988; Grattarola 1990; Bleicken 1998 7–172; *CAH* IX, 468–490; cf. also biographies of Cicero (cf. Intr. 2.2., nr. 33). – The most extensive evidence for the period 44–43 BCE is provided by Cicero's writings. However, all of them are suspect of subjective and suggestive presentation; that also applies to the letters to some extent (for Cicero's views on letters cf. *Fam.* 2.4). Nevertheless, in order to convey an idea of the relevant statements in Cicero, the respective passages are given for each event as well as a selection of later historical sources (on the reliability of Appian and Cassius Dio and the relation of their reports to the text of Cicero's *Philippics* cf. Gowing 1992, esp. 235–239). – For locating the towns and provinces mentioned in this survey cf. the two maps provided (vol. 1, pp. *58–*59).

to have been an active participant in its realization,¹² but the deed probably occurred in Cicero's presence and was approved by him in public and in private.¹³ However, in his view, the business had only been half done since Marcus Antonius, Caesar's consular colleague, was left unharmed on the intervention of M. Iunius Brutus, and no decisive action to recover the Republican system was taken immediately.¹⁴

After Caesar's assassination the Republicans wished the old system to be restored, but the Liberators did not have sufficient executive power. Since there was one consul left, the leading conspirators, the praetors M. Iunius Brutus and C. Cassius Longinus (*MRR* 2.320; 2.321–322), did not have the same opportunities for action as they would have had if M. Antonius had also been assassinated. Yet, the conspirators apparently did not even take vigorous action in Rome within the range open to them, for they seem to have understood their deed as an idealistic act, which did not require further reinforcement: the old Republican order was expected to return after the elimination of the 'tyrant'. Neither did the Senate initiate measures to revive the Republican system.

Thus the only person who took action after Caesar's assassination was M. Antonius, who showed a Republican attitude at first; at the same time he acquired possession of valuables, funds and documents (allegedly) left by Caesar and exploited them for his own purposes, even by means of forgeries.¹⁵ Soon after Caesar's death, on 17 March, Antonius convened a Senate meeting in the Temple of Tellus.¹⁶ He still presented himself as

12 Cf. *Phil.* 2.25–33; *Fam.* 10.28.1; 12.2.1; 12.3.1; 12.4.1; *Plut. Brut.* 12.1–2; *Cic.* 42.1–2.

13 Cf. *Phil.* 2.28–29; 2.32–33; 2.114; 5.35; 10.7; 11.27; 11.35; *Att.* 14.4.2; 14.6; 14.9.2; 14.10.1; 14.11.1; 14.12.1–2; 14.13.2–3; 14.14.2–5; 14.17A.5; 14.22.2; 15.3.2; 15.4.2–3; *Fam.* 9.14.5; 11.5.1–2; 11.7; 12.1.2; 12.2.1; *Ad Brut.* 1.15.4; 2.5.2. – Habicht (1990, 92–93 / 76) believes that Cicero had a share in the assassination since he, though not one of the conspirators, contributed to spreading the underlying ideology.

14 Cf. *Phil.* 2.34; 2.89; 2.117–118; *Att.* 14.4.1; 14.5.2–3; 14.6; 14.9.2; 14.10.1; 14.11.1; 14.12.1; 14.14.2–5; 14.18.4; 14.21.3; 14.22.2; 15.4.2–3; 15.11.2–3; *Fam.* 10.28.1; 12.1; 12.3.1; 12.4.1; *Ad Brut.* 1.15.4; 2.5.1–2; *Off.* 1.35; *Vell. Pat.* 2.58.2; *Flor.* 2.17.1–3; *Plut. Brut.* 18.1–6; 20.1–2; *App. B Civ.* 2.114.478.

15 Cf. *Phil.* 1.16–17; 2.35; 2.93; 2.97; 2.100; 2.109; 3.30; 5.11–12; 5.15; 8.26; 12.12; *Att.* 14.12.1; 14.13.6; 14.14.2; 14.18.1; *Fam.* 12.1.1; *Vell. Pat.* 2.60.4; *Plut. Ant.* 15; *App. B Civ.* 2.125.524; 3.5.16; *Cass. Dio* 44.53.2–5; 45.23.5–8.

16 Cf. e.g. *Phil.* 1.1; *App. B Civ.* 2.126.525–526. – Cf. *NTDAR* 378–379, s.v. *Tellus, Aedes*; F. Coarelli, s.v. *Tellus, aedes, LTUR V* (1999), 24–25; on its use for this Senate meeting cf. Bonnefond-Coudry 1989, 132–136.

cooperative at this point in time, and a Senate decree was passed that reconciled the different factions in the Senate by a compromise: Caesar's assassins should not be prosecuted, and all arrangements of Caesar (*acta Caesaris*) should remain valid, which included the appointment of magistrates and the distribution of provinces; further regulations on Caesar's unpublished acts were also decreed.¹⁷ Cicero clearly did not approve of all of Caesar's acts, but believed that they had to be maintained in the interest of safety and political peace.¹⁸ Slightly later, Antonius proposed a Senate decree abolishing the dictatorship for ever, which was accepted by the Senate and later became a law.¹⁹ Nevertheless, Caesar's assassins left the city of Rome in early April.²⁰

On 3 or 4 April the consuls, M. Antonius and P. Cornelius Dolabella (Cicero's former son-in-law, who had entered office as *consul suffectus* after Caesar's assassination), received the provinces of Macedonia (possibly M. Iunius Brutus' province by appointment of Caesar) and Syria (possibly C. Cassius Longinus' province by appointment of Caesar) for 43 by means of a *sortitio*.²¹ In April and May Antonius travelled through Campania in order to settle and to win over Caesar's veterans;²² later in the summer he took command of the *legio V Alaudae*.²³ He obviously intended to ensure himself sufficient military force.

On 5 June the praetors M. Iunius Brutus and C. Cassius Longinus were assigned to supply grain from Asia and Sicilia, which would allow them to leave the city.²⁴ Later in the summer new provinces for 43 were

-
- 17 Cf. e.g. *Phil.* 1.1–3; 1.16–17; 1.31–32; 2.91; 2.100; 13.10; 13.12; *Att.* 14.6.2; 14.9.2; 15.4.3; 16.14.1; *Fam.* 12.1; *Vell. Pat.* 2.58.2–4; *Liv. Epit.* 116; *Flor.* 2.17.4; *Plut. Ant.* 14.3; *Brut.* 19; *Caes.* 67.8–9; *Cic.* 42.3; *App. B Civ.* 2.127.528–135.565; 3.2.2; 3.5.16; 3.13.43; 3.57.235; 3.62.256; 3.64.261; 4.57.244; 4.132.554; *Cass. Dio* 44.34.1–4; 45.23.4–5. – On the decrees concerning the *acta Caesaris* in this period cf. Ramsey 1994; Matijević 2006a.
- 18 Cf. e.g. *Phil.* 1.16–17; 2.100; 13.10; *Cass. Dio* 45.23.4–5.
- 19 Cf. *Phil.* 1.3–4; 1.32; 2.91; 2.115; 5.10; *Liv. Epit.* 116; *App. B Civ.* 3.25.94; 3.37.148; 4.2.6; *Cass. Dio* 44.51.2; 45.24.2; 45.32.2; 46.24.2.
- 20 Cf. *Phil.* 10.7–8; *Att.* 14.7.1; 14.10.1; *Plut. Ant.* 15.1; *Brut.* 21; *Caes.* 68.7; *Cic.* 42.5; *App. B Civ.* 2.148.615; 3.2.3–5; 4.57.245–246; *Cass. Dio* 47.20.
- 21 Cf. *Cass. Dio* 45.9.3; 45.20.3; cf. also *Phil.* 11.4; 11.27–28; *Att.* 14.9.3. – On the question of whether M. Iunius Brutus and C. Cassius Longinus (cf. *Flor.* 2.17.4; *App. B Civ.* 3.2.5; 3.6.18; 3.7.23–24; 3.12.42; 3.16.58; 3.24.91; 3.36.145; 4.57.245; cf. also *Phil.* 11.27–28) had actually been allocated provinces by C. Iulius Caesar cf. Kniely 1974, 37–71.
- 22 Cf. *Phil.* 1.5; 2.100–107; 5.3; 5.44; *Att.* 14.17.2; 14.21.2.
- 23 Cf. *Att.* 16.8.2; cf. *Phil.* 5.12 n.
- 24 Cf. *Att.* 15.9.1; 15.10; 15.11.1–2; 15.12.1; *App. B Civ.* 3.6.20; 4.57.246.

allocated to them. The sources are not unanimous: probably M. Iunius Brutus received Creta and C. Cassius Longinus Cyrenaica.²⁵ But Cyrenaica and Creta (cf. App. *B Civ.* 3.8.29) as well as Libya (cf. Plut. *Brut.* 19.5) are also mentioned for C. Cassius Longinus, as is Bithynia for M. Iunius Brutus (cf. App. *B Civ.* 3.8.29; Cass. Dio 47.21.1).²⁶ In late August M. Iunius Brutus and C. Cassius Longinus left Italy, but they did not set off for their new provinces. Instead, M. Iunius Brutus moved towards Macedonia and C. Cassius Longinus towards Syria, the provinces probably intended for them by Caesar and more convenient in the present conflict.²⁷ During the following months M. Iunius Brutus acquired great military force and occupied Macedonia, Illyricum and all Greece.²⁸ The Liberators' policy was more provident and fortunate as regards the provinces than with respect to their activities in Rome, and they made sure to command strategic provinces and large armies.²⁹

When M. Antonius became dissatisfied with the proconsular province assigned to him and with the length of tenure according to Caesar's law, he tried to improve his position by new regulations for the consular provinces, proposed in June: the prorogation of the proconsulship from two to five years and the exchange of the present proconsular provinces for others. Antonius had originally intended to have both regulations passed by the Senate on 1 June (cf. *Att.* 14.14.4), but then he changed his mind and did not put them forward at that meeting of the Senate, when numerous influential senators, who opposed this plan as an instance of

25 Cf. *Phil.* 2.31; 2.97; 11.27–28; *Att.* 15.5.2; Plut. *Ant.* 14.3; *Brut.* 19.5; App. *B Civ.* 3.8.29; 3.12.42; 3.16.58; 3.36.145; 4.57.247; Cass. Dio 45.32.4; 46.23.3; 47.21.1.

26 On the different traditions concerning the allocation of provinces to M. Iunius Brutus and C. Cassius Longinus cf. e.g. Groebe 1898, 17–27; Rice Holmes 1928, 196–197; Kniely 1974, 27–30; *CAHIX*, 475 and n. 41; *MRR* 2.320; 2.321–322. – Creta and Cyrenaica seem to have still been governed separately in this period and to have been assigned one common governor under Augustus only. Thus M. Iunius Brutus and C. Cassius Longinus did receive unimportant provinces, but they were not additionally humiliated by having to share one standard provincial government (cf. Marquardt 1881, 1.460–462; Mommsen 1893, 601–603; but cf. Ramsey 2003, 304).

27 Cf. *Phil.* 10.26; 11.27–28; 13.30; *Fam.* 12.5.1; 12.14.6; Vell. Pat. 2.62.2; Flor. 2.17.4; Nic. Dam. *Aug.* 135; App. *B Civ.* 3.24.91; 4.57.247; Cass. Dio 47.21.1–2; 47.26.1–2.

28 Cf. *Phil.* 10.11; 10.25–26; *Fam.* 12.5.1; Flor. 2.17.4; Plut. *Brut.* 25.1–4; Cass. Dio 47.21.

29 Cf. Drum 2007.

Antonius' egotistic and monarchical policy, did not attend and the original agenda was not followed. The *Lex (Antonia?) de provinciis consularibus* was then passed by the People in the *comitia tributa*, where it was proposed by a tribune of the *plebs* immediately after the failure in the Senate; it was probably accepted on 2 June.³⁰ In contrast to Caesar's *Lex Iulia de provinciis* of 46 (cf. *Phil.* 3.38 and n.), this tribunician law granted the consuls Antonius and Dolabella provincial governorships of five years after their consulship (till 39 BCE).³¹ In Cicero's view, the law violated the *acta Caesaris* and was passed illegally; he therefore regarded it as characteristic of Antonius' selfish and inconsiderate policy and repeatedly pointed to this example.³²

This law was probably identical with the *Lex Antonia de permutatione provinciarum*,³³ which assigned Gallia Citerior and Gallia Ulterior

30 Cf. Rotondi 1912, 432. – Cf. *Phil.* 1.6; 1.8; 2.108–109; *Att.* 14.14.4; 14.22.2; 15.4.1.

31 Cf. *Phil.* 1.19; 2.108–109; 5.7–8 (and n.); *Att.* 14.14.4; 15.11.4.

32 Cf. *Phil.* 1.19; 1.24; 2.108–109; 5.7–8 (and n.); *Att.* 14.14.4.

33 Cf. Rotondi 1912, 432. – Since the sources do not present a coherent picture, it is not completely clear whether the exchange of provinces was passed at the same time as the prorogation of the proconsulships or whether these were two different arrangements, possibly dating to slightly different points in time: the historical accounts mention an exchange of provinces (on the basis of a law or a Senate decree), whereas Cicero talks of a tribunician law, which extended the provincial governorships for the consuls of 44 BCE from two to five years. At the same time Cicero was, of course, aware of the fact that Antonius laid claim to the Gallic provinces and tried to march his army there (cf. *Phil.* 1.19; 2.108–109; 5.7–8; 8.27–28; *Liv. Epit.* 117; *Vell. Pat.* 2.60.5; *Nic. Dam. Aug.* 122; *App. B Civ.* 3.27.102–104; 3.29.113; 3.30.115–119; 3.31.121; 3.37.147–38.154; 3.49.198; 3.55.225–226; 3.63.257; *Cass. Dio* 45.9.3; 45.20.3–4; 45.22.3; 45.25.1–2; 46.24.3). – Sources, arguments and bibliography can be found in Botermann (1968, 22–23 and n. 4) and Ehrenwirth (1971, 6–16; cf. Groebe 1898, 8–16; Bellincioni 1974, 145–149). – The reason for the divergent focus is probably (cf. Ehrenwirth 1971, 11–13) the following one: the exchange of provinces is important for the historiographers because it is seen as the reason for the conflict at Mutina, whereas the extension of the proconsulships seems unimportant since it was never put into practice. Cicero, however, concentrates on this extension since only in that respect can he criticize the law for violating Caesar's arrangements and being illegal (somewhat differently cf. Frisch 1946, 99; Bengtson [1972] 1974, 482; Girardet 1987, 326, 328). – It is commonly assumed since Sternkopf (1912a, esp. 357–381 [with extensive discussion of the relevant sources]; cf. also Sternkopf 1912, 9 and n. 3; 1913, 5 and n. 1) that the two arrangements were different parts of one law (cf. e.g. Rice Holmes 1928, 192–196; Frisch 1946, 99; Botermann 1968, 22–23 n. 4; Ehrenwirth 1971,

(excluding Gallia Narbonensis)³⁴ to Antonius instead of Macedonia. He was also given command of five of the six well-equipped legions stationed in Macedonia for Caesar's Parthian war; without delay he started to transfer four of those to Brundisium (and later to his new provinces), where they arrived in the autumn.³⁵ At the same time this legislation

13–15; Bengtson [1972] 1974, 482; Girardet 1987, 326; Ortmann 1988, 103–104; Monteleone 2005, 71 n. 135; *CAH* IX, 474). However, Rotondi (1912, 432) and Drumann (1899, 1.120–121; cf. Groebe 1899, 1.435–437) seem to posit two laws; Levi (1986, 67 and n. 52 [p. 128]) apparently thinks of two contemporary laws. Shackleton Bailey (1967, 230, on *Att.* 14.14.4) leaves the question open.

34 In the *Philippics* Cicero never talks of *Gallia cisalpina* and *Gallia transalpina* nor of *Gallia togata* and *Gallia comata*; instead, he uses *Gallia* or *Gallia citerior* for the nearer part of Gaul and *illa ultima Gallia quam Plancus obtinet* and shorter versions of this phrase for the further part of Gaul excluding *Gallia Narbonensis* (cf. *Phil.* 3.38 n.: 8.27 n.). In what follows here, for ease of reference one of the conventional pairs of designations, which is suggested by Cicero's wording, *Gallia Citerior* and *Gallia Ulterior* (cf. e.g. *Prov. cons.* 36; *Caes. B Gall.* 2.2.1; *Sall. Cat.* 42.1), and their English equivalents will be used for these two Gallic provinces. – In the time of the *Philippics* the Gallic provinces were distributed as follows: in 44 BCE *Gallia Citerior* or *Cisalpine* was governed by D. Iunius Brutus by appointment of Caesar, which was confirmed by the Senate on 20 December 44 till the appointment of a successor; at the same time this province was claimed by M. Antonius on the basis of his consular power and of his new assignment of the provinces. The further parts of Gaul were first governed by A. Hirtius in 45 BCE (cf. *MRR* 2.309). *Gallia Ulterior* or *Gallia Transalpina* (excluding *Gallia Narbonensis*), i.e. the originally free Gaul conquered by Caesar, was then taken over by L. Munatius Plancus for 44–43 BCE (cf. *MRR* 2.329; 2.347–348). The provinces of *Gallia Narbonensis*, the southwestern part of the Gallic territory around the town of Narbo, and of *Hispania Citerior* were combined; and M. Aemilius Lepidus became provincial governor of this area for 44–43 BCE by appointment of Caesar (cf. *MRR* 2.326; 2.341–342). Since the provincial governorships in the different parts of Gaul were divided among three men and the political and military situation was different in each region, Cicero makes sure to use an unambiguous terminology for denoting these provinces (on the names of the Gallic provinces in relation to the historical development cf. Spranger 1955, 119–146).

35 Cf. *Att.* 15.13.2; 15.21.3; 16.4.4; 16.5.3; *Fam.* 12.23.2; *App. B Civ.* 3.24.92; 3.25.95; 3.27.104; 3.30.119; 3.43.175; 3.46.189. – These core troops destined for the Parthian war consisted of six legions (cf. *App. B Civ.* 3.24.92): the *legio Martia* (cf. *Phil.* 3.6; *Fam.* 11.7.2), the *legio quarta* (cf. *Phil.* 3.7; *Fam.* 11.7.2), the *legio secunda* (cf. *Phil.* 5.53; *Fam.* 10.30.1), the *legio tricesima quinta* (cf. *Phil.* 5.53; *Fam.* 10.30.1) as well as an undefined fifth legion, which was commanded by C. Antonius' legate, L. Piso, and later surrendered to Cicero's son (cf. *Phil.* 10.13), and an unspecified sixth legion, which was given to Dolabella (cf. *App. B Civ.*

arranged for Dolabella to take command of Syria. The traditional name of the law does not refer to an exchange of provinces between two magistrates, but rather to an exchange of the provinces of one person, i.e. of the provinces previously assigned to Antonius (and Dolabella) for other provinces that were regarded as more advantageous. Appian, however, notes that this arrangement was designed to be a proper ‘exchange’ with regard to Antonius: he mentions Antonius’ stratagem that D. Iunius Brutus Albinus, present governor of Gallia Citerior, should receive Macedonia instead; at the same time he indicates that this was only a move of Antonius to keep up appearances (cf. *App. B Civ.* 3.37.150; 3.49.198).

These arrangements for the distribution of provinces as well as his consular power provided the basis for Antonius’ claim to the Gallic provinces. Because of their strategic importance Antonius attempted to take them over in the autumn; but D. Iunius Brutus, who had been in Gallia Citerior since early April 44 (cf. *Att.* 14.13.2) and was the present governor of this province by appointment of Caesar, resisted.³⁶ Besides, D. Iunius Brutus was encouraged by the Senate and by Cicero to do so;³⁷ and he received official authorization of his ongoing initiatives by the Senate on 20 December, when the senators accepted Cicero’s motion to that effect (cf. *Phil.* 3.37–38).

In late April / early May 44 (during Antonius’ absence) the young Octavian, the future emperor Augustus, had arrived in Rome via southern Italy from the Greek city of Apollonia (in modern Albania), where he had been staying for the purposes of study and military practice for some months in advance of Caesar’s intended campaign against the Parthians.³⁸ He accepted the inheritance of Caesar, and in early May he

3.25.95); the two latter ones were not transported to Italy and remained on the other side of the Adriatic. The army also included archers, light-armed troops and cavalry (cf. *App. B Civ.* 3.24.92).

36 Cf. *Phil.* 3.8; 3.37–38; 4.9; 5.37; 10.21; 11.4; *Att.* 15.4.1; *Fam.* 11.1.1; Vell. Pat. 2.60.5; Suet. *Aug.* 10.2; *App. B Civ.* 3.2.4; 3.6.18; 3.16.58; 3.27.102; 3.30.116; 3.37.150; 3.49.198–199; 3.55.225–227; 3.63.257; Cass. Dio 45.9.3; 45.20.3–4; 45.22.3. – Soon after Caesar’s assassination Antonius had already made it clear that he did not want D. Iunius Brutus to govern this Gallic province, assigned to Brutus by Caesar (cf. *Fam.* 11.1.1).

37 Cf. *Fam.* 11.5; 11.7; *App. B Civ.* 3.27.103; 3.37.151; 3.38.153; 3.49.198.

38 Cf. Vell. Pat. 2.59.4; Suet. *Aug.* 8.2; Plut. *Brut.* 22.2; *App. B Civ.* 3.9.30–31; Cass. Dio 45.3.1.

presented himself to the Roman People at a *contio*.³⁹ Although Octavian's adoption and his assumption of the name Caesar were not formally ratified by a *Lex curiata* until August 43 (due to Antonius' obstruction),⁴⁰ his appearance and acceptance of Caesar's inheritance meant that from that point onwards there were two candidates for Caesar's succession, M. Antonius and Octavian.

Despite the positive start of Antonius' rulership, Cicero had early on arrived at the opinion that Antonius was striving for absolute power and that the Senate and himself would not be able to take effective action while Antonius was consul. Since Cicero regarded Antonius as the greater danger to the political system, he decided to form a (temporary) alliance with Octavian for the sake of preserving the Republican system (cf. Intr. 3.3.1.). Hence Cicero tried to exert influence on Octavian and to separate him from Antonius.⁴¹ In a letter to Atticus of 9 or 10 June Cicero did not call Octavian 'Octavius' any more, as he had done so far,⁴² but 'Octavianus' (cf. *Att.* 15.12.2); and in another letter to the Caesarian Cornificius of 10 October Cicero spoke of 'Caesar Octavianus' for the first time (cf. *Fam.* 12.23.2).⁴³ By eventually using these meaningful and programmatic names (which others were already employing), Cicero acknowledged Octavian's position as Caesar's heir.

At about the same time, in response to a request of Caesar's assassins, Cicero tried to win the consuls-designate, A. Hirtius and C. Vibius Pansa, for the Republican cause; generally, he regarded their political position as

39 Cf. *Att.* 14.10.3; 14.20.5; 14.21.4; 15.2.3; Vell. Pat. 2.59.4–6; Liv. *Epit.* 117; Oros. 6.18.1; Nic. Dam. *Aug.* 38–57; Plut. *Cic.* 43.8; App. *B Civ.* 3.9.30–21.79. – On the details of Octavian's movements cf. Toher 2004.

40 Cf. Flor. 2.15.1–3; App. *B Civ.* 3.94.389–391; Cass. Dio 45.5.3–4; 46.47.4–6.

41 Cf. *Att.* 15.12.2; Nic. Dam. *Aug.* 111; Plut. *Cic.* 44.1.

42 Cf. *Att.* 14.5.3; 14.6.1; 14.10.3; 14.11.2; 14.12.2; 14.20.5; 15.2.3.

43 The same name 'Caesar Octavianus' was chosen by Cicero in a later letter to Cornificius (cf. *Fam.* 12.25.4; cf. also *Ad Brut.* 2.5.2). In letters to Atticus and Tiro, however, Cicero continued to prefer 'Octavianus' (cf. *Att.* 15.12.2; 16.8.1; 16.9.1; 16.11.6; 16.14.1; *Fam.* 16.24.2; cf. also C. Asinius Pollio: *Fam.* 10.33.3–4). From December 44 onwards, Cicero also called the young man 'Caesar' in his letters (cf. *Fam.* 10.28.3; 11.7.2; 11.8.2; 11.14.2; 11.21.2; 12.5.2; *Ad Brut.* 1.3.1; 1.10.2–4; 1.15.6; 1.15.9), like his correspondents (cf. *Fam.* 10.23.6; 10.24.4–8; 10.30.4; 11.13.1; 11.20.1; 11.20.4; 11.28.6; *Ad Brut.* 1.4a.2), although he had initially opposed that appellation (cf. *Att.* 14.12.2). – The formal and honorary terminology employed in letters to Cornificius is probably due to the Caesarian attitude of the addressee (cf. Ortmann 1988, 141). – On Octavian's names cf. Intr. 2.2., nr. 19.

uncertain and ambiguous, but he knew that they would have to be included in any future activity and that their accession to the consulship, which meant the close of Antonius' term of office, would bring further opportunities for action.⁴⁴ Overall, Caesar's assassination had presented Cicero with the possibility to end his political withdrawal and fight for the Republican cause once again. Though not holding an office, Cicero felt that he had another chance to play a leading role during the period when he delivered the *Philippics*.⁴⁵

As an immediate consequence of his assessment of the political situation, Cicero had first left Rome soon after 5 April and withdrawn to his rural estates.⁴⁶ His plan had been to travel to Greece as a *legatus*, since his son currently was a student in Athens, i.e. to leave Italy and to return just in time for the inauguration of the new consuls on 1 January 43, since he thought that chances to influence political developments would then increase.⁴⁷ But Cicero delayed his application for a legateship because he waited until the situation had become clearer and because he wanted to avoid the impression of fleeing from the centre of action.⁴⁸ After having approached the two consuls, M. Antonius and P. Cornelius Dolabella, with respect to his legateship (cf. *Att.* 15.8.1), Cicero was appointed *legatus* by Dolabella for the whole period of his term of office on 3 June, since Dolabella had just received the provincial governorship for five years (*MRR* 2.331).⁴⁹

44 Cf. e.g. *Att.* 14.9.2; 14.12.2; 14.20.4; 14.21.4; 14.22.1; 15.1.2–3; 15.5.1; 15.6.1; 15.22; 16.1.4; *Fam.* 16.27; *Ad Brut.* 2.1.1; *Fat.* 2.

45 Cf. *Phil.* 14.17–18; 14.20; *Fam.* 12.24.2; *Ad Brut.* 1.4a.1–2; 2.1.2; cf. also *Plut. Ant.* 17.1; *Cic.* 45.4; *App. B Civ.* 3.66.269; 4.19.73.

46 Cf. *Att.* 14.1; 14.2; 14.3; 14.9; 14.13; 15.5.2–3; 15.26.1. – On the dates cf. Becht 1911, 44 and n. 2. – According to Marinone (2004, 232) Cicero stayed away from Rome on his rural estates from 6 April to 17 Juli 44.

47 Cf. *Phil.* 1.6; *Att.* 14.7.2; 14.12.2; 14.13.4; 14.16.3; 14.18.4; 14.19.6; 15.11.3; 15.25; 16.6.2; 16.7.2; 16.9; 16.11.6; 16.15.3; *Plut. Cic.* 43.3.

48 Cf. *Att.* 14.5.2; 14.13.4; 14.19.6; 14.22.2; 15.25.

49 Cf. *Phil.* 1.6; *Att.* 15.8.1; 15.11.4; 15.19.2; 15.20.1; 15.29.1; *Plut. Cic.* 43.3. – On the date (and on the text in *Att.* 15.11.4) cf. Ehrenwirth 1971, 15 and n. 3. – Since Roman senators had to reside in Rome and were only allowed to leave the city for public reasons or after having applied for leave (cf. Mommsen 1888, 3.912–913), Cicero needed an official permit in order to realize his plans. He seems to have thought of a *legatio libera* or *votiva* at first (cf. *Att.* 14.5.2; 14.13.4; 14.22.2; 15.8.1; 15.11.4), which was usually applied for when senators wished to leave Rome for personal reasons (cf. e.g. *Att.* 2.18.3; *Fam.* 11.1.2; 12.21; *Leg. agr.* 1.8; 2.45; *Flac.* 86; cf. Mommsen 1887, 2.690–692). Cicero eventually approached the consuls and was appointed *legatus* by Dolabella. Since Dolabella

In July and early August Cicero eventually tried to cross to Greece on the basis of his legateship.⁵⁰ Due to his indecisiveness, the unsafe routes and the inclement weather, however, Cicero only got as far as Rhegium. There he received information about events at Rome, particularly that an important Senate meeting on 1 August 44 was expected and negotiations with Antonius might again become possible. This information suggested a chance of effective political intervention even before 1 January 43; these prospects in connection with the astonishment at his journey in Rome induced Cicero to return immediately.⁵¹ On his way back Cicero learned of a courageous speech against Antonius' suppression of the Republican system, which L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus delivered in the Senate on

did not assign any tasks to him, this status equalled complete freedom and meant an advantage over a *legatio libera* in that Cicero did not have to name a specific reason for his absence and was granted a relatively long period of possible absence straightaway. The unspecific expression *ius legationis liberum* in *Phil.* 1.6 may be chosen deliberately so that Cicero's special position and his relationship to Dolabella remain unclear (cf. Groebe 1899, 1.431–432; Shackleton Bailey 1986, 9 n. 13; Ramsey 2003, 96–97, ad loc.). Cicero generally believed that embassies were justified in the public interest only. Therefore he even tried to abolish the institution of *legatio libera* during his consulship, but finally had to confine himself to restricting the duration of such embassies to the maximum of one year (cf. *Leg.* 3.18). A temporal limit was also fixed by Caesar in 46 BCE (cf. *Att.* 15.11.4; cf. Rotondi 1912, 419–420).

- 50 According to Marinone (2004, 233) the journey covered the period from 17 July to 6 August 44. – On the details of the voyage: for some time Cicero had been considering travelling to Greece, but had been in doubt about the most convenient and safest route because of the present political and military situation (cf. *Phil.* 1.7; *Att.* 15.20.3; 15.21.3; 16.2.4; 16.4.4; 16.5.3). Besides, he was uncertain in principle whether to go on this journey, because of its possible impression on others and of his financial situation (cf. *Att.* 15.17.1; 16.1.3; 16.2.4; 16.3.4–5; 16.7.5); therefore he discussed his plans with Atticus (cf. e.g. *Att.* 15.25; 16.2.4; 16.7.2). Finally, on 7 July 44, he reached his rural estate near Puteoli (cf. *Att.* 15.26.3; 15.28; 16.1.1), then he travelled on to Velia (cf. *Fam.* 7.19; 7.20), to Vibo (cf. *Att.* 16.6.1) and then to Syracuse, where he arrived on 1 August (cf. *Phil.* 1.7). On the next day he set off by ship (cf. *Phil.* 1.7), but the wind brought him to Leucopetra, a promontory near Rhegium (cf. *Phil.* 1.7). From there he set off anew on 6 August, yet was driven back by a strong southerly wind (cf. *Phil.* 1.7; *Att.* 16.7.1; *Fam.* 12.25.3; *Ad Brut.* 1.15.5). Therefore he stayed in Rhegium with his friend P. Valerius; there he received news from Rome, by which he was motivated to return to the city.

- 51 Cf. *Phil.* 1.7–10; 2.76; *Att.* 16.7.1; *Fam.* 10.1.1; *Ad Brut.* 1.10.4; 1.15.5–6; *Off.* 3.121; Plut. *Cic.* 43.4; Cass. Dio 45.15.4. – On Antonius' policy and the chronology of events in this period cf. Ramsey 2001.

1 August and which no senator dared to support;⁵² this piece of news confirmed him in his intention to return.

On 31 August or more probably on the morning of 1 September Cicero arrived in Rome.⁵³ On 1 September a Senate meeting was held in the Temple of Concordia,⁵⁴ dealing with the question of whether all future *supplicationes* should include an extra day in Caesar's honour.⁵⁵ Cicero did not attend this meeting, allegedly because he was still exhausted by his journey; in fact, however, he seems to have been warned of the danger threatening him and to have wanted to avoid an embarrassing discussion and vote.⁵⁶ Because of this absence Antonius vehemently threatened Cicero at the meeting, since he had obviously recognized him as a major opponent and interpreted his absence as a sign of defiance.⁵⁷ On the following day, on 2 September, there was another meeting of the Senate, probably on general issues, chaired by the consul P. Cornelius Dolabella in Antonius' absence.⁵⁸ This meeting of the Senate was attended by Cicero, who delivered *Philippic One*. On this occasion there was no need to discuss the issue on the agenda the day before; and so Cicero could use his speech for his own purposes. He explained his reasons for leaving Rome and returning and expressed his disapproval of

52 On Piso's speech cf. *Phil.* 1.10; 1.14–15; 1.28; 5.19; 12.14; *Att.* 16.7.5; 16.7.7; *Fam.* 12.2.1.

53 According to Cicero's own statements in his letters, the day after his return to Rome was the day (2 Sept. 44) of the Senate meeting at which he delivered *Philippic One* (cf. *Fam.* 12.25.3–4; ..., *atque inde ventis remis in patriam omni festinatione properavi postridieque in summa reliquorum servitute liber unus fui. sic sum in Antonium invectus ut ...*). According to Plutarch, however, the day after his return was the day (1 Sept. 44) of the Senate meeting which he did not attend (*Cic.* 43.5–6); since in Plutarch Cicero's return also occurs one day before a Senate meeting, it is dated to 31 August 44 (followed e.g. by Shackleton Bailey 1986, 3; Wiedemann 1994, 76; Bleicken 1998, 88; Everitt 2001, 276; Marinone 2004, 233; Monteleone 2005, 83). But Plutarch may have changed the chronology in order to make room for his description of the overwhelming reception of Cicero in Rome (cf. Ramsey 2003, 9, 111).

54 Cf. *NTDAR* 98–99, s.v. *Concordia, Aedes (2) (also Templum)*; A.M. Ferroni, s.v. *Concordia, aedes, LTUR* I (1993), 316–320; on its use for Senate meetings cf. Bonnefond-Coudry 1989, 90–112.

55 Cf. *Phil.* 1.11–13; 2.110–111; 5.18–19.

56 Cf. *Phil.* 1.11–12; 1.28; 5.19; *Plut. Cic.* 43.6.

57 Cf. *Phil.* 1.11–12; 5.19; *Plut. Cic.* 43.7.

58 Cf. *Phil.* 1.11; 1.16; 1.27; 1.29–31; 5.19.

Antonius' measures, but still appealed to him and his consular colleague Dolabella to return to a policy conducive to the *res publica*.⁵⁹

Antonius apparently regarded this speech as provocative and answered it by another speech, delivered at a Senate meeting in the Temple of Concordia on 19 September; prior to that he had withdrawn with his rhetoric teacher Sex. Clodius in order to compose and rehearse this oration (according to Cicero).⁶⁰ Cicero was again absent at this meeting of the Senate because, he says, he had been warned of the potential danger to him.⁶¹ Antonius' vehement speech has not been preserved (cf. 159.15–16 ORF⁴ [pp. 1.472–475]); its contents can partly be inferred from Cicero's *Philippic Two*. For ***Philippic Two*** is Cicero's reaction to Antonius' speech and presents itself as a direct reply given at the same meeting of the Senate, although it was never delivered and was not published immediately, but only distributed to some select friends.⁶² For instance, Cicero corresponded with Atticus about his oration (cf. esp. *Att.* 16.11.1–2); this evidence shows that the speech was finished by 25 October 44, when it was sent to Atticus (cf. *Intr.* 3.2.). At this point in time Cicero had again left Rome and withdrawn to his rural estates.⁶³

Meanwhile, both Antonius and Octavian tried to raise troops with a view to an impending war. Antonius left Rome on 9 October, moved to Brundisium to meet the Macedonian legions and travelled through Campania to raise new legions of veterans.⁶⁴ Octavian attempted to make Antonius' soldiers defect, recruited new troops and levied an army mainly from Caesar's veterans in Campania (on the basis of their continuing attachment to Caesar and of Octavian's offers of money).⁶⁵ When he intended to discuss these activities and the future strategy with Cicero, the latter was reluctant at first, but then came to regard Octavian's efforts as

59 Cf. *Phil.* 1.11; 5.19; *Fam.* 12.2.1; 12.25.3–4; *Ad Brut.* 1.15.6.

60 Cf. *Phil.* 2.15; 2.19; 2.42–43; 2.112; 3.33; 5.19–20; *Fam.* 12.2.1; 12.25.3–4.

61 Cf. *Phil.* 3.33; 5.19–20; *Fam.* 12.2.1.

62 Cf. *Att.* 15.13.1; 15.13.7 (= 15.13a.3); 16.11.1.

63 Cf. *Att.* 16.8; 16.14.

64 Cf. *Att.* 15.13.2; *Fam.* 12.23.2; *Plut. Ant.* 16.8; *Brut.* 23.1; *Nic. Dam. Aug.* 122; 129; *App. B Civ.* 3.40.164; 3.43.175–178; 3.44.179–183; *Cass. Dio* 45.12.1; cf. *Phil.* 3.4; 5.22; *Att.* 15.21.3; 16.4.4; 16.10.1; *Fam.* 10.30.1.

65 Cf. *Phil.* 3.3; 3.7; 3.31; 3.38; 4.3–4; 5.23; 5.28; 5.44; 5.46; 5.53; 7.10; 10.21; 11.20; 11.37; 13.16; 13.33; 14.4; *Att.* 15.13.2; 16.8; 16.9; *Fam.* 10.28.3; 11.7.2; *Aug. Resg.* 1.1; *Vell. Pat.* 2.61.1–2; *Suet. Aug.* 10.3; *Tac. Ann.* 1.10.1; *Liv. Epit.* 117; *Flor.* 2.15.4; *Nic. Dam. Aug.* 115–119; 131–139; *Plut. Ant.* 16.4; 16.8; *Brut.* 23.1; *App. B Civ.* 3.40.164–42.174; 3.44.179; 3.47.191–193; *Cass. Dio* 45.12; 45.38.3; 55.24.8; *CIL* X 3886 = *ILS* 2225.

serious and therefore set off for Rome in November.⁶⁶ The *legio Martia* and the *legio quarta*, two of the Macedonian legions, defected from Antonius to Octavian in late November.⁶⁷

Antonius returned to Rome in mid-November (cf. *Att.* 16.14.1–3). He convened a meeting of the Senate in the Temple of Jupiter on the Capitoline Hill for 24 November; but after he received news of the defection of the *legio Martia*, he postponed it to 28 November. In that meeting Antonius did not pursue his original plan to have Octavian declared a public enemy, because he had learned the news of the defection of the *legio quarta*, which changed the respective military positions. Instead, Antonius had the senators decree a *supplicatio* for M. Aemilius Lepidus (without asking for their opinions first), perhaps in order to align this wavering candidate with his cause, and he carried out the distribution of the praetorian provinces.⁶⁸ Directly afterwards, during the night of 28 to 29 November, Antonius left Rome for the rest of his consular year⁶⁹ and demanded Gallia Citerior of D. Iunius Brutus, on the basis of his consular power and of his assignment of the consular provinces.

One day prior to the inauguration of the tribunes of the *plebs* for the coming year, on 9 December, Cicero returned to Rome (cf. *Fam.* 11.5.1), somewhat earlier than originally intended because of the political developments (cf. *Att.* 16.11.6). He encouraged D. Iunius Brutus to resist Antonius and not to wait for a Senate decree (cf. *Fam.* 11.5; 11.7). On 20 December a meeting of the Senate was held, chaired by the new tribunes of the *plebs*, in order to discuss safety measures for the inauguration of the new consuls on 1 January 43.⁷⁰ Cicero had planned not to come to this meeting, but to attend the Senate only from 1 January 43 onwards.⁷¹ Yet on that day a dispatch of D. Iunius Brutus became

66 Cf. *Phil.* 3.19; *Att.* 16.8; 16.9; 16.11.6; *Fam.* 10.28.3; *Plut. Ant.* 16.4; *Brut.* 22.4; *Cic.* 44.1.

67 Cf. *Phil.* 3.6–7; 3.14; 3.39; 4.5–6; 5.4; 5.23; 5.28; 5.46; 5.53; 7.10; 10.21; 11.21; 12.8; 13.19; 13.33; 14.27; 14.31; *Fam.* 10.28.3; 11.7.2; *Vell. Pat.* 2.61.2; *Liv. Epit.* 117; *App. B Civ.* 3.45.185; 3.47.191; 3.48.197; 3.56.232; 3.74.303; *Cass. Dio* 45.13.3.

68 Cf. *Phil.* 3.19–21; 3.23–26; 5.23; 13.19; *App. B Civ.* 3.45.185–186.

69 Cf. *Phil.* 3.11; 3.24; 5.24; 5.30; 13.19; *Fam.* 10.28.1; *App. B Civ.* 3.45.186.

70 Cf. *Phil.* 3.13; 3.25; 3.37; 4.16; *Fam.* 10.28.2; 11.6a.1; 12.25.2; *Cass. Dio* 45.15.2–3.

71 Cf. e.g. *Phil.* 1.6; *Fam.* 11.6a.1; cf. also *Att.* 16.9; 16.11.6.

known in Rome, saying that he would defend his province and keep it in the control of the Senate and the People of Rome.⁷²

Cicero realized the need and the favourable opportunity for intervention and attended the meeting on 20 December; his presence allegedly caused a high turnout of senators.⁷³ After the introductory report of the tribunes of the *plebs* Cicero was the first consular to be asked for his opinion, and he delivered *Philippic Three*.⁷⁴ At the end of this speech he moved that D. Iunius Brutus' policy in Gaul be confirmed, that the present provincial governors continue to hold their provinces until successors have been appointed by the Senate and that Octavian, the veterans who followed him and the legions who defected to him be honoured for their resistance to Antonius (cf. *Phil.* 3.37–39). According to Cicero, nobody supported Antonius except L. Varius Cotyla (cf. *Phil.* 5.5; cf. *Phil.* 5.7); at any rate the motion was passed by the Senate.⁷⁵ This Senate decree meant that Antonius' law on the distribution of provinces passed in June 44 and his allotment of the provinces on 28 November 44 were annulled and that private initiatives of resistance were authorized by the Senate. On the same day, Cicero informed the populace of the Senate decree in *Philippic Four*, delivered before a *contio* convened by the tribune of the *plebs* M. Servilius (cf. *Phil.* 4.1–2; 4.16).

The uncompromising and contrasting positions of D. Iunius Brutus and Antonius had indicated that a military struggle between the two men was impending: between 20 December 44 and 1 January 43 their conflict intensified and developed into the so-called *Bellum Mutinense*.⁷⁶ Antonius besieged D. Iunius Brutus in Mutina (modern Modena);⁷⁷ Octavian marched his army towards Gaul (cf. *Phil.* 5.46; 13.20). In Rome influential senatorial circles started to oppose the civil war that would be

72 Cf. *Phil.* 3.8; 3.37–38; 4.7–8; 5.28; 5.36–37; *Fam.* 11.6a.

73 Cf. *Phil.* 3.32; *Fam.* 11.6a.

74 Cf. *Phil.* 4.1; 5.30; 6.1–2; 10.23; 14.20; *Fam.* 10.28.1–2; 11.6a; 12.22a.1; 12.24.2; 12.25.2.

75 Cf. *Phil.* 4.2–9; 5.3–5; 5.28; 5.30; 6.1; 10.23; *Fam.* 10.31.4; 11.6a.2; 12.22a.1; 12.25.2; App. *B Civ.* 3.47.193; Cass. Dio 45.15.2.

76 On this term cf. Suet. *Aug.* 9; 84.1; Ov. *Fast.* 4.627–628; Plin. *HN* 10.110; cf. also Nep. *Att.* 9.1.

77 Cf. *Phil.* 5.24; 5.26; 5.27; 6.2; 6.3; 6.4; 6.5; 6.6; 7.15; 7.21; 7.22; 8.5; 8.20; 8.21; 10.10; 11.22; 12.4; 12.8; 12.11; 12.12; 13.11; 13.20; 13.21; 13.39; 13.46; 13.47; 14.1; 14.4; Vell. Pat. 2.61.4; Suet. *Aug.* 10.2–4; Liv. *Epit.* 117; 118; Flor. 2.15.3; Oros. 6.18.3; App. *B Civ.* 3.49.198–201; Cass. Dio 45.36.3; 46.35.2.

the inevitable result of the developments supported by Cicero (cf. *Phil.* 5.5–6; 7.1–5).

On 1 January 43 a meeting of the Senate, chaired by the new consuls A. Hirtius and C. Vibius Pansa, who had been designated by Caesar, took place in the Temple of Iuppiter Capitolinus on the Capitoline Hill, protected by armed guards.⁷⁸ This meeting started a senatorial debate lasting four days;⁷⁹ from 2 January onwards meetings were held in the Temple of Concordia.⁸⁰ The meeting on 1 January opened with a speech of the consuls on the general condition of the *res publica*, the usual procedure after inaugurations, and then moved on to more specific issues concerning the present situation, particularly to the question of honours for those who had done services to the *res publica*, in line with the decree of 20 December 44,⁸¹ and to the choice of the immediate future policy. The first senator to be called upon was the consular Q. Fufius Calenus, consul Pansa's father-in-law, who proposed that the Senate should send an embassy to Antonius and negotiate with him (cf. *Phil.* 5.4; 10.3). By contrast, Cicero pursued a strict war policy in *Philippic Five*: he argued against an embassy and for an immediate declaration of war;⁸² he also detailed the appropriate honours for Antonius' opponents (cf. *Phil.* 5.35–53).

Three more days of fluctuating negotiations followed, during which acceptance of Cicero's proposal seemed likely.⁸³ Eventually, on the second or third day of the debate, Cicero's motions for honorary decrees were passed by the Senate (with slight modifications); in Octavian's case there were also motions of L. Marcius Philippus, Octavian's stepfather, demanding the erection of a gilt statue and of Ser. Sulpicius Rufus and P. Servilius Isauricus asking for improvements of Octavian's right to stand

78 Cf. *Phil.* 5.1; 6.1–2; App. *B Civ.* 3.50.202; Cass. Dio 45.17.1; 45.17.9; 45.19; 45.22.5; 46.26.7. – Cf. *NTDAR* 221–224, s.v. *Iuppiter Optimus Maximus (Capitolinus)*, *Aedes*; S. De Angeli, s.v. *Iuppiter Optimus Maximus Capitolinus, aedes (fasi tardo-repubblicane e di età imperiale)*, *LTUR* III (1996), 148–153; on the use for Senate meetings cf. Bonnefond-Coudry 1989, 65–80.

79 Cf. *Phil.* 6.3; 6.16; App. *B Civ.* 3.50.202–61.252; Cass. Dio 45.17.1; 46.29.2 (wrongly: three days). – On the length of this senatorial debate cf. Comm. 3.1.

80 Cf. *Phil.* 7.21; Cass. Dio 46.28.3.

81 Cf. *Phil.* 5.1; 5.4; 5.28; 5.34–35; 6.1.

82 Cf. *Phil.* 5.1; 5.3; 5.25–26; 5.30–31; 6.1–3; 14.20; *Ad Brut.* 2.3.4; App. *B Civ.* 3.50.203–204; Cass. Dio 45.17.9–47.5.

83 Cf. *Phil.* 6.2–3; App. *B Civ.* 3.50.206.

for offices.⁸⁴ But Cicero's aim to declare war immediately was not realized since the majority of the Senate tended to prefer avoidance of war with Antonius and therefore sending an embassy. When the voting was deferred from 2 to 3 January by the tribune of the *plebs* Salvius, the discussion was continued on 3 January.⁸⁵ And on 4 January Cicero's motion to declare war was finally rejected, and the hope prevailed of negotiating and making peace with Antonius by means of an embassy.⁸⁶

Thus an embassy consisting of the consulars Ser. Sulpicius Rufus, L. Marcius Philippus and L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus was decreed (*MRR* 2.350);⁸⁷ its mission followed the terms of a compromise proposed by Ser. Sulpicius on 4 January (cf. *Phil.* 9.7; 9.9), namely that conditions were to be presented to Antonius and that war was to be declared on him if he did not comply with them.⁸⁸ Besides, the envoys were to convey the honorary decree to D. Iunius Brutus (cf. *Phil.* 6.6). At the same meeting the *Lex Antonia agraria* was abolished, on the motion of L. Iulius Caesar (cf. *Phil.* 6.14). Cicero presented the outcome of this Senate meeting to the People on 4 January, when he delivered *Philippic Six* before a *contio*, convened by the tribune of the *plebs* P. Apuleius (cf. *Phil.* 6.1; 6.3; 6.16).

The envoys set off on 5 January.⁸⁹ Slightly later the Senate decreed that one consul should set forth to war and the other one should start preparations for war in Italy. The consuls distributed these tasks by drawing lots: A. Hirtius departed for war, and C. Vibius Pansa made Italy prepare for an armed conflict.⁹⁰ While the return of the embassy was awaited, public opinion was influenced by rumours spread by Antonius' friends, according to Cicero (cf. *Phil.* 7.1–5). In view of this situation and of the fact that waiting for the return of the embassy basically equalled

84 Cf. *Phil.* 5.35–53; 6.6; 7.10–11; 11.20; 13.7–9; *Ad Brut.* 1.15.7; Vell. Pat. 2.61.3; 2.62.1; Liv. *Epit.* 118; Aug. *Res. g.* 1.1; Tac. *Ann.* 1.10.2; Suet. *Aug.* 10.3; Plut. *Ant.* 17.1; Cic. 45.4; App. *B Civ.* 3.51.209; 3.53.219; 3.56.232; 3.64.263–65.265; 3.75.306–307; Cass. Dio 46.29.2–3; 46.35.4.

85 Cf. App. *B Civ.* 3.50.206–51.207; 3.51.209; 3.52.213–214; 4.17.65–66.

86 Cf. *Phil.* 6.3; 7.14; App. *B Civ.* 3.61.250–252.

87 Cf. *Phil.* 6.3; 7.1; 7.14; 8.17; 8.20–28; 9.1; 9.7; 9.9; 12.11; 13.20; 14.4; *Fam.* 11.8.1; 12.4.1; 12.24.2; Liv. *Epit.* 118; App. *B Civ.* 3.61.250; 3.62.254; Cass. Dio 46.29.4; 46.35.5.

88 Cf. *Phil.* 6.3–9; 6.16; 7.2; 7.14; 7.26; 8.21; 12.11; 14.4; *Fam.* 12.4.1; 12.24.2; App. *B Civ.* 3.61.250–252.

89 Cf. *Phil.* 9.9; cf. also *Phil.* 8.17; 8.28; 9.1; 12.11; 13.20–21; Liv. *Epit.* 118.

90 Cf. *Phil.* 7.11–13; 8.5–6; 10.16; 10.21; 11.21; 11.24; 14.4–5; *Fam.* 11.8.2; 12.5.2; Oros. 6.18.3; Plut. *Ant.* 17.1–2; Cic. 45.4; App. *B Civ.* 3.65.266; Cass. Dio 46.36.2.

inactivity,⁹¹ Cicero argued against peace with Antonius and for a strict war policy in **Philippic Seven**, delivered during a meeting of the Senate devoted to routine matters soon after the middle of January (cf. *Phil.* 7.1; 7.27).

One of the three envoys sent to Antonius, Ser. Sulpicius Rufus, already elderly and ill when setting off, died on the way;⁹² the other two, L. Marcus Philippus and L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus, returned to Rome on or rather shortly before 2 February, accompanied by an envoy of Antonius, L. Varius Cotyla (*MRR* 2.351). They reported that Antonius had not complied with the instructions of the Senate and instead had made demands of his own, *intolerabilia postulata* in Cicero's opinion (cf. *Fam.* 12.4.1), but *aequissimae condiciones* in Antonius' view (cf. *Phil.* 13.36; cf. *Phil.* 13.37: *aequae et verecundae condiciones*).⁹³

On the return of the envoys a meeting of the Senate was held on 2 February, which featured the report of the envoys and an ensuing vehement debate; finally the Senate declared a state of *tumultus* (but not of *bellum*) for the *res publica* and ordered that *saga* ('military cloaks') were to be put on from 4 February onwards.⁹⁴ Antonius' envoy L. Varius Cotyla attended this meeting and took notes (cf. *Phil.* 8.28). Also on 2 February, a report of the consul A. Hirtius about the situation in northern Italy arrived in Rome and was read out by his colleague to the Senate on the following day (cf. *Phil.* 8.6). In this Senate meeting on 3 February⁹⁵ Cicero delivered **Philippic Eight**: he criticized the *tumultus* decree of the previous day and particularly Q. Fufius Calenus' calls for peace (cf. *Phil.* 8.1–4; 8.11–19); for his part he moved that those who left Antonius by 15 March should remain unpunished, but those who joined him from that point in time onwards (with the exception of L. Varius Cotyla) should be regarded as public enemies and that the consuls should check whether any of Antonius' supporters had done anything worth honouring (cf. *Phil.* 8.33). This motion was passed by the Senate.⁹⁶

In a meeting of the Senate on c. 4 February honours for Ser. Sulpicius Rufus, who had died while serving as an envoy, were being debated. The

91 Cf. *Fam.* 11.8.1; 12.24.2; *Ad Caes. iun.* fr. 12.

92 Cf. *Phil.* 8.22; 9; 13.29; *Fam.* 10.28.3; 12.5.3; Hieron. *Chron.*, p. 157e Helm.

93 Cf. *Phil.* 8.22–28; 8.32–33; *Fam.* 12.4.1; App. *B Civ.* 3.62.254–63.258; Cass. Dio 46.30.1–31.2.

94 Cf. *Phil.* 8.1–2; 8.6; 8.32; 10.19; 12.12; 12.16; 12.17; 13.23; 14.1–3; *Ad Caes. iun.* fr. 16; Liv. *Epit.* 118; Cass. Dio 46.29.5; 46.31.2.

95 Cf. *Phil.* 8.1; 8.6; *Ad Caes. iun.* fr. 16.

96 Cf. *Ad Caes. iun.* fr. 1; App. *B Civ.* 3.63.258; Cass. Dio 46.31.2.

consul C. Vibius Pansa suggested the honour of a statue; P. Servilius Isauricus argued against it and proposed a public tomb (cf. *Phil.* 9.3; 9.14). In reaction to these statements Cicero argued for an extraordinary honour in *Philippic Nine* and moved that a statue be erected and a public tomb and a state funeral be awarded to Ser. Sulpicius Rufus (cf. *Phil.* 9.15–17). This motion, which meant a great distinction for a respected statesman, was passed by the Senate.⁹⁷

Meanwhile, M. Iunius Brutus reported to Rome that he had brought Macedonia, Illyricum and all Greece into his power and that these regions were at the disposition of the Senate and the People of Rome (cf. *Fam.* 12.5.1). Therefore the consul Pansa convened a meeting of the Senate in mid-February (cf. *Phil.* 10.1; 10.25): Q. Fufius Calenus was the first consular to speak, and he proposed that M. Iunius Brutus' letter was correctly written and that he should give up his legions.⁹⁸ By contrast, Cicero moved in *Philippic Ten* that M. Iunius Brutus' activities should be recognized and legitimized, that he should defend Macedonia, Illyricum and all Greece (with the support of public funds), that he and his troops should remain as close to Italy as possible and that the proconsul Q. Hortensius should act as the provincial governor of Macedonia till the Senate appointed a successor (cf. *Phil.* 10.25–26). The Senate passed this motion.⁹⁹ At this point in time all regulations and laws introduced by Antonius during his consulship had been annulled by Senate decrees.¹⁰⁰

In the second half of February news arrived in Rome that in mid-January C. Trebonius, one of Caesar's assassins and the provincial governor of Asia, had been murdered by P. Cornelius Dolabella in Asia.¹⁰¹ For that reason, on the motion of Q. Fufius Calenus, Dolabella was declared a *hostis* by the Senate.¹⁰² On the day following this decision, the enforcement of the decree, i.e. details of the fight against the public

97 Cf. Pompon. *Dig.* 1.2.2.43; Hieron. *Chron.*, p. 157e Helm.

98 Cf. *Phil.* 10.2–6; 10.9; *Ad Brut.* 2.3.4.

99 Cf. *Phil.* 11.26; 13.30; 13.32; *Ad Brut.* 2.4.4; Cass. Dio 46.40.3; 47.22.1–2; Plut. *Brut.* 27.2; App. *B Civ.* 3.63.258–259; 4.75.317.

100 Cf. *Phil.* 10.17; 12.11–12; 13.5; 13.26; Cass. Dio 46.36.2.

101 Cf. *Phil.* 11; 12.21; 12.25; 13.22–23; 13.36–39; 14.8; *Fam.* 12.12.1; 12.14.5; 12.15.4; *Ad Brut.* 2.3.1; 2.3.5; Vell. Pat. 2.69.1; Liv. *Epit.* 119; Oros. 6.18.6; App. *B Civ.* 3.26.97–101; 3.61.253; 3.64.262; 4.58.248; Cass. Dio 47.29.1–3; Zonar. 10.18; Strabo 14.1.37 (C 646).

102 Cf. *Phil.* 11.9; 11.15–16; 11.29; 13.23; 13.36–39; *Fam.* 12.15.2; Liv. *Epit.* 119; 121; Oros. 6.18.6; App. *B Civ.* 3.61.253; 3.64.262; 4.58.248; Cass. Dio 47.28.5; 47.29.4.

enemy, was discussed (cf. *Phil.* 11.16). L. Iulius Caesar proposed that the supreme command (an extraordinary *imperium*) over that area be given to P. Servilius Isauricus, Trebonius' predecessor (cf. *Phil.* 11.16–19; 11.25), and (probably) Q. Fufius Calenus moved that the consuls should draw lots for Asia and Syria and go to war against Dolabella there after relieving D. Iunius Brutus at Mutina (cf. *Phil.* 11.16; 11.21–25).

By contrast, Cicero proposed in *Philippic Eleven* that C. Cassius Longinus should be appointed proconsul of Syria and commissioned to pursue Dolabella on the basis of the military force present in this province; he should be vested with an *imperium maius* extending over the provinces of Asia, Bithynia and Pontus for the purposes of the war; and the Senate should discuss the distribution of the consular and praetorian provinces as soon as possible and they should remain under their present governors till successors had been appointed by the Senate (cf. *Phil.* 11.29–31). But, influenced probably by the motion of Q. Fufius Calenus and by Pansa's opposition to other proposals (cf. *Fam.* 12.7.1; *Ad Brut.* 2.4.2), the Senate did not accept Cicero's suggestion and commissioned the consuls instead, who received the provinces of Syria and Asia respectively.¹⁰³ Nevertheless, C. Cassius Longinus also attacked Dolabella without being officially authorized by the Senate.¹⁰⁴

In Rome, the enthusiasm for war seems not to have been as great as Cicero claimed, and Antonius' supporters continued to influence public opinion.¹⁰⁵ Hence, further peace negotiations with Antonius were being considered: another initiative to renew dealings with Antonius, taken by L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus and Q. Fufius Calenus in late February or early March 43, was approved by Pansa.¹⁰⁶ Accordingly, the Senate decreed a second embassy consisting of Q. Fufius Calenus, L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus, L. Iulius Caesar, P. Servilius Isauricus and M. Tullius Cicero (*MRR* 2.351).¹⁰⁷ At another session a few days later, probably held to define the commission of the embassy, one of the designated members, P. Servilius Isauricus, made it clear that his decision to participate in the embassy had provoked dismay among his family and friends (cf. *Phil.* 12.5). Thereupon, Cicero delivered *Philippic Twelve* and pointed out the uselessness of such an initiative and the personal danger to himself caused

103 Cf. *Fam.* 12.7; 12.14.4; *Ad Brut.* 2.4.2; Cass. Dio 47.29.5.

104 Cf. *Phil.* 11.27; *Fam.* 12.7.2; 12.11.1; 12.14.4; *Ad Brut.* 2.3.3.

105 Cf. *Phil.* 12.13; 12.18; Cass. Dio 46.32.

106 Cf. *Phil.* 12.1–3; 12.6; 12.18.

107 Cf. *Phil.* 12.5–6; 12.17–18; 13.36; Cass. Dio 46.32.3.

by his involvement. Eventually, the project was dropped, and no further peace embassy was sent.¹⁰⁸

Instead, the consul C. Vibius Pansa left Rome on 19 or 20 March and set forth to war; he was to command part of the newly levied troops together with his colleague A. Hirtius.¹⁰⁹ From that time onwards the *praetor urbanus* M. Caecilius Cornutus chaired the Senate meetings (as was usual practice in the absence of superior magistrates),¹¹⁰ but limited himself to urgent business.¹¹¹ M. Aemilius Lepidus, the provincial governor of Hispania Citerior and Gallia Narbonensis, had not reacted to the honorary decree awarded to him (cf. *Fam.* 10.27.1) and to the demand of the consul Pansa to keep himself at the disposition of the Senate, but rather suggested peace with Antonius instead; L. Munatius Plancus, the provincial governor of Gallia Ulterior, supported this call for peace.¹¹²

Since letters from M. Aemilius Lepidus and L. Munatius Plancus had arrived in Rome, which recommended peace with Antonius, the *praetor urbanus* M. Caecilius Cornutus convened a Senate meeting on 20 March. About the same time Antonius had sent a letter to A. Hirtius and Octavian, and Cicero had obtained a copy from Hirtius (cf. *Phil.* 13.22). In *Philippic Thirteen* Cicero disapproved of the call for peace (cf. *Phil.* 13.7–10; 13.49) and criticized this letter in detail (cf. *Phil.* 13.22–48). On the motion of P. Servilius Isauricus Lepidus, who spoke before Cicero, the Senate rejected Lepidus' proposal of peace, and Cicero demanded that an appreciation of Sex. Pompeius, who had promised his services to the *res publica*, be added to the Senate decree (cf. *Phil.* 13.50). On the day of the Senate meeting Cicero sent letters to Lepidus and Plancus, in order to deter them from further attempts to negotiate with Antonius in view of the position of the Senate.¹¹³

During the first half of April various pieces of news about the situation in the eastern provinces and in northern Italy reached Rome. The consuls defeated Antonius at Forum Gallorum (modern Castelfranco) on the Via

108 Cf. *Phil.* 13.47–48; Cass. Dio 46.32.3–4. – On the developments concerning the second embassy cf. Hall 2007.

109 Cf. *Phil.* 13.16; *Fam.* 10.10.1; Oros. 6.18.3.

110 Cf. Kunkel 1995, 242–243.

111 Cf. *Phil.* 14.37; *Fam.* 10.12.3; 10.16.1; 12.28.2; *Ad Brut.* 2.5.2–3.

112 Cf. *Phil.* 13.7–10; 13.13–16; 13.43; 13.49; *Fam.* 10.6; 10.27; 10.31.4; 10.33.1; 11.18.2; *Ad Brut.* 2.2.1.

113 Cf. *Fam.* 10.6 to Plancus; *Fam.* 10.27 to Lepidus; cf. also *Fam.* 10.5; 10.10 to Plancus.

Aemilia near Mutina on 14/15 April,¹¹⁴ which became known in Rome on 20 April (cf. *Phil.* 14.16; *Ad Brut.* 1.3.2). At the same time a rumour was spread that Cicero intended to have himself declared dictator on 21 April, the city's foundation day (cf. *Phil.* 14.14–15). The tribune of the *plebs* P. Apuleius convened a *contio* on 20 April in order to answer the reproaches of the slanderers; a few hours later the news of the victory in northern Italy reached Rome. Thereupon a great crowd escorted Cicero from his house to the Capitoline Hill and the Rostra.¹¹⁵

In a meeting of the Senate on 21 April (cf. *Phil.* 14.14) the *praetor urbanus* M. Caecilius Cornutus put up reports about the battle of Forum Gallorum, received from the military leaders, for discussion.¹¹⁶ P. Servilius Isauricus proposed a festival of thanks and putting on peace clothes for one day.¹¹⁷ In **Philippic Fourteen** Cicero argued against this motion, since he wished to avoid the impression that peace had already been achieved; instead, he proposed general honours for all combatants (beyond Servilius' motion), namely a public festival of thanksgiving lasting fifty days for the three military leaders, who were to be awarded the title of *imperator*, besides the renewal of the promises given to the soldiers, the erection of a monument for those killed in action and the transference of the promised rewards to their relatives (cf. *Phil.* 14.36–38). The Senate accepted Cicero's motion.¹¹⁸

Also on 21 April the battle of Mutina was fought, as a result of which D. Iunius Brutus was relieved and Antonius incurred a second defeat, but the consul Hirtius died.¹¹⁹ And the consul Pansa died in Bononia on 23 April, from wounds received in the battle of 14 April.¹²⁰ News of this

114 The evidence on the date of the battle of Forum Gallorum is not completely unambiguous; it probably took place on 15 April 43 (cf. Bengtson [1972] 1974, 499). – Cf. *Phil.* 14.26–28; 14.36–38; *Fam.* 10.30; 10.33; *Ad Brut.* 1.3a; *Liv. Epit.* 119; *Suet. Aug.* 10.3–4; *Oros.* 6.18.3–4; *Ov. Fast.* 4.625–628; *Plut. Ant.* 17.2; *App. B Civ.* 3.66.272–70.289; *Cass. Dio* 46.37; *Zonar.* 10.14.

115 Cf. *Phil.* 14.12–13; 14.16; *Ad Brut.* 1.3.2.

116 Cf. *Phil.* 14.1; 14.6; 14.11; 14.22.

117 Cf. *Phil.* 14.1–2; 14.11; 14.22–24.

118 Cf. *App. B Civ.* 3.74.302–303; *Cass. Dio* 46.38.1–2.

119 On the date of this battle cf. Bengtson (1972) 1974, 504. – Cf. *Fam.* 10.11.2; 11.13.1–2; *Ad Brut.* 1.3a; 1.4.1; *Vell. Pat.* 2.61.4; *Liv. Epit.* 119; *Suet. Aug.* 11; *Aug. Res. g.* 1; *Flor.* 2.15.4; *Oros.* 6.18.5; *Ov. Tr.* 4.10.6; *Tib.* 3.5.18; *App. B Civ.* 3.71.290–294; *Cass. Dio* 46.39.1.

120 Cf. *Fam.* 10.33.4; 11.9.1; *Ad Brut.* 1.3a; *Vell. Pat.* 2.61.4; *Liv. Epit.* 119; *Oros.* 6.18.4; *App. B Civ.* 3.75.305–76.311; *Cass. Dio* 46.39.1. – On the death of both

second battle and D. Iunius Brutus' liberation reached Rome only after the Senate meeting, at which Cicero delivered *Philippic Fourteen*.

In the session on 26 April the Senate eventually declared Antonius and his followers public enemies and honoured the victors.¹²¹ On 30 June the *hostis* declaration of Lepidus followed.¹²² However, at that point in time, this political success, which finally realized Cicero's aim, did not have any further impact, since after the deaths of the two consuls there were no constitutional leaders according to the laws of the *res publica*; further measures against Antonius could not be taken swiftly and rigorously enough to destroy his remaining political and military power.

After the death of the consuls, war against Antonius was continued under the supreme command of D. Iunius Brutus.¹²³ Nevertheless, M. Antonius gained strength again, while Octavian made several unsuccessful attempts to win the consulship from the Senate.¹²⁴ Eventually, Octavian was reconciled with M. Antonius and M. Aemilius Lepidus.¹²⁵ On 19 August 43 Octavian and Q. Pedius, whom he had chosen as his colleague, were elected consuls (cf. *MRR* 2.336–337).¹²⁶ Cicero, who became increasingly sceptical about Octavian (cf. *Ad Brut.* 1.18.3–4), asked for dispense from regular attention at meetings of the Senate, which was granted to him by Octavian (cf. *Ad Caes. iun. fr.* 23B).

In October the *hostis* declarations of Antonius and Lepidus were abolished; L. Munatius Plancus and Asinius Pollio defected to Antonius, and D. Iunius Brutus died. In this situation the influential military leaders settled their conflicts: in late October 43 the so-called Second Triumvirate, uniting M. Antonius, Octavian and M. Aemilius Lepidus, was established and officially sanctioned by the *Lex Titia* on 27

consuls cf. also *Fam.* 10.17.2; 10.21.4; 11.9.1; 11.10.2; 11.13.1–2; 12.25a.1; *Ad Caes. iun. fr.* 22; Vell. Pat. 2.61.4; Plut. *Ant.* 17.2; *Cic.* 45.4; Cass. Dio 46.39.1.

121 Cf. *Ad Brut.* 1.3a; 1.5.1; 1.15.8–9; Vell. Pat. 2.62.4–5; 2.64.4; Liv. *Epit.* 119; Cass. Dio 46.39.3; 46.41.5. – On the *hostis* declaration and its difference from a *senatus consultum ultimum* cf. Kunkel 1995, 238–239; Lintott 1999a, 154–155.

122 Cf. *Fam.* 12.10.1; *Ad Brut.* 1.12; 1.15.10; Vell. Pat. 2.64.4; App. *B Civ.* 4.12.45; Cass. Dio 46.51.4.

123 Cf. Liv. *Epit.* 119–120; App. *B Civ.* 3.74.302; 3.80.325–326; Cass. Dio 46.40.1.

124 Cf. *Fam.* 10.24.6; *Ad Brut.* 1.4a.2; Suet. *Aug.* 26.1; App. *B Civ.* 3.82.337–339; 3.88.361–363; Cass. Dio 46.42.2–43.4.

125 Cf. Liv. *Epit.* 119; App. *B Civ.* 3.80.329–81.331; Cass. Dio 46.43.6; 46.52.1.

126 Cf. App. *B Civ.* 3.94.388; Cass. Dio 46.45.3–5.

November.¹²⁷ Political enemies were proscribed;¹²⁸ on the instigation of M. Antonius Cicero was murdered on 7 December 43.¹²⁹

2.2. People involved

This section succinctly provides essential information on the individuals who played a major role in the historical events of 44–43 BCE that form the background to the *Philippics* and / or who get a prominent mention in the *Philippics* (arranged in alphabetical order of *nomina gentilia*); particular emphasis has obviously been given to facts important to the *Philippics*.

(1) M. AEMILIUS LEPIDUS

References: P. von Rohden, s.v. *Aemilius* (73), *RE* I 1 (1894), 556–561; *MRR* 3.7–8; cf. also Hayne 1971; Weigel 1992; Welch 1995.

Dates: c. 89–12 BCE; 49 *praetor* (*MRR* 2.257); 48–47 provincial governor of Hispania Citerior (*MRR* 2.275; 2.288); 46 *consul* with Caesar (*MRR* 2.293–294); 46–44 *magister equitum* (*MRR* 2.295; 2.306; 2.318–319); 44 provincial governor of Gallia Narbonensis and Hispania Citerior (*MRR* 2.326), war against Sextus Pompeius Magnus (cf. *Phil.* 5.39–41; 13.7–9); 43 provincial governor (*MRR* 2.341–342), 30 June declared a public enemy (cf. *Fam.* 12.10.1; *Ad Brut.* 1.12; 1.15.10; *Vell. Pat.* 2.64.4; *App. B Civ.* 4.12.45; *Cass. Dio* 46.51.4), 27 November Second Triumvirate established (*triumviri rei publicae constituendae*, *MRR* 2.337–338) consisting of M. Aemilius Lepidus, M. Antonius (cf. nr. 4) and Octavian (cf. nr. 19); 42 *consul* with L. Munatius Plancus (*MRR* 2.357; cf. nr. 24).

Family: brother-in-law of M. Iunius Brutus (cf. nr. 22).

Position: Lepidus allegedly showed astonishment and dismay at the Lupercalia of 44 BCE (cf. *Phil.* 5.38; 13.17). In March 44 he was ready to depart for his provinces and had therefore assembled an army close to the city of Rome. Accordingly, he occupied the city with his troops after

127 Cf. *Liv. Epit.* 119; *Flor.* 2.16; *Suet. Aug.* 12–13.1; *Plut. Ant.* 19; *Cic.* 46; *App. B Civ.* 3.80.326–81.332; 4.2.4–3.13; 4.7.26–27; *Cass. Dio* 46.41.5; 46.54–56.

128 Cf. *Liv. Epit.* 119–120; *Plut. Ant.* 19.2–4; *Cic.* 46; *App. B Civ.* 4.5.16–12.48; *Cass. Dio* 47.3.1–2.

129 Cf. *Vell. Pat.* 2.66.2–5; [*Aur. Vict.*] *De vir. ill.* 81.6; *Liv. Epit.* 120; *Val. Max.* 5.3.4; *Sen. Suas.* 6.17; 6.20–21, *Controv.* 7.2; *Tac. Dial.* 17; *Oros.* 6.18.11; *Plut. Ant.* 19.3; 20.2–4; *Cic.* 46–49; *App. B Civ.* 4.6.21; 4.19.73–20.81; *Cass. Dio* 47.8.3–4; 47.11.1–2.

Caesar's assassination; generally, he supported M. Antonius and the Caesarians (cf. App. *B Civ.* 2.118.496–497; 2.124.518–519; 2.130.542–131.551). On Cicero's motion, the Senate made an attempt to win Lepidus for the Republican cause by an honorary decree passed on 1 January 43 (cf. *Ad Brut.* 1.15.9), which awarded him a gilt equestrian statue and a triumph (cf. *Phil.* 5.38–41; 13.7–9). However, Lepidus remained ungrateful and unimpressed (cf. *Fam.* 10.27.1). Instead, he called for peace, jointly with L. Munatius Plancus (cf. nr. 24), in March 43; this proposal was rejected by the Senate (cf. *Phil.* 13.7–10; 13.49–50; *Fam.* 10.6; 10.27). When Lepidus was declared a public enemy on 30 June 43, the honours were rescinded. Lepidus remained sympathetic to M. Antonius and served as an intermediary between M. Antonius and Octavian before their alignment in autumn 43.

(2) C. ANTONIUS

Reference: E. Klebs, s.v. *Antonius* (20), *RE* I 2 (1894), 2582–2584.

Dates: 49 BCE Caesar's *legatus* (*MRR* 2.266); 44 *praetor* (*MRR* 2.319), after M. Iunius Brutus' withdrawal from Rome (cf. nr. 22) acted as *praetor urbanus* (organization of the *ludi Apollinares*), received Macedonia at the allotment of the provinces on 28 November 44 (cf. *Phil.* 3.26), soon afterwards departed from Italy in the direction of Greece, conflict with M. Iunius Brutus (cf. *Phil.* 10.9; *Plut. Brut.* 25.3–4; *Cass. Dio* 47.21.4–7); 43 provincial governor of Macedonia (*MRR* 2.342); 42 death.

Family: brother of L. Antonius (cf. nr. 3) and M. Antonius (cf. nr. 4).

Position: C. Antonius was naturally a supporter of his brother M. Antonius; all three brothers Antonii held influential offices in 44 BCE.

(3) L. ANTONIUS

References: E. Klebs, s.v. *Antonius* (23), *RE* I 2 (1894), 2585–2590; cf. also Roddaz 1988.

Dates: 50 BCE *quaestor* (*MRR* 2.249); 44 *tribunus plebis* (*MRR* 2.323), chair of the *septemviri* implementing the *Lex Antonia agraria* of June 44 (*MRR* 2.332–333); 43 participated in the fighting at Mutina (*MRR* 2.352); 41 *consul* (*MRR* 2.370); after 41 death.

Family: brother of C. Antonius (cf. nr. 2) and M. Antonius (cf. nr. 4).

Position: L. Antonius was naturally a supporter of his brother M. Antonius; all three brothers Antonii held influential offices in 44 BCE. Lucius is disrespectfully styled a 'gladiator' by Cicero (cf. *Phil.* 3.31 n.).

(4) M. ANTONIUS

References: P. Groebe, s.v. *Antonius* (30), *RE I 2* (1894), 2595–2614; *MRR* 3.19–20; cf. also Rossi 1959; Chamoux 1986; Roberts 1988; Dettenhofer 1992; Southern 1998b; Matijević 2006b.

Dates: 82–30 BCE; 57–55 *magister equitum* under A. Gabinius, provincial governor in Syria (*MRR* 2.205; 2.213; 2.220); 54 in Gaul with Caesar; 52 *quaestor* (*MRR* 2.236); 52–50 participated in Caesar's Gallic Wars; 50(–30) *augur* (*MRR* 2.254); 49 *tribunus plebis* (*MRR* 2.258), *tribunus plebis pro praetore* (*MRR* 2.260), supported Caesar and opposed Pompeius; 48 participated in the battles of Dyrrhachium and Pharsalus; 48–47 *magister equitum* in Rome and Italy (*MRR* 2.272; 2.286); disagreement with Caesar, without office; 44 *consul* with C. Iulius Caesar and with P. Cornelius Dolabella (cf. nr. 14) after the Ides of March (*MRR* 2.315–316), 15 February festival of the Lupercalia (*MRR* 2.334; cf. *Phil.* 2.84–87; 3.12; 5.38; 10.7; 13.17; 13.31; 13.41; Quint. *Inst.* 9.3.61; Suet. *Iul.* 79.2; Liv. *Epit.* 116; Vell. Pat. 2.56.4; Nic. Dam. *Aug.* 71–75; Plut. *Ant.* 12; *Caes.* 61; App. *B Civ.* 2.109.456–458; Cass. Dio 44.11.1–3; 45.30–32; 46.17.4–5; 46.19.4–7), 28 November departure to Gallia Citerior; December 44 to April 43 fighting at Mutina; 43 provincial governor, 29 May uniting of the armies of M. Antonius and M. Aemilius Lepidus (cf. nr. 1) in Gallia Narbonensis; 27 November Second Triumvirate (*triumviri rei publicae constituendae*, *MRR* 2.337–338) consisting of M. Antonius, Octavian (cf. nr. 19) and M. Aemilius Lepidus (cf. nr. 1); October 42 participation in the battles of Philippi; 31 participation in the battle of Actium; 30 death in Alexandria.

Family: brother of C. Antonius (cf. nr. 2) and L. Antonius (cf. nr. 3); their grandfather M. Antonius the orator (143–87 BCE); father M. Antonius Creticus (cf. E. Klebs, s.v. *Antonius* [29], *RE I 2* [1894], 2594–2595; cf. *Phil.* 3.17); mother Iulia (later married to P. Cornelius Lentulus Sura, Antonius' stepfather); brother-in-law of Octavian (nr. 19).

'Wives': (a) Fadia, daughter of the freedman Q. (or C.) Fadius (cf. *Phil.* 2.3); (b) Antonia, daughter of his uncle C. Antonius (dismissed in c. 47/46 BCE because of alleged adultery with P. Cornelius Dolabella [cf. nr. 14], for the sake of a new marriage); (c) Fulvia, widow of P. Clodius and C. Curio (died in 40 BCE); (d) Octavia, Octavian's (nr. 19) sister (divorced in 32 BCE); (e) Cleopatra.

(5) P. APULEIUS

Reference: E. Klebs, s.v. *Appuleius* (15), *RE II 1* (1895), 258.

Dates: 43 BCE *tribunus plebis* (MRR 2.339), convened the *contiones* on 4 January (cf. *Phil.* 6.1) and on 20 April (cf. *Phil.* 14.16).

Name: In the Ciceronian manuscripts his name is spelled *Apuleius* (which is followed here); but both the forms *Apuleius* and *Appuleius* are found for persons of this name.

Position: Since by convening *contiones* Apuleius gave Cicero the chance to present the political situation and recent Senate decrees to the People and provided the opportunity to clear Cicero from reproaches levelled against him, he was probably sympathetic to Cicero and his policy.

(6) M. CAECILIUS CORNUTUS

Reference: F. Münzer, s.v. *Caecilius* (45), *RE* III 1 (1897), 1200.

Dates: 43 BCE *praetor urbanus* (MRR 2.338), took over governmental responsibilities after the consuls had left Rome to fight M. Antonius in spring 43 (cf. *Phil.* 14.37; *Fam.* 10.12.3; 10.16.1; 12.28.2; *Ad Brut.* 2.5.2–3).

Position: Cornutus fulfilled his duties as *praetor urbanus*, but seems not to have intervened actively in the political conflicts of 44–43 BCE.

(7) CAESENNIUS LENTO

Reference: F. Münzer, s.v. *Caesennius* (6), *RE* III 1 (1897), 1307.

Dates: 45 BCE officer under Caesar in Spain (MRR 2.311); 44 member of the committee of the *septemviri*, appointed to implement the *Lex Antonia agraria* of June 44 (cf. MRR 2.332–333).

Position: In 44–43 BCE Caesennius Lento was a follower of M. Antonius and one of the *septemviri*. In the *Philippics*, he is frequently mentioned, often jointly with Nucula (cf. nr. 26), as a representative of this group (cf. *Phil.* 11.13; 12.20; 12.23; 13.2; 13.26; 13.37). Cicero asserts that Lento acted in a tragedy (cf. *Phil.* 11.13) and thereby suggests that he belongs to the disreputable class of actors (cf. Garton 1972, 246, nr. 59; but cf. Klodt 2003, 56 n. 65).

(8) CAFO

Reference: not in *RE*.

Dates: before 43 BCE *centurio* (cf. *Phil.* 8.26).

Position: In 44–43 BCE Cafo was a follower of M. Antonius and perhaps a member of the committee of *septemviri*, appointed to implement the *Lex Antonia agraria* of June 44 BCE (cf. Syme 1937, 135–136; MRR 2.332–333; cf. *Phil.* 5.7 n.). In the *Philippics*, he is mentioned several times,

typically together with L. Decidius Saxa (cf. nr. 15) and also in connection with other associates of Antonius (cf. *Phil.* 8.9; 8.26; 10.22; 11.12; 11.37; 12.20).

(9) L. CALPURNIUS PISO CAESONINUS

References: F. Münzer, s.v. *Calpurnius* (90), *RE* III 1 (1897), 1387–1390; *MRR* 3.47; cf. also Castner 1988, 16–23.

Dates: 58 BCE *consul* (*MRR* 2.193–194); 1 August 44 courageous speech in the Senate (cf. *Phil.* 1.10; 1.14–15; 5.19; 12.14; *Att.* 16.7.5; 16.7.7; *Fam.* 12.2.1); 43 member of the first embassy to M. Antonius (*MRR* 2.350) with Ser. Sulpicius Rufus (cf. nr. 31) and L. Marcius Philippus (cf. nr. 23), designated as a member of the second embassy (*MRR* 2.351) with Q. Fufius Calenus (cf. nr. 17), P. Servilius Isauricus (cf. nr. 30), L. Iulius Caesar (cf. nr. 20) and M. Tullius Cicero (cf. nr. 33).

Family: father-in-law of Caesar.

Position: Piso started open opposition to M. Antonius by his speech in the Senate on 1 August 44 BCE, which contributed to inducing Cicero to return to Rome. Later, however, Piso seems to have collaborated with Antonius (cf. *Phil.* 12.1). He apparently was in favour of negotiations with Antonius and was appointed a member of both embassies. The result of the first embassy was disapproved of by Cicero, and he criticized the envoys responsible for it (cf. *Phil.* 8).

(10) TI. CANNUTIUS

Reference: F. Münzer, s.v. *Cannutius* (3), *RE* III 2 (1899), 1485–1486.

Dates: 44 BCE *tribunus plebis* (*MRR* 2.323–324), excluded by M. Antonius from the Senate meeting on 28 November (cf. *Phil.* 3.23; *MRR* 2.324) like D. Carfulenus (cf. nr. 11) and L. Cassius Longinus (cf. nr. 13).

Position: Cannutius supported Cicero and Octavian, but opposed M. Antonius (cf. e.g. *Fam.* 12.3.2; 12.23.3; *Vell. Pat.* 2.64.3; *App. B Civ.* 3.41.167), who therefore feared the tribune's right of veto.

(11) D. CARFULENUS

References: F. Münzer, s.v. *Carfulenus*, *RE* III 2 (1899), 1589–1590; *MRR* 3.50.

Dates: excluded by M. Antonius from the Senate meeting on 28 November 44 BCE (cf. *Phil.* 3.23; *MRR* 2.324) like Ti. Cannutius (cf. nr. 10) and L. Cassius Longinus (cf. nr. 13), thus probably like them *tribunus*

plebis in 44 (MRR 2.324); 43 active during the fighting at Mutina, death in an ambush at Forum Gallorum.

Position: Carfulenus was probably an opponent of M. Antonius' policy; at any rate Antonius seems to have feared his intervention against measures planned by him.

(12) C. CASSIUS LONGINUS

References: F. Fröhlich, s.v. *Cassius* (59), *RE* III 2 (1899), 1727–1736; MRR 3.51; cf. also Dettenhofer 1992.

Dates: c. 90–42 BCE; 49 *tribunus plebis* (MRR 2.259); 44 *praetor* (MRR 2.320), instigator of the conspiracy against Caesar, which was later led by M. Iunius Brutus (cf. Liv. *Epit.* 116; Eutr. 6.25; [Aur. Vict.] *De vir. ill.* 83.6; Plut. *Brut.* 8–12; App. *B Civ.* 2.113.470–473), left Rome in early April, received a new province in the summer (cf. *Phil.* 2.31; 2.97; 11.27–28; *Att.* 15.5.2; App. *B Civ.* 3.8.29; Cass. Dio 47.21.1; Plut. *Brut.* 19.5), in late September departed from Italy in an easterly direction and later went to Syria via Asia (cf. *Phil.* 11.27–28; 13.30; *Fam.* 12.5.1; 12.14.6; Vell. Pat. 2.62.2; Cass. Dio 47.21.1–2; 47.26.1–2), military activities in Syria, successful campaign against P. Cornelius Dolabella (cf. nr. 14); 43 provincial governor of Syria (MRR 2.343–344).

Family: brother of L. Cassius Longinus (nr. 13); brother-in-law of M. Iunius Brutus (cf. nr. 22).

Position: Being one of Caesar's assassins, Cassius opposed M. Antonius and did not accept the decrees initiated by him. So Cassius of his own accord conducted successful military campaigns against Caesarians in the eastern provinces.

(13) L. CASSIUS LONGINUS

Reference: F. Münzer, s.v. *Cassius* (65), *RE* III 2 (1899), 1739.

Dates: 44 BCE *tribunus plebis* (MRR 2.324), excluded by M. Antonius from the Senate meeting on 28 November (cf. *Phil.* 3.23; MRR 2.324) like Ti. Cannutius (cf. nr. 10) and D. Carfulenus (cf. nr. 11).

Family: brother of C. Cassius Longinus, one of Caesar's assassins (cf. nr. 12).

Position: Unlike his brother, Cassius did not participate in the conspiracy against Caesar; nevertheless he was viewed sceptically by M. Antonius, who feared his right of veto.

CICERO: see (33) M. TULLIUS CICERO.

(14) P. CORNELIUS DOLABELLA

References: F. Münzer, s.v. *Cornelius* (141), *RE* IV 1 (1900), 1300–1308; *MRR* 3.65; cf. also Dettenhofer 1992.

Dates: c. 70–43 BCE; 51 *quindecimvir sacris faciundis* (*MRR* 2.246); 47 *tribunus plebis* (*MRR* 2.287); 44 *consul suffectus* (*MRR* 2.317), designated by Caesar for the office of *consul suffectus* during the Parthian campaign (cf. *Phil.* 2.79–84; Vell. Pat. 2.58.3; Plut. *Ant.* 11.3–5; Cass. Dio 43.51.8), took over the consulship for the rest of the year after Caesar's assassination (according to the *acta Caesaris*, without having previously served as a praetor or having reached the required minimum age); 43 provincial governor of Syria (*MRR* 2.344), on his way to Syria murdered C. Trebonius (provincial governor of Asia), hemmed in by C. Cassius Longinus in Syria, committed suicide probably in late July.

Wives: (a) Fabia; (b) 50–46 BCE Cicero's only daughter Tullia (on Cicero's opinion of his son-in-law cf. *Phil.* 11.10; *Fam.* 2.15.2; 7.32.3; 8.6.1–2; 8.13.1; *Att.* 6.6.1; 16.15.1–2).

Position: Dolabella was a close associate of Caesar and eventually became M. Antonius' consular colleague. Antonius obviously was the more active and the more powerful of the two, but they both were responsible for some decrees criticized by Cicero. After his year of office in Rome Dolabella fought against some of Caesar's assassins in Syria and Asia.

(15) L. DECIDIUS SAXA

References: F. Münzer, s.v. *Decidius* (4), *RE* IV 2 (1901), 2271–2272; *MRR* 3.80; cf. also Syme 1937.

Dates: 49 and 45 BCE *centurio* in Caesar's campaigns (cf. *Phil.* 8.26; Caes. *B Civ.* 1.66.3), perhaps acted as some kind of surveyor during his military service (cf. *Phil.* 11.12; 14.10); 44 *tribunus plebis* (*MRR* 2.324); 42 commander of the forces in Macedonia, participated in the battle of Philippi (*MRR* 2.365); 41–40 *legatus* under M. Antonius in Syria (*MRR* 2.376; 2.384); 40 death.

Position: In 44–43 BCE Saxa was a follower of M. Antonius and perhaps a member of the committee of *septemviri*, appointed to implement the *Lex Antonia agraria* of June 44 BCE (cf. Syme 1937, 135–136; *MRR* 2.332–333; cf. *Phil.* 5.7 n.). In the *Philippics*, he is mentioned several times, typically jointly with Cafo (cf. nr. 8) and also in connection with other associates of Antonius (cf. *Phil.* 8.9; 8.26; 10.22; 11.12; 11.37; 12.20;

13.2; 13.27; 14.10). Cicero's description of him probably has a true basis, but is obviously exploited in his argument against M. Antonius (on this issue cf. Syme 1937, 132–137).

(16) L. EGNATULEIUS

Reference: F. Münzer, s.v. *Egnatuleius* (2), *RE* V 2 (1905), 2004.

Dates: 44 BCE *quaestor* (*MRR* 2.325–326), led the *legio quarta* from Macedonia to Italy and defected with it to Octavian in November (cf. *Phil.* 3.7; 3.39; 4.6; 5.52), which was approved by the Senate on 20 December 44; in early January 43 Cicero moved to honour him with the right to stand for further offices three years before the legal time (cf. *Phil.* 3.39; 5.52).

Position: Egnatuleius led the *legio quarta* from M. Antonius to Octavian and thereby indicated his political position.

(17) Q. FUFIVS CALENVS

Reference: F. Münzer, s.v. *Fufius* (10), *RE* VII 1 (1910), 204–207.

Dates: 61 BCE *tribunus plebis* (*MRR* 2.180); 59 *praetor* (*MRR* 2.188–189); supporter of Caesar during the Civil War (cf. *Att.* 9.5.1; *Caes. B Civ.* 1.87.4; 3.8.2; 3.14; 3.26.1; 3.56; 3.106.1; *B Alex.* 44.2); 49 Caesar's envoy (*MRR* 2.267); 48 *legatus pro praetore* in Greece (*MRR* 2.281); 47 continued to be *legatus pro praetore* in Greece, later *consul* with P. Vatinius (*MRR* 2.286, 2.290); 43 designated as a member of the second embassy to M. Antonius (*MRR* 2.351) with L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus (cf. nr. 9), P. Servilius Isauricus (cf. nr. 30), L. Iulius Caesar (cf. nr. 20) and M. Tullius Cicero (cf. nr. 33).

Family: father-in-law of C. Vibius Pansa (cf. nr. 35; cf. *Phil.* 8.19; 10.6); son of Q. Fufius Calenus (cf. *Phil.* 8.13; cf. F. Münzer, s.v. *Fufius* [9], *RE* VII 1 [1910], 204).

Names used by Cicero: In the *Philippics* Cicero calls Q. Fufius Calenus either Q. Fufius (cf. *Phil.* 8.11; 8.16; 8.18; 10.5; 11.15; 12.4; cf. *Att.* 9.5.1) or Calenus (cf. *Phil.* 8.12; 8.15; 8.19; 10.3; 10.6; 12.3; 12.4; 12.18) and once Fufius (cf. *Phil.* 11.15). This last version of the name is typically used in the *Epistulae ad Atticum* (cf. *Att.* 1.14.1; 1.14.5; 1.14.6; 1.16.2; 2.18.1; 11.15.2; 11.16.2), apart from Calenus alone once (cf. *Att.* 16.11.1). According to Adams (1978, 155) the use of these forms is a sign of Cicero's low esteem of this person: Cicero does not go so far as to call Q. Fufius Calenus by his *nomen* alone in public; on the other hand he does not honour him by using a combination of *praenomen* and *cognomen*.

Position: Calenus seems to have been the leader of the opposition to Cicero's war policy (cf. *Phil.* 8.11–19; 10.2–6; 11.15; 12.3–4; 12.18; *Att.* 15.4.1; 16.11.1; cf. Schol. Bob. *In Clod. et Cur. argum.* [p. 85.22–25 St.]: ... *auctore huius conspiracyonis Q. Fufio Caleno tribuno pl. cuius mentionem celeberrimam Tullius in Filippicis orationibus facit.*). At any rate, he was usually the first senator to be called on to speak in meetings of the Senate throughout 43 BCE, and Cicero therefore had to discuss Calenus' more compromising and restrained proposals when it was his turn to present his opinion. – Calenus supported a policy different from Cicero's on earlier occasions too (cf. e.g. *Att.* 1.14.1; 1.14.6; 9.5.1; *Fam.* 5.6.1).

(18) A. HIRTIUS

Reference: F. Von der Mühl, s.v. *Hirtius* (2), *RE* VIII 2 (1913), 1956–1962.

Dates: 46 BCE *praetor* (*MRR* 2.295); 45 provincial governor of Gallia Ulterior, including Gallia Narbonensis (*MRR* 2.309); 44 illness (cf. *Phil.* 1.37; 7.12; 8.5; 10.16; 14.4; *Fam.* 12.22.2); 43 *consul* with C. Vibius Pansa (cf. nr. 35) by appointment of Caesar (*MRR* 2.334–336), died in the battle of Mutina on 21 April.

Literary role: oratorical student with Cicero (cf. *Att.* 14.12.2; 14.22.1; *Fam.* 7.33.1; 9.16.7; 9.18; Quint. *Inst.* 12.11.6; Suet. *Gram.* 25.3; Sen. *Controv.* 1, *praef.* 11); author of *De bello Gallico* 8; important interlocutor in Cicero's *De fato* (cf. *Fat.* 1.2).

Position: Hirtius and his consular colleague in 43 BCE seem basically to have supported Republican ideas, but they were reluctant to introduce fierce measures against M. Antonius.

(19) C. IULIUS C. F. CAESAR (OCTAVIAN / AUGUSTUS)

References: K. Fitzler / O. Seeck, s.v. *Iulius* (132), *RE* X 1 (1917), 275–381; cf. also Bleicken 1998; Southern 1998a; Kienast 1999.

Dates: 23 September 63 BCE – 19 August 14 CE; early association with Caesar, participation in Caesar's wars; 43 *imperium pro praetore* (*MRR* 2.345–346), from 19 August *consul suffectus* with Q. Pedius (*MRR* 2.336), 27 November Second Triumvirate (*triumviri rei publicae constituendae*, *MRR* 2.337–338) consisting of Octavian, M. Antonius (cf. nr. 4) and M. Aemilius Lepidus (cf. nr. 1); 33, 31–23 *consul* (*MRR* 2.413–414, 2.420).

Family: great-nephew of Caesar (his mother: Atia, a niece of Caesar); stepson of L. Marcius Philippus (cf. nr. 23); later brother-in-law of M. Antonius (cf. nr. 4).

Name: He was originally called Γάιος Ὀκτάουιος Καίσιος (cf. Cass. Dio 45.1.1), and from 60 onwards C. Octavius Thurinus (cf. Suet. *Aug.* 7.1). After the adoption by Caesar's will (cf. Schumacher 1999) his name changed to C. Iulius C. f. Caesar, and he was called 'Caesar' by his followers, the name functioning as a political programme (cf. *CIL* IX 2142; cf. *Att.* 14.12.2; Liv. *Epit.* 117; Oros. 6.18.1; Nic. Dam. *Aug.* 55; Plut. *Brut.* 22.3; App. *B Civ.* 3.11.38; Cass. Dio 45.3.2; 45.5.1; 46.47.5). Later, his official name was Imperator Caesar Divi f., and from 16 January 27 he bore the *cognomen* Augustus. Finally he was called Imp. Caesar Divi f. Augustus. He never used the name of Octavianus himself, but it was already in general use among his contemporaries (on the name cf. Syme 1958; Schmitthenner 1973, 65–76; Shackleton Bailey 1991, 60–63; Rubincam 1992; Bleicken 1998, 39–40).¹³⁰

(20) L. IULIUS CAESAR

Reference: F. Münzer, s.v. *Iulius* (143), *RE* X 1 (1917), 468–471.

Dates: 77 BCE *quaestor* in Asia (*MRR* 2.89); between 74 and 67 *praetor*; 64 *consul* (*MRR* 2.161); 63 *duumvir perduellionis* (*MRR* 2.171); 52–49 legate of C. Iulius Caesar in Gaul (*MRR* 2.238; 2.244; 2.252; 2.267); 47 *praefectus urbi* (*MRR* 2.292); September 44 absence from Senate meetings because of illness; during the senatorial debate in early January 43 motion to abolish the *Lex Antonia agraria*, accepted by the Senate (cf. *Phil.* 6.14), on 2 February motion to declare *tumultus* instead of *bellum*, accepted by the Senate (cf. *Phil.* 8.1–2), in spring designated as a member of the second embassy to M. Antonius (*MRR* 2.351) with Q. Fufius Calenus (cf. nr. 17), L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus (cf. nr. 9), P. Servilius Isauricus (cf. nr. 30) and M. Tullius Cicero (cf. nr. 33).

Family: uncle of the brothers Antonii (cf. nr. 2–4; cf. e.g. *Phil.* 2.14; 8.2; 12.18).

Position: According to Cicero, in 44–43 BCE Caesar was a loyal and active Republican consular, but hindered by his family relationship and ill health (cf. *Phil.* 12.18; *Fam.* 10.28.3; 12.2.3; 12.5.2). As to details of the fight against M. Antonius his opinion differed from Cicero's, possibly due to his family relationship (cf. *Phil.* 8.1–2).

130 In line with general practice, the name 'Octavian' will be used for the sake of clarity. Cicero's terminology in the *Philippics*, who calls him *Caesar*, is not followed in order to avoid confusion (the English translation of *Philippics* 3–9 excepted). The name 'Caesar' here denotes Octavian's adoptive father C. Iulius Caesar (cf. e.g. Bleicken 1998, 65; Southern 1998a, 21; 1998b, 53).

(21) D. IUNIUS BRUTUS ALBINUS

References: F. Münzer, s.v. *Iunius* (55a), *RE* Suppl. V (1931), 369–385; cf. also Dettenhofer 1992.

Dates: c. 81–43 BCE; since 56 officer and follower of C. Iulius Caesar (*MRR* 2.213); 49–46 legate of C. Iulius Caesar (*MRR* 2.267; 2.281; 2.291; 2.301); (probably) 45 *praetor* (*MRR* 2.307); 44–43 provincial governor of Gallia Citerior (*MRR* 2.328; 2.347), participated in the conspiracy against C. Iulius Caesar despite benefits received from him (cf. Cass. Dio 44.14.3–4), in early April 44 departed from Rome for his province; resisted M. Antonius' demand to hand over the province of Gallia Citerior, later supported by the Senate (20 December), besieged in Mutina, *imperator* because of victory over Alpine peoples (*MRR* 2.328); 43 death in flight after being condemned by Octavian; *consul designatus* for 42 by appointment of Caesar.

Family: member of the *gens Iunia* like M. Iunius Brutus (cf. nr. 22), according to Plut. *Brut.* 28.1.

Name: son of D. Iunius Brutus (cf. F. Münzer, s.v. *Iunius* [46], *RE* X 1 [1917], 968); adopted by a Postumius Albinus.

Position: D. Brutus took part in the conspiracy against Caesar and sided with the Republicans against M. Antonius. He resisted Antonius' attempts to take over the province of Gallia Citerior in late 44 BCE; that led to the war of Mutina, which was finally brought to an end by the defeats of M. Antonius in April 43.

(22) M. IUNIUS BRUTUS

References: M. Gelzer, s.v. *Iunius* (53), *RE* X 1 (1917), 973–1020; *MRR* 3.112; cf. also Bengtson 1970; Dettenhofer 1992.

Dates: c. 85–42 BCE; 53 *quaestor* under his father-in-law Appius Claudius Pulcher, provincial governor of Cilicia (*MRR* 2.229); 49 legate under P. Sestius in Cilicia (*MRR* 2.267); 46 (until spring 45) provincial governor of Gallia Citerior (*MRR* 2.297; 2.301); 44 *praetor urbanus* (*MRR* 2.321–322), prominent participant in Caesar's assassination on 15 March, later departed from Rome and then from Italy, received a new province in the summer (cf. *Phil.* 2.31; 2.97; 11.27–28; *Att.* 15.5.2), but travelled to Macedonia via Greece, military activities in Greece (cf. *Phil.* 10.11; 10.25–26; 11.27–28; *Fam.* 12.5.1; *Flor.* 2.17.4; Plut. *Brut.* 25.1–4; Cass. Dio 47.21); 43 provincial governor of Macedonia, Achaea and Illyricum (*MRR* 2.346–347).

Family: nephew of Cato Uticensis; member of the *gens Iunia* like D. Iunius Brutus Albinus (cf. nr. 21), according to Plut. *Brut.* 28.1.

Name: His official name was Q. Servilius Caepio Brutus (cf. *Phil.* 10.25; *Att.* 2.24.2) because he had been adopted by a maternal uncle called Q. Servilius Caepio in 59 (cf. Syme 1958, 176).

Literary role: extensive writings (mostly unpreserved); correspondence with Cicero; dedicatee of Cicero's *Orator* (cf. full title; *Orat.* 1) and eponymous character in his *Brutus* (cf. title; *Brut.* 20–21).

Position: M. Brutus was one of the leading members of the conspiracy against Caesar. He then opposed M. Antonius; and he conducted successful military campaigns in Greece and Macedonia.

(23) L. MARCIUS PHILIPPUS

References: F. Münzer, s.v. *Marcus* (76), *RE* XIV 2 (1930), 1568–1571; cf. also van Ooteghem 1961, 173–181; Gray-Fow 1988.

Dates: born c. 102 BCE; 62 *praetor* (*MRR* 2.173); 61–60 provincial governor of Syria (*MRR* 2.180; 2.185); 56 *consul* (*MRR* 2.207); 43 member of the first embassy to M. Antonius (*MRR* 2.350) with Ser. Sulpicius Rufus (cf. nr. 31) and L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus (cf. nr. 9).

Family: stepfather of Octavian (cf. nr. 19); his second wife was Octavian's mother Atia (since 58 or 57 BCE), daughter of a sister of Caesar and widow of the ex-*praetor* C. Octavius, who died in 59 BCE while running for the consulship (cf. F. Münzer, s.v. *Octavius* [15], *RE* XVII 2 [1937], 1806–1808).

Position: Although Philippus was Octavian's stepfather (cf. nr. 19), he advocated a cautious policy and participated in the first embassy to M. Antonius. The result of this embassy was disapproved of by Cicero, and he criticized the envoys responsible for it (cf. *Phil.* 8).

(24) L. MUNATIUS PLANCUS

References: R. Hanslik, s.v. *Munatius* (30), *RE* XVI 1 (1933), 545–551; *MRR* 3.146; cf. also Watkins 1997.

Dates: 54 BCE Caesar's envoy in Gaul (*MRR* 2.226); 46 legate of C. Iulius Caesar in Africa (*MRR* 2.302); 45 *praefectus urbis* and *praetor* (*MRR* 2.307; 2.313); 44–43 provincial governor in Gallia Ulterior except Gallia Narbonensis (*MRR* 2.329; 2.347–348), *imperator* after an expedition to Raetia (*MRR* 2.329), *consul designatus* for 42 by appointment of Caesar; 42 *consul* with M. Aemilius Lepidus (*MRR* 2.357; cf. nr. 1).

Position: Plancus constantly exchanged letters with Cicero in 44–43 BCE (cf. *Fam.* 10.1–24). He acted as if loyal, but turned out to be an unreliable partner (cf. *Phil.* 13.44; *Fam.* 11.9.2). In March 43, jointly with M. Aemilius Lepidus (cf. nr. 1), he called for peace with M. Antonius; this

proposal was rejected by the Senate (cf. *Phil.* 13.7–10; 13.49–50; *Fam.* 10.6; 10.27).

(25) SEIUS MUSTELA

Reference: F. Münzer, s.v. *Mustela* (3), *RE* XVI 1 (1933), 909.

Position: In 44–43 BCE Seius Mustela was a follower of M. Antonius (cf. *Phil.* 2.8; 2.106; 5.18; 8.26; 12.14; 13.3).

(26) NUCULA

Reference: F. Münzer, s.v. *Nucula* (1), *RE* XVII 1 (1936), 1238–1239.

Dates: 44 BCE member of the committee of *septemviri*, appointed to implement the *Lex Antonia agraria* of June 44 (cf. *MRR* 2.332–333).

Position: In 44–43 BCE Nucula was a follower of M. Antonius and one of the *septemviri*. In the *Philippics*, he is frequently mentioned, often jointly with Caesennius Lento (cf. nr. 7), as a representative of this group (cf. *Phil.* 6.14; 8.26; 11.13; 12.20; 13.2; 13.26; 13.37). Cicero claims that Nucula was a writer of mimes (cf. *Phil.* 11.13); and the implied suggestion of an association with the mime actors who surrounded M. Antonius (cf. e.g. *Phil.* 2.101; 8.26) is meant to discredit him (but cf. Klodt 2003, 56 n. 65).

(27) NUMISIUS TIRO

Reference: F. Münzer, s.v. *Numisius* (11), *RE* XVII 2 (1937), 1401.

Position: In 44–43 BCE Numisius Tiro was a follower of M. Antonius (cf. *Phil.* 2.8; 5.18; 8.26; 12.14; 13.3).

OCTAVIAN: see (19) C. IULIUS C. F. CAESAR (OCTAVIAN / AUGUSTUS)

(28) SALVIUS

Reference: F. Münzer, s.v. *Salvius* (6), *RE* I A 2 (1920), 2022–2023.

Dates: 43 BCE *tribunus plebis* (*MRR* 2.340), according to Appian moved the postponement of the decision whether M. Antonius was to be declared a public enemy during the senatorial debate in early January, and thus contributed to preventing the decree favoured by Cicero (cf. App. *B Civ.* 3.50.206–51.209; 3.52.213; 4.17.65–66).

Position: By his intervention in the senatorial debate in early January 43 BCE, Salvius acted as a defender of M. Antonius; but he is said to have cooperated with Cicero later.

(29) M. SERVILIUS

Reference: F. Münzer, s.v. *Servilius* (21), *RE* II A 2 (1923), 1766.

Dates: 43 BCE *tribunus plebis* (*MRR* 2.340); on 10 December 44 entered office, on 20 December summoned the Senate together with other tribunes, in order to have safety measures decreed for the inauguration of the new consuls (cf. *Phil.* 3.13; 3.25; 3.37), and convened the ensuing *contio* probably on his own (cf. *Phil.* 4.16); convened another *contio* in late February / early March 43 after the Senate meeting at which Cicero delivered *Philippic Eleven* (cf. *Fam.* 12.7.1); 43–42 legate under M. Iunius Brutus and C. Cassius Longinus (*MRR* 2.366).

Position: Since M. Servilius (together with his colleagues) tried to ensure that the constitutional bodies could function properly and gave Cicero the opportunity to present the results of Senate meetings to the People, he clearly supported the Republicans.

(30) P. SERVILIUS ISAURICUS

References: F. Münzer, s.v. *Servilius* (67), *RE* II A 2 (1923), 1798–1802; *MRR* 3.196.

Dates: born c. 94 BCE; 54 *praetor* (*MRR* 2.222); 48 and 41 *consul* (*MRR* 2.272; 2.370–371); 46–44 *propraetor* and later *proconsul* in Asia until Trebonius succeeded him (*MRR* 2.298; 2.309–310; 2.329; cf. *Fam.* 13.66–72); in late 44 followed Cicero's example and argued against M. Antonius in the Senate (cf. *Fam.* 12.2.1); 43 designated as a member of the second embassy to M. Antonius (*MRR* 2.351) with Q. Fufius Calenus (cf. nr. 17), L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus (cf. nr. 9), L. Iulius Caesar (cf. nr. 20) and M. Tullius Cicero (cf. nr. 33).

Position: P. Servilius Isauricus seems to have been basically sceptical about M. Antonius, but the policy pursued by him was not as fierce as that proposed by Cicero. In 43 BCE Servilius frequently spoke before Cicero in the Senate. And his motions were not always approved by Cicero (cf. *Phil.* 7.27; 9.3; 9.14; 13.50; 14.11); his position sometimes was in direct opposition to that of Cicero (cf. *Fam.* 10.12.4; *Ad Brut.* 2.2.3).

(31) SER. SULPICIUS RUFUS

References: B. Kübler, s.v. *Sulpicius* (95), *RE* IV A 1 (1931), 851–860; cf. also Bauman 1985, 4–65; Harries 2006, 117–126.

Dates: c. 105–43 BCE; 65 *praetor* (*MRR* 2.158); 51 *consul* (*MRR* 2.240–241); 46–45 provincial governor of Achaia (*MRR* 2.299, 2.310); 44 after Caesar's assassination author of a Senate decree concerning the *acta Caesaris* (cf. *Phil.* 1.3; 2.91); 43 member of the first embassy to M.

Antonius (*MRR* 2.350) with L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus (cf. nr. 9) and L. Marcius Philippus (cf. nr. 23), its compromising terms having been defined by him (cf. *Phil.* 9.7; 9.9), died during the embassy (*MRR* 2.350), rewarded by a ‘funeral speech’ proposing honours for him in *Phil.* 9 (cf. *Brut.* 150–151).

Position: Sulpicius was a friend of Cicero and a supporter of Republican policy.

(32) C. TREBONIUS

Reference: F. Münzer, s.v. *Trebonius* (6), *RE* VI A 2 (1937), 2274–2282.

Dates: 60 BCE *quaestor urbanus* (*MRR* 2.184); 48 *praetor urbanus* (*MRR* 2.273–274); 45 *consul suffectus* (*MRR* 2.305); 44 participated in the conspiracy against Caesar, later departed for his province of Asia; 43 provincial governor of Asia (*MRR* 2.349–350), assassinated by P. Cornelius Dolabella (cf. nr. 14; cf. *Phil.* 11; 12.21; 12.25; 13.22; 13.36–39; 14.8; *Fam.* 12.12.1; 12.14.5; 12.15.4; *Ad Brut.* 2.3.1; 2.3.5; *Vell. Pat.* 2.69.1; *Liv. Epit.* 119; *Oros.* 6.18.6; *App. B Civ.* 3.26.97–101; 3.61.253; 3.64.262; 4.58.248; *Cass. Dio* 47.29.1–3; *Zonar.* 10.18; *Strabo* 14.1.37 [C 646]).

Position: Trebonius was a member of the conspiracy against Caesar and therefore was opposed by the Caesarians.

(33) M. TULLIUS CICERO

References: M. Gelzer / W. Kroll / R. Philippson / K. Büchner, s.v. *Tullius* (29): *M. Tullius Cicero*, *RE* VII A 1 (1939), 827–1274; cf. also e.g. Büchner 1964; Seel 1967; Gelzer 1969; Shackleton Bailey 1971; Stockton 1971; Mitchell 1975; Rawson 1975; Grimal 1986 / 1988; Habicht 1990; Fuhrmann 1997 / 1992; Wiedemann 1994; Everitt 2001.

Dates: 3 January 106 – 7 December 43 BCE; 81 first published speech (*Pro Quinctio*); 80 first court case, defence of Sextus Roscius from Ameria against Chrysogonus, a freedman of the dictator Sulla (*Pro Sexto Roscio Amerino*); 66 *praetor* (*MRR* 2.152), first political speech (*De imperio Cn. Pompei* or *De lege Manilia*); 63 *consul* (*MRR* 2.165–166), fight against the Catilinarian Conspiracy (*In Catilinam* 1–4); 58–57 exile; 53(–43) *augur* (*MRR* 2.233; 2.255); during Caesar’s dictatorship withdrew from politics (cf. e.g. *Orat.* 148; *Top.* 4–5); 44 *legatus* without special mission (*MRR* 2.331); 43 designated as a member of the second embassy to M. Antonius (*MRR* 2.351) with Q. Fufius Calenus (cf. nr. 17), L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus (cf. nr. 9), L. Iulius Caesar (cf. nr. 20) and P. Servilius Isauricus

(cf. nr. 30), in autumn proscribed by the triumvirs as one of their first victims.

(34) L. VARIUS COTYLA

Reference: H. Gundel, s.v. *Varius* (6), *RE* VIII A 1 (1955), 386–387.

Dates: 43 BCE *aedilicius* (cf. *Phil.* 8.24), probably 44 *aedilis* (*MRR* 2.323); on 20 December 44 defended M. Antonius in the Senate (*Phil.* 5.5); 43 envoy of M. Antonius (*MRR* 2.351; cf. *Phil.* 8.24; 8.28; 8.32; 8.33).

Name: Varius' *cognomen* is derived from κοτύλη, meaning 'drinking vessel / pouring vessel' (cf. F. Leonard, s.v. *Kotyle* [1], *RE* XI 2 [1922], 1542–1546). The form of this name is not unanimously transmitted in the Ciceronian manuscripts (cf. *Phil.* 5.5; 5.7; 8.24; 8.28; 13.26). On the name cf. Plut. *Ant.* 18.8: Κοτύλωνα, *CIL* XII 5686.274: *Cotulo*; cf. *TLL* *Onom.* II 677.60–67, s.v. *Cotyla*; *MRR* 3.216; Shackleton Bailey 1991, 46; Magnaldi 2002, 72–74.

Position: Cotyla was a close friend and loyal supporter of M. Antonius (cf. *Phil.* 8.24; 13.26).

(35) C. VIBIUS PANSA CAETRONIANUS

References: H. Gundel, s.v. *Vibius* (16), *RE* VIII A 2 (1958), 1953–1965; *MRR* 3.220–221.

Dates: 51 BCE *tribunus plebis* (*MRR* 2.241); 48 *praetor* (*MRR* 2.274); 47–46 provincial governor of Bithynia (*MRR* 2.290; 2.299); 45 provincial governor of Gallia Citerior as successor of M. Iunius Brutus (*MRR* 2.310); 43 *consul* with A. Hirtius (cf. nr. 18) by appointment of Caesar (*MRR* 2.334–336), wounded in the battle of Forum Gallorum, died of his injuries shortly after the battle of Mutina (23 April).

Family: son of a man proscribed by Sulla (cf. Cass. Dio 45.17.1); son-in-law of Q. Fufius Calenus (cf. nr. 17; cf. *Phil.* 8.19; 10.6).

Literary role: oratorical student with Cicero (cf. *Att.* 14.12.2; *Fam.* 9.18; Quint. *Inst.* 12.11.6; Suet. *Gram.* 25.3; Sen. *Controv.* 1, *praef.* 11).

Position: Pansa and his consular colleague in 43 BCE seem basically to have supported Republican ideas, but they were reluctant to introduce fierce measures against M. Antonius.

3. The corpus of the *Philippics*

3.1. Title

The name *Philippics* / *orationes Philippicae* for a corpus of political speeches composed by Cicero in the course of the conflict with Marcus Antonius goes back to Cicero himself, as evidence from his letters shows (cf. *Ad Brut.* 2.3.4; 2.4.2).¹³¹ Giving titles to groups of his speeches seems to have been a practice familiar to Cicero at this stage, as can be inferred from his remarks on his *orationes consulares* in a letter to Atticus (cf. *Att.* 2.1.3): *orationes, quae consulares nominarentur* ('orations, which might be called 'consular'). The designation for the *Philippics*, however, was not developed from their concrete circumstances; instead, it was coined after the model of Demosthenes' speeches against king Philip II of Macedon (cf. Intr. 3.5.). And that Cicero intended to refer to Demosthenes (and thus related the Greek orator's literary and political position to himself) was already recognized by ancient authors (cf. Juv. 10.114–132; App. *B Civ.* 4.20.77).

To illustrate the significance of Cicero's name for his orations, some relevant facts about Demosthenes' speeches against Philip need to be sketched briefly.

The prolific Greek orator Demosthenes (384–322 BCE)¹³² delivered his speeches against Philip between 351 and 341 BCE. These speeches refer to the conflict between Athens and Macedon and are directed against king Philip II of Macedon (ruled: 359–336 BCE). They discuss issues such as appropriate war tactics or the procurement of necessary funds; they oppose the party in Athens that is friendly towards Macedon; and they aim at winning allies in order to establish a united Greek front against Philip. Demosthenes' orations could not prevent the eventual defeat of Athens at

131 Cf. e.g. Fuhrmann 1982, 81 = 1993, 587; 1997, 250 / 1992, 178; Strohm 1983a, 48–49.

132 For more recent overviews of Demosthenes cf. e.g. Sealey 1993; Usher 1999, 171–278; Worthington 2000 (all with bibliography); for bibliographical information cf. also Karvounis 2002, 15–43.

Chaeronea in 338; nevertheless they have been regarded as high points of oratory since antiquity. In 340 and 339 Demosthenes was honoured by a golden crown from the populace. In 336 the Athenian citizen Ctesiphon proposed to the assembly that Demosthenes should receive a crown for his outstanding services to the city, which was to be given to him in a formal ceremony in the theatre at the Great Dionysia. Aeschines, intending to attack Demosthenes, prosecuted Ctesiphon because of the alleged illegality of this proposal in his speech *Against Ctesiphon*. In this trial, which took place in 330, Demosthenes pleaded for the defence and delivered his speech *On the crown* (Περὶ στεφάνου); in this speech he successfully defended Ctesiphon and gave a retrospective account and justification of his own policy.

The cycle of Demosthenes' speeches dealing with Philip consists of four speeches entitled *Against Philip* in a narrower sense. But there are twelve works altogether (with various titles) belonging to this conflict, which are conventionally arranged as follows: Ὀλυνθιακός 1–3 / *Olynthiacs* 1–3 (Or. 1–3), Κατὰ Φιλίππου 1 / *Against Philip* 1 (Or. 4), Περὶ τῆς εἰρήνης / *On the peace* (Or. 5), Κατὰ Φιλίππου 2 / *Against Philip* 2 (Or. 6), Περὶ Ἀλοννήσου / *On the Halonnesos* (Or. 7), Περὶ τῶν ἐν Χερρονήσῳ / *On the matters in the Chersonesos* (Or. 8), Κατὰ Φιλίππου 3–4 / *Against Philip* 3–4 (Or. 9–10), Πρὸς τὴν ἐπιστολὴν Φιλίππου / *In response to Philip's letter* (Or. 11), Ἐπιστολὴ Φιλίππου / *Philip's letter* (Or. 12) or (sometimes in its place) Περὶ συντάξεως / *On organization* (Or. 13).¹³³

The collection of these orations probably does not go back to Demosthenes himself, but was put together by later scholars.¹³⁴ At any rate, it is an instance of a coherent group of published political speeches connected by common subject matter. The whole group, as well as individual speeches from this group, was entitled Φιλίππικοὶ λόγοι (*Philippic Orations*) in antiquity, even if the title does not seem to have been coined by Demosthenes himself.¹³⁵ In fact, the group consists of only eleven orations belonging to the fight against Philip (some of which may be spurious). These were supplemented by *Philip's letter* (Or. 12) as a

133 For a convenient summary of the contents of these speeches cf. Usher 1999, 217–226, 230–234, 237–243.

134 On the transmission of the Demosthenic corpus cf. Sealey 1993, 221–229; Dilts 2002, v–xv; on questions of authenticity cf. Sealey 1993, 230–240 (with bibliography).

135 For instance, Dionysius of Halicarnassus called the *Olynthiacs* 'Speeches against Philip' in the section on Demosthenes in his Περὶ ἀρχαίων ῥητόρων (cf. *Dem.* 21; 43).

twelfth element, which is included in two of the four primary manuscripts of Demosthenes' speeches (according to Dilts' edition); or they were combined with the speech *On organization* (*Or.* 13) in twelfth place (for instance, in Didymus' commentary on Demosthenes), although ancient commentators already criticized this arrangement.¹³⁶ Since in his discussion of Demosthenes' speeches Dionysius of Halicarnassus puts *Olynthiac Three* (*Or.* 3) in first place and divides *Against Philip One* (*Or.* 4) into two separate speeches, he again comes up with a different order and numbering of the speeches within this group. In his version the eleventh speech in modern numbering is the last one in the corpus of speeches against Philip;¹³⁷ in the end he too arrives at a corpus of twelve speeches.¹³⁸ Editions of Cicero's time are most likely to have given a corpus of twelve speeches (as in Didymus), all of them considered as Demosthenic.

That Cicero intended to refer to this Demosthenic group of speeches by describing his speeches against Marcus Antonius as *Philippics* has been *communis opinio* since antiquity (cf. also Intr. 3.2.2.). This belief has not

136 On the status of *Or.* 13 cf. Harpokration, p. 207.14 Dindorf: μόραν· Δημοσθένους Φιλίππικοῖς [Dem. *Or.* 13.22]; p. 260.4 Dindorf: προπύλαια ταῦτα· Δημοσθένους Φιλίππικοῖς [Dem. *Or.* 13.28]; Schol. on Dem. *Or.* 13 (p. 163.2–6 Dilts 1983): ὁ περὶ συντάξεως λόγος οὐκ ἔχει μὲν προφανῆ τὸν χρόνον, εἰκάσειε δ' ἂν τις αὐτὸν εἰρῆσθαι πρὸ τῶν Φιλίππικῶν, ἀφεστηκότων μὲν ἤδη τῶν συμμάχων. Ῥοδίων δὲ ὀλιγαρχουμένων. ὥστε, ὅσοι συντάττουσιν αὐτὸν τοῖς Φιλίππικοῖς, ἡγνοήκασιν παντελῶς ὅτι τῶν Φιλίππικῶν ἐστὶ προγενέστερος. : Didymus, col. 13, heading (p. 88 Harding): [Ῥ]τι οὐκ (ἔστι) τῶν Φιλίππικῶν ὁ λό[γος], Δημοσθένους δ(ὲ) ἄλλως, and ll. 18–25 (p. 90 Harding), whereas it is included as the twelfth (Philippic) speech in his *On Demosthenes* according to the *subscriptio*, following other scholars of his time (p. 96 Harding: Διδύμου περὶ Δημοσθένους κη Φιλίππικῶν γ'. Θ Πολλῶν, ὧ ἄνδ(ρες) Ἀθ(ηναῖοι) [*Or.* 9], Ἴ Καὶ σπουδαῖα ν[ο]μίζ(ων) [*Or.* 10], Ἰ[Α] [Ῥ]τι μ(έν) ὧ (ἄνδρες) Ἀθ(ηναῖοι) Φ[ιλίπ]πος [*Or.* 11], ΙΒ Περὶ μ[ε]ν τ[ο]ῦ π(αρ)όν(τος) [*Or.* 13]. – cf. Harding 2006, 216; Libanius, *Arg. Dem. Or.* 13: ὁ λόγος οὗτος οὐκέτι Φιλίππικός ἐστιν, ἀλλ' ἀπλῶς συμβουλευτικός. – On this problem cf. Stroth 1983a, 38–40.

137 Cf. Dion. Hal. *Ad Ammaeum* 10 (p. 271.4–8 Usener / Radermacher): καὶ ἔστιν αὕτη τελευταία τῶν κατὰ Φιλίππου δημηγοριῶν. ἄρχῃν ἔχουσα ταύτην· ὅτι μὲν ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι Φίλιππος οὐκ ἐποίησατο τὴν εἰρήνην πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ἀλλ' ἀνεβάλετο τὸν πόλεμον [Dem. *Or.* 11.1].

138 On dating and arrangement of Demosthenes' speeches against Philip and the divergent opinion of Dionysius of Halicarnassus cf. the collection and discussion of the relevant evidence in Böhnecke 1843, 222–278. – Since Dionysius of Halicarnassus divides one of the speeches against Philip into two and since Didymus criticizes a tradition followed by him, the evidence of their works does not allow the conclusion that the corpus originally contained eleven speeches (so Canfora 1974, 49–51).

really been shaken by the hypothesis of J. Gagé (1952)¹³⁹ that this title referred to a L. Marcius Philippus.¹⁴⁰ Gagé pointed to the fact that in 77 BCE L. Marcius Philippus initiated a *senatus consultum ultimum* against the proconsul M. Aemilius Lepidus, sent the young Cn. Pompeius against M. Iunius Brutus, a legate under Lepidus, and besieged him in Mutina (cf. e.g. Plut. *Pomp.* 16–17). He also mentioned that Cicero praised the oratorical talent of this Marcius Philippus several times and that an important speech by him was preserved as a fragment of Sallust's *Historiae* (fr. I 76, 77 Maurenbrecher). But particularly the parallel to Cicero's *orationes consulares*, for which Cicero explicitly mentions Demosthenes' speeches against Philip as a model (cf. *Att.* 2.1.3; cf. Intr. 3.2.2.), and Cicero's test of this description in a letter to an Atticist (cf. *Ad Brut.* 2.3.4) indicate almost beyond doubt that an allusion to Demosthenes was intended.

Cicero sent copies of some of his speeches that are called *Philippics* today to M. Iunius Brutus and used the term *Philippicae* (*orationes*) for them in one of his letters. This letter and perhaps others referring to this context are lost, but that detail can be inferred from an answer by M. Iunius Brutus and Cicero's reaction to that, which survive. In a letter written on 1 April 43 BCE M. Brutus commented approvingly on two speeches he had received and on their potential appellation (*Ad Brut.* 2.3.4): *legi orationes duas tuas, quarum altera Kal. Ian. usus es [Phil. 5], altera de litteris meis, quae habita est abs te contra Calenum [Phil. 10]. nunc [codd. : non Shackleton Bailey] scilicet hoc exspectas, dum eas laudem. nescio animi an ingeni tui maior in his libellis laus contineatur. iam concedo, ut vel Philippici vocentur, quod tu quadam epistula iocans scripsisti.* – 'I have read your two speeches, the one you made on the Kalends of January and the one concerning my dispatch which you delivered against Calenus. Now you will probably be waiting for me to praise them. I don't know whether these pieces say more for your spirit or for your genius. I am now willing to let them be called by the proud name of 'Philippics,' as you jestingly suggested in one of your letters.' [trans. Shackleton Bailey, adapted].¹⁴¹

139 Contra e.g. Boulanger / Willeumier 1972, 30; Martín 2001, 57–58; Cristofoli 2004, 5–6.

140 Cf. F. Münzer, s.v. *Marcus* (75), *RE* XIV 2 (1930), 1562–1568 (consul in 91 BCE).

141 The brief references to the contents of the two speeches received by M. Iunius Brutus show that these are *Philippics Five* and *Ten* (cf. Shackleton Bailey 1980, 227, ad loc.: 1986, xi) and not *Philippics Five* and *Seven* (but cf. Burnand 2000, 146; Shackleton Bailey 2002, 210–211 n. 3, ad loc.; Steel 2005, 105) or *Philippics Five* and *Nine* (but cf. Terry / Upton 1969, xxii n. 1). – Bellardi (1978, 371/372 n. 1)

This reaction suggests that Cicero's introduction of the term was not a mere joke (as characterized by M. Brutus); instead, a seemingly light-hearted remark seems to have covered a kind of cautious inquiry about whether that phrase might be applied to these speeches, which thereby are implicitly compared with those of Demosthenes. Deliberately, it was addressed to a friend, who was equally rhetorically educated, experienced in Atticism, favoured the slender Attic style and admired Demosthenes (cf. *Att.* 15.1a.2; *Orat.* 105; 110). M. Brutus answered politely in the same light mood and eventually approvingly. Cicero seems to have been glad about this 'permission', which also acknowledged an Attic character and the rhetorical quality of his speeches (cf. *Intr.* 3.5.). At any rate, in a further letter to M. Brutus, written on 12 April 43, Cicero used the accepted term without qualification (*Ad Brut.* 2.4.2): *de te etiam dixi tum quae dicenda putavi. haec ad te oratio [Phil. 11] perferetur, quoniam te video delectari Philippicis nostris.* – 'I also said what I thought proper about yourself. The speech will be sent to you, since I see you enjoy my Philippics.' [trans. Shackleton Bailey].¹⁴²

The term *Philippici (libelli) / Philippicae (orationes)* is employed in the plural both by M. Brutus and by Cicero. Hence, it is obvious that Cicero did not intend it to be used just for one individual speech, but rather for a group of speeches. And M. Brutus commented on it after he had received several speeches dealing with the same subject matter. Because of the indefinite reference *quadam epistula*, M. Brutus probably does not refer to the letter accompanying *Philippics Five* and *Ten*, but rather to another (lost) one, in which Cicero 'tested' the term *Philippics*. This letter is most likely

seems to refer the remarks in *Ad Brut.* 2.4.2 to *Philippic Five* as well, but they concern *Philippic Eleven*. – Plasberg (1926, 171) obviously did not pay sufficient attention to the context and therefore believed that the term '*Philippicae*' was coined by M. Brutus. – Shackleton Bailey (1980, 103, 227; 2002, 210) suggested changing *nunc scilicet* to *non scilicet* in *Ad Brut.* 2.3.4, since otherwise the passage had to be understood ironically and could easily be taken wrongly. But this alteration of the text seems unnecessary.

142 On the interpretation of these letters cf. Stroh 1983a, 49–50; 2000, 97–98; cf. Brighthouse 1903, xi; Shackleton Bailey 1986, xi; Dugan 2005, 335–336. – Canfora (1974, 49–51) thought that the appellation was a 'facezia' of Cicero and he never seriously intended it; however, that is not an adequate explanation of the function of this 'joke'. Besides, Canfora believed that if Cicero had really wanted to establish a connection, he would have followed the model of eleven Demosthenic speeches (cf. n. 138 above). – A similar reason, a *delectare* of the addressee by his speeches, is given by Cicero for sending his consular speeches to Atticus (cf. *Att.* 2.1.3).

to have been connected with *Philippic Three*, which opens the cycle and exhibits numerous Demosthenic features (cf. Intr. 3.2.2.). That would mean that M. Brutus did not immediately react to *Philippic Three* or at least did not comment on the description suggested by Cicero, but only after he had read *Philippics Five* and *Ten*, whereby he extended this term to further speeches from the same context. Thus, as in the case of the *orationes consulares* (cf. *Att.* 2.1.3: σῶμα ‘corpus’; cf. Intr. 3.2.2.), several self-contained but connected Ciceronian orations are defined as a coherent corpus (after the model of Demosthenes).¹⁴³

To give a Greek title to a work in Latin and thus refer to Greek precedents, was not new or remarkable in Rome. It had been common practice in Roman literature since its beginnings and particularly for Roman Republican dramatists. But Cicero’s appellation *Philippicae* (*orationes*), by which he lays claim to a Greek title for his speeches, merits special attention since it describes a different kind of relationship to the model:¹⁴⁴ Cicero’s term does not indicate that a Greek work has been transformed into Latin more or less freely, but rather that an independent Latin work on a separate, yet similar subject is composed after a Greek model in topic, structure and aim. Thus the connection to the model materializes only as a second step as it were since this influence gives a certain literary and rhetorical shape to the historical situation. This title thereby indicates that Cicero intended to emulate Demosthenes as an oratorical and political model.

That Cicero himself called a group of speeches *Philippicae* (*orationes*) and that this term was known as their title in antiquity is confirmed by various sources using that phrase as a title or commenting on it (cf. Quint. *Inst.* 3.8.46; Plut. *Cic.* 24.6; 48.6; Lactant. *Div. inst.* 2.3.5; 6.18.28). At the same time the speeches are referred to as *orationes Antonianae* or *orationes in Antonium* in other contexts, named after M. Antonius according to their subject matter (cf. Gell. 1.16.5; 1.22.17; 6.11.3; 13.1.1; 13.22.6; Quint. *Inst.* 8.4.8; 8.6.70; Macrobi. *Sat.* 1.5.5; cf. Plut. *Ant.* 20.3). And some of the authors who use the title *Philippicae* are aware of this contrast: the name

143 On this process cf. Stroh 2000, 80. – On σῶμα cf. Birt 1882, 36–43; for the corresponding Latin word cf. Suet. *Gram.* 6.2: *dimissa autem schola, Rutilius Rufum damnatum in Asiam secutus ibidem Zmyrnae simul consenuit* [i.e. Aurelius Opillus] *composuitque variae eruditionis aliquot volumina, ex quibus novem unius corporis, quae – quia scriptores ac poetas sub clientela Musarum iudicaret – non absurde et fecisse et <in>scripsisse se ait ex numero divanum et appellatione.*

144 Cf. Classen (on Stroh) 1982, 35.

was chosen by Cicero, but the speeches in fact are *orationes in Antonium* (cf. Plut. *Cic.* 24.6; 48.6; App. *B Civ.* 4.20.77). Significantly Lactantius, who apparently did not understand the meaning and intention of Cicero's description, called them *alieno titulo inscriptas* 'inscribed with a foreign title' (cf. *Div. inst.* 6.18.28).

In order to explain the different names used in the sources people have suggested that the title '*Philippicae*', found in the Ciceronian manuscripts, had won general acceptance with the exception of the rhetorical tradition, which maintained the simple title, or that the phrase '*Philippicae*' was the unofficial title besides the perhaps more correct term '*Antoniana*'.¹⁴⁵ However, one cannot simply distinguish between authors following different traditions since Quintilian, for instance, knows and uses both the terms *Philippicae* and *In Antonium* (cf. *Inst.* 3.8.46 vs. 8.4.9; 8.6.70).

Another explanation regards the existence of different forms of the title as an indication of the genesis of the corpus and sees the occurrence of both forms in one author as a hint of a later, more imprecise use of terminology (cf. *Intr.* 3.2.2.).¹⁴⁶ That means that *Philippic Two*, an invective against M. Antonius, though probably not originally part of what Cicero envisaged to be the corpus of the *Philippics*, would be called *In Antonium*, but the corpus proper would be termed *Philippicae*. This theory is plausible on the basis of the distribution of terms in Quintilian since he uses the term *Philippicae* for a general reference (cf. *Inst.* 3.8.46) and the title *In Antonium* with respect to *Philippic Two* (cf. *Inst.* 8.4.9; 8.6.70).

The picture changes, however, if one looks to other authors: Gellius, for instance, employed not only the collective title (*orationes*) *Antoniana* (cf. 1.22.17; 6.11.3; 13.1.1; 13.22.6), but also the very expression *In Antonium* with reference to *Philippic Six*, and the context suggests that he regarded it as a collective title of the corpus as well (cf. 1.16.5). Juvenal (10.125–126) famously called *Philippic Two* the *divina Philippica* and considered it as the second item in a group denoted by this title.¹⁴⁷ That demonstrates that at least in later periods the terms *orationes in Antonium* /

145 Cf. Boulanger / Wuilleumier 1972, 31; Narducci 1992, 197.

146 Cf. Stroh 1983a, 46–47; 2000, 85. – To support his theory, Stroh (1983a, 46–47) posited a new edition of Cicero's speeches in the period between Quintilian and Juvenal, which abandoned the original composition of the corpus and assembled fourteen *Philippics* as extant today.

147 Juvenal thereby had a strong influence on the use of the term in modern languages even if originally this speech might not have belonged to the *Philippics* proper in Cicero's view; it is at any rate an atypical 'speech against Antonius' (cf. *Intr.* 3.2.2.).

orationes Antonianae and *orationes Philippicae* existed besides each other as titles of the whole corpus (and of individual speeches), denoting the historical and the literary aspect respectively.

3.2. Publication

3.2.1. Delivered vs. published versions

The general problems of how, when and why speeches were published after delivery and of the relationship between the delivered and the published versions apply to all Roman speeches, but are particularly relevant to the *Philippics*, since these speeches have been collected into a coherent corpus and reflect a number of selected occasions within an extended process (cf. Intr. 3.2.2.).

All ancient speeches are extant as written versions, which were usually drawn up by the orator himself after the event (since orators typically did not use scripts for delivery). That means that the appropriate analysis of these orations is heavily influenced by the question of whether or to what extent they were delivered in their transmitted form or, in other words, of whether they were revised before ‘publication’, i.e. before distribution as written scripts beyond the original audience (among friends or a larger reading public).¹⁴⁸

For Cicero, the publication of speeches after their delivery was a matter of course (cf. *Off.* 2.3). Among other indications, that may be inferred from the fact that he mentions the practice of publishing speeches and some of its extant exemplars in the *Brutus* and frequently uses his own speeches or passages from them as examples in his rhetorical and

148 On the relationship between the delivered and the published versions of Cicero’s speeches and possible reasons for publication (with divergent views) cf. esp. Humbert 1925; Laurant 1936–40, 1.1–23; Settle 1962, 60–67; Stroh 1975, 31–54 (against Humbert); Crawford 1984, esp. 3–21; Classen 1985, 2–8; Newbound 1986, 143–155; Enos 1988 (with reference to forensic speeches); Fogel 1994, 263–269; Riggsby 1999, 178–184; Blänsdorf 2001; Butler 2002, esp. 71–84 (with reference to the *Verines*); Craig 2002a, 515–517 (with bibliography); Heil 2003; Morstein-Marx 2004, 25–30; Powell / Paterson 2004, 52–57 (with reference to lawcourt speeches); Dugan 2005, 2 and n. 3, 9; Steel 2005; 2006, 25–43; on the relationship between ‘orality’, ‘literacy’ and ‘fictitious orality’ in the case of ancient speeches and their publication cf. Fuhrmann 1990.

philosophical works; sometimes he even says that these speeches are available in writing (cf. e.g. *Off.* 2.51; *Brut.* 312; *Orat.* 103; 108; 131; 167; 210; 225). And Cicero seems to have regarded a certain polishing before publication as possible or necessary (cf. *Rosc. Am.* 3).

By publishing speeches Cicero followed usual practice in Rome, where orators wrote their speeches down after delivery, maybe revised them, asked friends for advice and corrected factual details.¹⁴⁹ The crucial question is the extent of this revision; in modern literature various opinions on the relation between the delivered and the published versions of Cicero's speeches can be found. Some scholars think that the published speeches, particularly the forensic ones, only have a slight connection with the orations originally delivered, since they have been assembled out of various utterances made in the course of the court case. Others believe that the publication has to be regarded as a separate literary act, which retains the main thread of the argument, but leaves out or adds details with a view to an audience further removed in time and place. There is also the view that the published speech reflects an ideal oration which should have been delivered on that occasion. Or, according to some critics, the published speeches basically reflect the delivered ones and have been revised only with respect to style and minor details.

Decisive ancient evidence is scarce; significant instances are the following: the *Pro Milone* is said to have been reworked entirely before its distribution (cf. Schol. Bob. on *Mil.* [p. 112.11–13 St.]; Quint. *Inst.* 4.3.17; Plut. *Cic.* 35); this instance shows that such a high degree of revision is possible, but not common practice, so that it is noted as a remarkable feature. Nepos' remark that a speech was delivered in his presence almost in the same words in which it has been published does not necessarily highlight the exceptional fact that a speech has been edited without major changes, but may point to the situation that in this case agreement of the delivered and the published versions can be proved by autopsy (cf. Nep. fr. 38 Marshall).¹⁵⁰ Cicero testifies to a similar correspondence with reference to a speech by Hortensius (cf. *Brut.* 328).

149 On the revision of texts before publication according to the advice of friends cf. e.g. *Att.* 1.13.5; 15.1a.2; Plin. *Ep.* 1.2. – After the publication of a text suggestions for changes could not be taken up any more (cf. *Att.* 13.20.2); only if comments by others at this point in time revealed obvious errors, one might still try to correct them (cf. *Att.* 13.44.3).

150 Cf. Riggsby 1999, 178 and n. 3 (p. 228). – On this speech cf. Crawford 1994, 63–144.

This evidence suggests that the published versions are relatively close to the delivered ones; and among modern scholars the assumption of a basic similarity between delivered and published speeches and of a limited reworking seems to be the prevailing opinion. General outline, tenor and intention of an oration will be maintained, but details will be revised; there will be a certain amount of tidying-up, such as stylistic changes, putting greater emphasis on some aspects, adding supporting elements, improving the argument, providing a smoother train of thought or rejecting objections of opponents more forcefully; more polishing might be necessary for lawcourt speeches than for political speeches due to the constraints of the court procedure at the time of delivery.¹⁵¹

This view has been supported by the following points. Cicero's rhetorical works exhibit no indications of a principle of major revision; he quotes from his speeches without distinguishing between oral and written versions; he mentions extant published speeches of earlier orators as examples or documents of their individual style in the *Brutus*; he regards his own published speeches as models for young orators (cf. e.g. *Att.* 2.1.3; 4.2.2; cf. *Brut.* 122–123), and these (youthful) followers are eager for examples of real oratory; in the rhetorical tradition the published speech is seen as a record of the delivered one (cf. Quint. *Inst.* 12.10.51) or as an *exemplar* of the delivered oration (cf. Plin. *Ep.* 1.20.6–10). And since in ancient rhetoric published speeches are nowhere regarded as a separate genre, it is improbable, particularly with a view to the contemporary situation, that speeches published soon after their delivery were completely reworked in substance.

Although publishing speeches was common practice in Rome, orators are known not to have issued all their orations, but only those that were regarded as suitable and conducive to their respective purposes; they

151 Cf. Morstein-Marx 2004, 26: "Even so, at present the debate seems to be favoring proponents of the view that the published speeches are, in substance and form, fair, if not by our standards exact, reflections of the oral original: the 'commemoration of a speech delivered,' as Quintilian puts it. ... On the other hand, in the usual instance – the subsequent publication of an actually delivered speech that was, and was known to have been, delivered in full – there is no good evidence that the published versions distort the content or form of the original. On the contrary, the (admittedly exiguous) evidence we have for Cicero's editing of written versions implies that while stylistic improvements, for example, were made as a matter of course, accuracy in representing the arguments actually employed and the circumstances of the speech was valued and expected."

considered whether the effort of publishing promised to be worthwhile with respect to the expected consequences, depending on the contents and occasion of the speech (cf. *Fam.* 9.12.2). An eventual publication may be intended to present the speech as an influential rhetorical and political model, i.e. to ensure the lasting rhetorical and literary presence of the author and to extend the political effect of a speech beyond the original audience, and thus to further the author's career and his standing in contemporary society.¹⁵²

Cicero certainly intended to have a literary impact and win literary glory by his published speeches as by his other literary works.¹⁵³ This is indicated, for instance, by the fact that he discussed the improvement of individual passages with friends and was eager for his friends' assessment (cf. e.g. *Att.* 1.13.5), as in the case of *Philippic Two* (cf. *Att.* 15.13.1; 15.13.7 [= 15.13a.3]; 16.11.1–2). However, this intention probably does not completely cover the motivation for the publication of speeches. For in the same letters Cicero asked his friend Atticus whether or when *Philippic Two* would be properly published and become known to a broader public. Cicero obviously was aware of the fact that this speech contained politically problematic statements, which prevented its immediate publication. Still, he composed such a text even if he did not know when or whether he would achieve literary fame thereby beyond his circle of friends. Yet in the case of political speeches particularly, their

152 Cf. e.g. Brunt 1988, 47–49; Heil 2003, 39–41. – On Cicero's reasons for publication or non-publication cf. Crawford 1984, 3–21. – That a speech was written down by a member of the audience and distributed according to the aims pursued by that person is another way of 'publication', which can be disregarded in this context.

153 Settle (1962, 46–54) believes that Cicero regarded his published speeches mainly as literary works, which were received by a broad and unspecified reading public. For in one of his letters, answering D. Lentulus' question after his *scripta* ('writings'), Cicero mentioned orations, rhetorical treatises and poetic works next to each other (cf. *Fam.* 1.9.23 [Dec. 54 BCE]). However, in this letter Cicero assured the addressee that he had not written a great number of speeches and distinguished his orations from the *mansuetiores Musae* ('gentler Muses'), to whom he was just turning more intensively, having moved away from speeches. Even if it is uncertain whether this distinction is based on a literary belief or on the political situation, it is clear that Cicero regards speeches as a literary genre distinct from others. That the argument only deals with the literary status of the respective texts seems due to the fact that the letter is directed to an addressee interested in literature.

distribution was also intended to have a political effect (at any rate on friends, who might spread it).

This aim holds true even for speeches not delivered, but only distributed as pamphlets, and this function seems to have been particularly common in the Late Republic. Speeches delivered and published afterwards can reach an audience beyond the original one extending across the Roman empire, which may function as an important contribution to and reinforcement of one's political strategy. For a wider audience becomes involved, and arguments and points of view can be presented more convincingly and may be better remembered when they are received under different circumstances and separately from the specific political debate. Especially when conflicts extend over longer periods and are not decided at one occasion, the publication of a speech soon after its delivery may influence future developments.

When Cicero says in 63 BCE that he publishes speeches *adulescentulorum studiis excitatus* 'moved by the enthusiasm of young admirers' (cf. *Att.* 2.1.3; cf. *Att.* 4.2.2); it is unclear whether the eagerness and interest of these young men refer to political, rhetorical or literary aspects or to several of these. A combination of self-presentation and self-fashioning, information about and pursuit of political programmes, education of young orators and literary intentions, as assumed by the majority of modern scholars, seems to be the most plausible motivation for the publication of Cicero's speeches. The relative importance of these components may vary according to the respective situation.

There is not much external evidence on the 'publication' of Cicero's *Philippics*, but some indications can be inferred from the texts themselves and from a few references in Cicero's letters.¹⁵⁴ A general distinction has to be made between the individual publication of single speeches and the collection of several orations into a corpus.¹⁵⁵

154 Kelly (2007) remarks that at no other time in his career did Cicero publish so many political speeches so quickly. He explains this by the increased importance of distributing written statements in the last years of the Roman Republic and by the political tension of this conflict (cf. also Steel 2005, esp. 27–28, 105–106, 145–146).

155 Monteleone (2005, 121–123) does not clearly distinguish between these two kinds of distribution and therefore connects the fact that *Philippics One* and *Two* have been sent to friends individually with his view that *Philippic Three* is the first *Philippic* in the Demosthenic sense (cf. *Intr.* 3.2.2.).

Philippic Two is a special case, since this speech is attested to have never been delivered, but only distributed as a pamphlet among friends when it had been written: Cicero sent it to Atticus and asked him to pass it on to some other people, but to withhold it from his opponents. As regards a wider-ranging publication, Cicero doubted whether that would be possible in the near future; he envisaged it only for the time after the return of the Republic (cf. *Att.* 15.13.1; 15.13.7 [= 15.13a.3]; 16.11.1–2). That means that in stating his view of himself and of M. Antonius Cicero wrote both for the purposes of the immediate struggle and for future readers.¹⁵⁶

156 Against the *communis opinio* that *Philippic Two* was never actually delivered (cf. e.g. Sternkopf 1913, 6; Ehrenwirth 1971, 88; Castorina 1975, 149; Fuhrmann 1982, 104, 135–136 = 1993, 610, 626–627; 1997, 254, 288 / 1992, 181, 205; Brunt 1988, 48; Gotter 1996, 17; Burnand 2000, 148–149; Marinone 2004, 236; Dugan 2005, 337; Steel 2005, 28, 141; Kelly 2007), Cerutti (1994; 1996, 159–160) argued (cf. sceptically Marinone 2004, 498) that the speech was delivered at a Senate meeting probably on 10 October 44 BCE (after Antonius had left Rome) and was published soon afterwards (at least in certain circles). But the length and structure of this speech as well as Cicero's remarks in his letters to Atticus show that Cicero did not deliver this speech and hesitated to publish it. The outline of a speech allegedly presented on 19 September in response to a preceding speech by Antonius (e.g. by referring to the situation and by not mentioning any event after this date) would have been strange if the oration was delivered on 10 October. – It is widely believed that *Philippic Two* was published in late November or early December 44 without the notion of 'publication' being clearly defined. For it is assumed that the speech need no longer be suppressed after Antonius had left Rome in late November 44 and that its distribution might further Cicero's political aims (cf. e.g. Nohl 1895, VI; Brighthouse 1903, xxvii, xxxi; Turberville 1928, 16; Motzo 1932/33, 22; Mack 1937, 63; Remy 1941, 2.139; Settle 1962, 279; Terry / Upton 1969, xxi, xxv; McDermott 1972, 279 n. 11; Castorina 1975, 149; Shackleton Bailey 1986, 31; Watkins 1997, 61; Burnand 2000, 148–149; Eich 2000, 207; Zecchini 2001, 17; Monteleone 2003, 36 n. 131 [p. 93]; 2005, 122 n. 2; Cristofoli 2004, 8–9; Marinone 2004, 236 and n. 2; Dugan 2005, 341; Steel 2005, 142; Kelly 2007; cautiously Rice Holmes 1928, 198–199). Loutsch (1994, 434 n. 46) believes that the speech circulated in certain circles from early November onwards. Stroh (1982, 28 n. 2) thinks that *Philippic Two* was published together with the first proper *Philippics* (*Phil.* 3 and 4 in his view). Ehrenwirth (1971, 88–89) is uncertain whether the speech was published at all during Cicero's lifetime; she regards a publication before Antonius set off to Gaul on 28 November 44 as impossible (cf. also Habicht 1990, 95–96 / 79). Gelzer (1969, 352 and n. 51), Bleicken (1998, 93) and Everitt (2001, 278) think that the speech became generally known only after Cicero's death. – Eich (2000, 204–205, 210) believes that Cicero worked on *Philippic Two* over a more extended period since it was to be delivered on 20

Other *Philippics* (*Phil.* 5; 10; 11) were also sent to a friend, to M. Iunius Brutus; as M. Brutus was in Dyrrachium at this time, that must have happened soon after the delivery of the respective speeches (cf. *Ad Brut.* 2.4.3 [1 April 43]: M. Brutus has already received and read *Phil.* 5 of 1 Jan. and *Phil.* 10 of mid-Feb. 43; *Ad Brut.* 2.4.2 [12 April 43]: Cicero will send *Phil.* 11 from the second half of Feb. 43). For the other *Philippics* there is no unambiguous evidence on whether and when they were ‘published’ as individual texts. In view of the fact that the publication and distribution of political utterances increased during the last years of the Roman Republic and was recognized as an effective and important means in the political struggle, it has been suggested that all *Philippics* were circulated individually soon after their delivery so that each speech or each pair of speeches in the series was published before the appearance of the next.¹⁵⁷ Although this scenario cannot be proved, it is a plausible assumption that the speeches including general statements on Cicero’s political views and on his assessments of various protagonists were quickly made available, at least passed on to those people who might be influenced thereby.¹⁵⁸ Later, a selection of the speeches composed by Cicero during the conflict with Antonius was assembled into a corpus, while the precise circumstances of the composition and possible ‘publication’ of the whole corpus cannot be determined beyond doubt (cf. Intr. 3.2.2.).

September 44 and still was not published in early November of that year. But since *Philippic Two* is a detailed reaction to Antonius’ Senate speech on 19 September 44, Cicero certainly started working on it only after that date. And he does not connect its eventual wider distribution with Antonius’ leaving of Rome (cf. Eich 2000, 205, but cf. 206–207), but with the restoration of the Republic, which he does not expect in the near future. – On the similar case of the *Verrinae* cf. Frazel 2004 (gathering earlier literature).

157 Cf. Kelly 2007. – Hall (2002, 281 n. 10) and Steel (2005, 141) also think that the preserved fourteen *Philippics* were all circulated soon after their delivery. Eich (2000, 204) even concludes on the basis of the letters to M. Iunius Brutus that not more than one month passed between the delivery and the publication of the individual *Philippics*. However, one has to be cautious in transferring these inferences to other *Philippics*, and it is uncertain whether Cicero continued to revise the speeches after having sent a version to friends. – On the possible evidence for *Phil.* 1 cf. Intr. 3.2.2.

158 If this procedure holds true only for those speeches which have entered the corpus of the *Philippics*, that would mean that at an early stage already Cicero realized which speeches were conducive to his self-fashioning and to promoting his political ideas. Other speeches given by Cicero during the conflict with M. Antonius (cf. Intr. 3.2.2.), then, would not have been preserved since they were not even distributed because of their reduced general importance.

On the basis of general considerations the following conclusion suggests itself for a series of speeches on the same political issue spread over a period of time: an important motive for a separate distribution of an individual speech (soon after its delivery and during the conflict itself) is likely to be the intended political effect,¹⁵⁹ i.e. demonstrating the orator's position and moving readers to support it, since without mass media and due to limited human memories this was the only way of demonstrating and spreading one's views effectively. Even if the actual meeting was over and the specific topic had already been debated and voted on, a speech from that context did not simply reconstruct the past situation, but also presented a certain point of view and general arguments referring to the overall issue, which might have some relevance for the development of the process. For a successful speech demonstrates the reasons for the eventual decision and its advantages. And in case of a negative effect, the speech still documents the superior reasons for a policy, which has been rejected, and thus the foolishness of the outcome; it thereby might move recipients to change their minds in future and justifies the orator before the general public. This potential function is not contradicted by the fact that additionally Cicero explained his view of the political situation in letters to his friends: in these descriptions he was able to include details that could not be mentioned in a speech, such as the reaction in the Senate, compare his position with that of the addressee and tailor his statements directly to the attitude of the recipient with a view to a particular goal.

When a collection of thematically connected speeches is assembled as a corpus and published in this form after the struggle, the presentation of the orator's political activities can still be a central aspect. However, a significant difference is that the published speeches can no longer influence the political process; instead, they are to show the orator's consistent, thoughtful and successful policy in hindsight.¹⁶⁰ This hypothesis is supported by the fact that only a selection of the speeches Cicero delivered during the fight against Antonius has been assembled in the corpus and preserved and that these are particularly telling instances (cf. Intr. 3.2.2.). At the same time the presentation of a literary and rhetorical

159 Contra Eich 2000, *passim* (for his view of the publication of the *Philippics* cf. Eich 2000, 204–211). – On the *Philippics* as parts of a publicist campaign cf. Jackob 2005, 79–81.

160 Cf. Harries 2006, 220: “The speeches [i.e. the *Philippics*] therefore contained a dossier of formal proposals to which reference could be made in the light of later events, when Cicero's judgement was proved correct.”

virtuosity is likely to play a more important role, since part of the effect of a corpus consists in acknowledging the polished texts and its literary composition.

Irrespective of the possible reasons, all the extant *Philippics* were published in some form at some point, which raises the question of the relationship between delivered and published versions for these speeches. Cassius Dio has Q. Fufius Calenus (cf. Intr. 2.2., nr. 17) reproach Cicero for the fact that all his speeches in this conflict were published in a form different from the delivered versions (cf. Cass. Dio 46.7.3). However, this statement is not a reliable testimony since it forms part of a fictitious argument between the two men and is brought forward by an enemy of Cicero.

What is certain for the *Philippics* on the basis of more reliable evidence is that Cicero changed passages in *Philippic Two* on the suggestion of Atticus (cf. *Att.* 16.11.1–2). However, no general conclusions can be drawn from this piece of evidence because of the special position of *Philippic Two*: although this speech exhibits all the features of an actual speech, it was never actually delivered; hence, establishing a convincing version in literary terms may have been a more important issue. For the individual other *Philippics* sent to his friend M. Iunius Brutus by Cicero soon after their delivery (cf. *Ad Brut.* 2.3–4), it is uncertain whether or to what extent they had been revised at that stage; at any rate Cicero would not have had much time to spend on polishing them. So it remains to assume that some (limited) reworking was carried out before the eventual publication.¹⁶¹

At any rate, the nature and extent of references to Demosthenes cannot be used as a criterion for determining the degree of this possible revision, since Cicero was familiar with Demosthenes from his youth, particularly studied his works during that period and therefore may well have used features going back to the Demosthenic model already in the oral versions of the speeches.¹⁶² Those allusions may have been reinforced later or phrased more succinctly without the general revision of a whole speech being necessary. It is only the selection of a certain number of connected speeches out of all those given during the conflict with Antonius and their collection into a corpus that ought to be seen as a later editorial step on the basis of the Demosthenic model (cf. Intr. 3.2.2.).

161 For the *Pro Sestio*, Kaster (2006, 36–37) shows that an apparently independent ‘manifesto’ is likely to have been an integral part of the speech from the outset.

162 Cf. Stroh 2000, 95–96.

However, this potential process of selecting and assembling is independent of the usual editing of each speech individually.

A later revision of an individual oration going beyond stylistic polishing may be posited only when the discussion of one issue extended over a longer period and a published speech referring to an early stage includes aspects that can only have come up later.¹⁶³ This might be the case for some of the *Philippics* delivered in the Senate, and this procedure is connected with the construction of a corpus.

In *Philippic Five* (cf. Comm. 3.1.) Cicero voices the wish that all consulars be asked for their opinions before him, since he could then deal with their views more easily (*Phil.* 5.5); he proceeds to discuss possible motions and objections without referring them to any individuals or groups (cf. *Phil.* 5.5–6 and n.). The structure and wording of the passage convey the impression that Cicero talks about these aspects because these ideas had been spread by rumours or because of his general assessment of the situation; and that certainly is the impression the published speech is meant to give. Cicero's presentation might agree with what actually happened. But since among other things Cicero deals with the consequences of one particular motion in detail, it is equally possible that this section was extended or rewritten in more specific terms after the proposal had actually been made (cf. *Phil.* 5.48; 5.50 and n.). As speeches delivered on subsequent days of this senatorial debate seem not to have been published (cf. Intr. 3.2.2.; Comm. 3.1.; 4.1.), essential elements from them (e.g. a more detailed discussion of such a proposal) might have been incorporated into the published oration, in order to make it more convincing and comprehensive. That does not affect the general structure and aim of the speech; a thorough change of those remains unlikely.

Philippic Eight (cf. Comm. 6.1.) includes an extensive discussion of Antonius' counter-proposals, by which he responded to the orders of the Senate conveyed by the envoys (*Phil.* 8.24–28); this passage is inserted in the section on the conduct of the consulars (*Phil.* 8.20–32). A detailed

163 For this assumption cf. e.g. Boulanger / Wuilleumier 1972, 29–30 (on *Phil.* 5; 8; 11; 13); Wuilleumier 1973, 217–218; Mosca 1972, 40 n. 108 (pp. 71–72), 62 n. 162 (p. 77), 352 n. 42 (p. 391) (esp. on *Phil.* 5; 7; 13); Bellardi 1978, 40, 372/373 n. 1 (on *Phil.* 5); Fuhrmann 1982, 481–482 = 1993, 655 (on *Phil.* 5); Shackleton Bailey 1986, 321 (on *Phil.* 13). – The fact that in *Philippic Thirteen* Cicero only mentions the letter calling for peace by M. Aemilius Lepidus, but not that by L. Munatius Plancus (cf. Intr. 2.1.) need not be an indication of major revision, but may also be caused by Cicero's personal relationship with the two men and by his view that Lepidus' initiative is the more important one.

treatment of this topic might rather be expected in the Senate speech on the preceding day, when the result of the embassy was debated on the return of the envoys and Cicero delivered another speech (cf. *Phil.* 8.1–2), which has not been included in the corpus. In the present speech the passage forms a convincingly and smoothly inserted unit and is not a disruptive element, but it may have been extended and enlarged by arguments used in the (unpublished) speech on the preceding day or in response to utterances of others during the debate. Thereby Cicero's position towards Antonius' proposals becomes entirely clear and all possible objections are given within one of the speeches selected for the corpus.

In both cases the debate in the Senate lasted for several days, but only one speech from this discussion has been included in the corpus of the *Philippics*, and that oration could have been elaborated on and supplemented by arguments from other (unpublished) speeches delivered in the same context.

The same may be true for *Philippic Eleven*, since this speech also comes from a senatorial debate in which the discussion of the topic of the previous day was continued: after Dolabella had been declared a *hostis* on the preceding day, concrete measures against him were discussed on the following day. In contrast to the two previous cases, there is no clear evidence that Cicero delivered a speech on the first day as well, and a statement by Cicero would not be absolutely necessary since a motion approved by Cicero was proposed and accepted by the Senate so that no detailed exposition of his view was required. Some of the remarks in the present *Philippic Eleven* would also make sense in a speech arguing for declaring Dolabella a *hostis*, but they have an equally convincing function in this speech dealing with further measures.¹⁶⁴

Apart from these instances of possible revision in places, for which there is some indication, there are no hints of large-scale reworking. It remains a plausible assumption that the aim, message and structure of the

164 If Cicero spoke twice, the first oration is lost and only the speech now called *Philippic Eleven* has been published and preserved. In contrast to the potential other one, this speech not only provides Cicero with the opportunity to condemn Dolabella and to compare him with Antonius, but also to voice his opinion on extraordinary commands and thus explain and justify his policy in the case of Octavian. As in other instances (cf. Intr. 3.2.2.), it would therefore be easily explicable why *Philippic Eleven*, but not the other speech has been transmitted in the corpus.

speeches were not substantially changed after their delivery.¹⁶⁵ Even elements of the performative situation have been kept in the published versions or, in other words, are used as essential parts of the argument so that their basic structure must go back to the original versions (cf. Intr. 3.3.3.). The necessary caution applied, this conclusion allows to analyse the preserved text of the *Philippics* with regard both to their impact on the immediate audience and to their effect as a literary corpus for a distanced readership.

3.2.2. Size and structure of the corpus

The corpus of Cicero's *orationes Philippicae* consists of several speeches on the same political problem spread over several months. Hence, the *Philippics* constitute one (and the last) phase of Ciceronian oratory; they are the only thematically connected and the largest coherent corpus of Ciceronian political speeches extant.¹⁶⁶ Because of their single theme they demonstrate the development of Cicero's argument and strategy in relation to the political process and his varying presentation of the same issue before different bodies, the Senate and the popular assembly respectively.¹⁶⁷

That Cicero's *Philippics* have been transmitted as a corpus of fourteen speeches is not particularly remarkable at first glance, since there are other groups of Ciceronian speeches: for instance, the corpus of the *Verrines* draws its unity from the fact that all these speeches belong to the same court case; the individual speeches present the relevant material and discuss various aspects in line with the development of the case.¹⁶⁸ Further groups of speeches are quoted as collections, which, however, might have come into being in the course of transmission, like 'orations delivered after

165 Cf. e.g. Newbound 1986, 145: "It would not be right to insist that the text of *Philippics* 3–14 represents exactly what Cicero said in the Senate word-for-word, but there is no reason to think that the published orations differed at all significantly from the delivered versions. Cicero did not therefore deliberately retailor them for propaganda or a wider audience."; cf. more generally also Burnand 2000, 287–291.

166 Cf. e.g. Brunt 1988, 48.

167 Cf. also Steel 2005, 144–145.

168 It is unclear whether the *orationes Verrinae* were collected by Cicero's secretary Tiro or even by Cicero himself (cf. *Orat.* 103; 210; Gell. 1.7.1; 13.21.15–17).

Cicero's return from exile' or 'speeches made before Caesar'; these descriptions cover speeches loosely connected by date and occasion.¹⁶⁹

Only in the case of his consular orations does Cicero's intention to set up a corpus become obvious (cf. *Att.* 2.1.3), and this seems to be the first instance of a deliberate collection of speeches by the author within ancient rhetoric.¹⁷⁰ If the composition of the *Philippic* corpus basically went back to Cicero himself, this principle would have been developed further and applied to a more coherent group by virtue of its common subject matter. Since Cicero (like the addressee M. Iunius Brutus) uses the term *Philippicae* (*orationes*) in the plural and with reference to various speeches from the extant corpus (cf. *Ad Brut.* 2.3.4; 2.4.2; cf. *Intr.* 3.1.), he seems to have regarded these orations as connected and may have collected them into a corpus himself or at least have intended to do so.¹⁷¹ For lack of sufficient unambiguous evidence, the question whether Cicero actually did so cannot be answered beyond doubt, but various kinds of information about these speeches and other speeches of the period provide a reliable basis for plausible hypotheses.

Discussing this question involves attempting to define the possible original size of the corpus: besides the direct tradition in the Ciceronian manuscripts, passages from the *Philippics* are quoted or referred to in various later authors.¹⁷²

Two scholiasts say that (P.) Ventidius (Bassus) is called a *mulio* in the *Philippics* (cf. Schol. Bob. on Cic. *Mil.* 29 [p. 120.24–26 St.]; Schol. on Juv. 7.199), as in a letter from L. Munatius Plancus of 18 May 43 BCE (cf. *Fam.* 10.18.3).¹⁷³ However, all seven mentions of Ventidius by name in

169 For instance, the speeches made before Caesar are quoted as *Caesarianae* (cf. Non., p. 437.9–11 M. = 703 L.; Serv. on Verg. *Aen.* 5.187; 11.438; Probus, *Gramm. Lat.* IV, p. 27.16–19), the speeches against Catilina as *invektivae* (cf. August. *De civ. D.* 3.15; Ps.-Sergius, *Gramm. Lat.* IV, p. 558.19–23; Prisc., *Rhet. Lat. Min.*, pp. 557.42–558.2 Halm; *Schemata dianoceas, Rhet. Lat. Min.*, p. 75.12–15 Halm) and the court speeches as (*libri*) *causarum* (cf. Diom., *Gramm. Lat.* I, p. 368.28–29).

170 Cf. Settle 1962, 127–146; Stroh 2000, 80; Cape 2002, 114, 119.

171 For a more detailed discussion of the structure of the corpus and its possible development cf. Manuwald 2007.

172 On a possible fragment of *Philippic Four* in Nonius Marcellus (p. 373.34–36 M. = 595 L.) cf. Comm. 2.1.

173 Cf. Schol. Bob. on Cic. *Mil.* 29 (p. 120.24–26 St.): *quamvis in Filippicis mulionem Ventidium dixerit eapropter, quod de publico redemerat iumentorum praebitionem quae esset apud exercitum necessaria*; Schol. on Juv. 7.199: *Ventidius ex mulione Caesaris dictator<is praetor> fuit, ut Tullius in epistolis* [cf. *Fam.* 10.18.3] *et in Philippicis*

the extant *Philippics* (cf. *Phil.* 12.23 [bis]; 13.2; 13.26; 13.47; 13.48; 14.20) show Cicero's contempt of him, but nowhere is he ridiculed as a *mulio*. Still, the remarks of the scholiasts do not have to be interpreted as pointing to a lost speech or a lost passage since they might reflect a specific interpretation or an error of the scholiasts. For, particularly in view of the wording in the scholium to Juvenal, it is quite plausible that these remarks combine two Ciceronian passages,¹⁷⁴ namely a passage from the letters (though not from a letter written by Cicero), where Ventidius is called a *mulio* (cf. *Fam.* 10.18.3), and a passage from the *Philippics*, where he is called a *praetor* and a *hostis* respectively (cf. *Phil.* 14.20).¹⁷⁵

Further, Arusianus Messius, a grammarian of the 4th century CE, quotes not only from the extant *Philippics* in his collection of grammatical examples, but also gives one sentence each from a '*Philippic Sixteen*' and a '*Philippic Seventeen*' (cf. *Gramm. Lat.* VII, p. 467.15–18).¹⁷⁶ Although that is the only attestation of these speeches, there is no immediate reason to doubt this evidence, since Arusianus Messius quotes correctly from the extant *Philippics* elsewhere.¹⁷⁷ Therefore it is frequently assumed that the

loquitur. opitulante Antonio <ab> Augusto usque eo provectus est, ut illi crederetur Part<h>icum bellum (cf. Fedeli 1982 / 1986, 184). – Cf. Plin. HN 7.135: triumphare P. Ventidium de Parthis voluit quidem solum, sed eundem in triumpho Asculano Cn. Pompei duxit puerum, quamquam Masurius [fr. 25 Husccke] auctor est bis in triumpho ductum, Cicero [Fam. 10.18.3] mulionem castrensis fumariae fuisse, plurimi iuventam inopem in caliga militari tolerasse.; Gell. 15.4.3: ...; post, cum adolevisset [i.e. Ventidius Bassus], victum sibi aegre quaesisse eumque sordide invenisse comparandis mulis et vehiculis, quae magistratibus, qui sortiti provincias forent, praebenda publice conduxisset. ..., non modo in amicitiam Caesaris, sed ex ea in amplissimum quoque ordinem pervenisse; mox tribunum quoque plebi ac deinde praetorem creatum atque in eo tempore iudicatum esse a senatu hostem cum M. Antonio; post vero coniunctis partibus non pristinam tantum dignitatem reciperasse, sed pontificatum ac deinde consulatum quoque adeptum esse, eamque rem tam intoleranter tulisse populum Romanum, qui Ventidium Bassum meminerat curandis mulis victitasse, ut vulgo per vias urbis versiculi proscriberentur: 'concurrite omnes augures, haruspices! / portentum inusitatum conflatum est recens: / nam mulos qui fricabat, consul factus est.' – On P. Ventidius Bassus cf. H. Gundel, s.v. Ventidius (5), RE VIII A 1 (1955), 795–816.

174 Cf. Achard 1981, 220 n. 184.

175 Cf. *Fam.* 10.18.3: ...; *tantum ego et mihi confido et sic percussas illius copias Ventidique mulionis castra despicio*; ...; *Phil.* 14.20: ...; *idem Ventidium, cum alii praetorem {volusenum}, ego semper hostem*.

176 Cf. Arusianus Messius, *Gramm. Lat.* VII, p. 467.15–16: *deflexit de proposito, Cic. Philip. XVI † 'latere sis ne vestigium quidem deflexit'*; p. 467.17–18: *disceptata lis est, Cic. Philipp. XVII 'non est illa dissensio disceptata bello'*. (cf. Fedeli 1982 / 1986, 184).

177 Cf. e.g. *Gramm. Lat.* VII, p. 458.17–23: *Phil.* 3.1; pp. 478.24–479.5: *Phil.* 4.12; p. 461.13–18: *Phil.* 5.12; p. 454.10–12: *Phil.* 9.1.

corpus of the *Philippics* originally contained more speeches than those preserved today.¹⁷⁸ At any rate, on the basis of the manuscripts of the transmitted corpus it can be ruled out that further speeches after *Philippic Fourteen* have been lost by damage to an ancient copy.¹⁷⁹

Further, the uncertain texts of the fragments, their brevity and their unspecific content do not provide a reliable basis on which to infer precise contents, contexts or dates for these alleged speeches, which would have been lost or separated from the corpus very early.¹⁸⁰ In principle, all Senate meetings between 21 April 43, the day of *Philippic Fourteen*, and Antonius' accession to power are potential occasions for further '*Philippics*'. But before accepting additional '*Philippics*', one will have to ask whether such titles and numbers would be justified for these speeches, i.e. whether Arusianus Messius (or one of his sources) continued to count and call further speeches belonging to the conflict with Antonius '*Philippics*' by analogy or whether Cicero might have applied this term to other speeches beyond those preserved in the corpus (possibly transmitted separately).

This turns out to be the fundamental question, in view of the fact that during the conflict with Antonius, even during the period covered by the transmitted fourteen *Philippics* (September 44 to April 43 BCE), Cicero

178 Cf. e.g. Krause 1847, 312–313; Boulanger / Wuilleumier 1972, 27–28; Mosca 1972, 62; Newbound 1986, 145; Shackleton Bailey 1986, xi; Narducci 1992, 197–198; Hall 2002, 281 and n. 9; Magnaldi 2004, 95; Kelly 2007. – According to Fuhrmann (1982, 83–84 = 1993, 589–590) the status of these fragments is unclear.

179 Cf. Reeve / Rouse 1983, 74.

180 Boulanger / Wuilleumier (1972, 27–28) connected the remarks of the scholiasts on statements in the *Philippics* with '*Philippic Sixteen*' and thus inferred the content of this speech. They also supposed that these two speeches were delivered after 21 April 43 BCE, the day of *Philippic Fourteen*, in one of the Senate meetings from 26/27 April 43 BCE onwards. And they even extrapolated that there might have been a round number of eighteen *Philippics* originally (cf. also Martin 2001, 76–77). – By reading † *latere sis* in the quotation from '*Philippic Sixteen*' (*Gramm. Lat.* VII, p. 467.15–16) as *Laterensis*, King (1878, 345; apparently supported by Ker 1926, 646–647 n. 1; cf. Krause 1847, 312–313) supposed that M. Iuventius Laterensis (cf. F. Münzer, s.v. *Iuventius* [16], *RE* X 2 [1919], 1365–1367), legate in the army of M. Aemilius Lepidus in 43 BCE (*MRR* 2.353), was referred to; this person is mentioned several times in the *Ad familiares* (cf. *Fam.* 8.8.2; 8.8.3; 10.11.3; 10.15.2; 10.18.2; 10.21.1; 10.21.3; 10.23.4). On this basis King concluded that '*Philippic Sixteen*' was delivered after it became known in Rome that Lepidus and Antonius had joined forces. – Krause (1847, 312–313) connects the fragment from '*Philippic Seventeen*' with the victory over Antonius at Mutina (cf. *Fam.* 10.30).

delivered more speeches than those preserved today. Apart from possible unknown orations, a number of speeches are attested in other Ciceronian works, but have not been preserved and were probably never published.¹⁸¹ Nevertheless, some scholars have expressed astonishment at the high number of *Philippics* published, since Cicero usually strove for variety and such a concentration of published political speeches did not seem normal practice in Roman or Greek political oratory; the only possible explanation was seen in the desire to match and outstrip the model of Demosthenes.¹⁸²

If one regards imitation of Demosthenes as the determining factor as suggested by the title, the overall number of twelve speeches in ancient editions of Demosthenes' orations against Philip (cf. Intr. 3.1.) has to be taken as a given basis.¹⁸³ However, such a group could be composed in different ways and / or other speeches could be published separately. But information about all the known, yet unpreserved speeches allows conclusions as to why they might have been less suitable for publication or at any rate for inclusion in a corpus. For, irrespective of the contemporary relevance and impact of these orations, they all seem to have been less relevant to demonstrating Cicero's assessment of the various protagonists and his corresponding political position in the long run, since they did not deal with central questions, led to a partial failure for Cicero or presented topics that are more impressively discussed in other speeches.¹⁸⁴ By

181 Cf. Boulanger / Wuilleumier 1972, 28; Crawford 1984, 1–2, 250–251, 253; Hall 2002, 281. – Generally, Cicero published a great number of speeches in this period, probably for political effect; this practice resembles that at the start of his public career, but contrasts with other phases of his life (cf. Crawford 1984, 10–14). – Kelly (2007) assumes that originally a larger number of '*Philippics*' were in circulation.

182 Cf. Newbound 1986, 145–150.

183 Narducci (1992, 197–198) thinks that Cicero did not follow Demosthenes' model as regards the number of *Philippics* since he was unlikely to work towards a specific number during the conflict or assemble a collection of a certain size later. That Cicero was looking towards a definite number of speeches during the conflict already, as Stroh (1983a, 48–50) seems to assume, is indeed improbable since Cicero had to react to the constraints of the situation and actually delivered more speeches than those preserved in the present corpus. But that a corpus of a specific size was assembled later may be plausibly assumed since the selection of the extant *Philippics* Three to Fourteen forms a coherent group (see below).

184 In his attempt to prove *Philippic Four* spurious (cf. Comm. 2.1.) and on the basis of different premises Jentzen (1820, 26–27) also arrived at the conclusion that Cicero published only the most important of his speeches against Antonius and thereby intended to present a broad picture of the development of his conflict with

contrast, the whole series of the actual *Philippics* illustrates Cicero's policy in relation to important events and presents the picture of a Cicero who is incessantly active for the public welfare and pursues the 'right' goal throughout.

The following speeches are known in addition to the preserved *Philippics*. In the second half of February 43, after the meeting of the Senate at which he delivered *Philippic Eleven*, Cicero informed the People of the outcome of the senatorial debate (as after *Philippics Three* and *Five*) and gave a speech before a *contio* convened by the tribune of the *plebs* M. Servilius (cf. *Fam.* 12.7.1).¹⁸⁵ On the day before *Philippic Fourteen* (20 April 43) Cicero may have given another speech before a *contio*, convened by the tribune of the *plebs* P. Apuleius, and discussed the political situation and his political attitude (cf. *Phil.* 14.12; 14.16; *Ad Brut.* 1.3.2).¹⁸⁶ In the Senate¹⁸⁷ Cicero delivered speeches on 4 January 43 (cf. *Phil.* 6.5; 6.9; 6.16),¹⁸⁸ on 2 February 43 (cf. *Phil.* 8.1; 8.32),¹⁸⁹ on 19 March 43 (cf. *Fam.*

Antonius. – Krause (1847, 312–313) did not accept internal criteria for the compilation of a corpus, but only posited the external criterion of 'speeches against Antonius'; thus he had to assume that other speeches in the conflict with Antonius were lost from the intended corpus or were no proper speeches.

185 Cf. Crawford 1984, 250–251 (*De imperatore adversus Dolabellam deligendo*); cf. also Pina Polo 1989, 312.

186 It is not completely clear from the sources whether Cicero actually delivered a speech at the *contio* convened by P. Apuleius, but he is likely to have justified himself once given this opportunity or to have spoken slightly later when the People bore him to the Rostra after news of the victory near Mutina had reached Rome.

187 For the Senate meetings during this period cf. the evidence in Stein 1930.

188 Rightly, Crawford (1984, 27–28; approved by Marinone 2004, 257) takes up Kasten's (1977, 211) position and argues against the opinion put forward by Puccioni (1972, 154–155), developing Luterbacher's (1922, 89) view, that *Phil.* 6.2–3 contained a reference to a speech delivered by Cicero in the Senate on 4 January 43 BCE. In this passage Cicero does not refer to a lost speech, but to *Philippic Five* delivered on 1 January 43. This passage was marked as a testimonium by Puccioni (1972, 154–155); Luterbacher (1922, 89) merely inferred another speech by Cicero on 4 January 43 by pointing generally to *Philippic Six*. Other passages in *Philippic Six* (*Phil.* 6.5; 6.9; 6.16), some of which have been identified by Simon (1911; cf. e.g. Sternkopf 1912, 99–100, 102), indeed allow the assumption of a further speech by Cicero. For the mention of proceedings in the Senate by *paulo ante* in *Phil.* 6.5 (cf. *itaque, quod paulo ante feci in senatu, faciam apud vos.*) most likely refers to a speech in the Senate on the same day as the *contio* speech (cf. also *Phil.* 6.9: ..., *me hoc et in senatu et in contione confirmasse, numquam illum futurum in senatus potestate, ...*), since *paulo ante* clearly denotes events in the Senate on 4 January 43 elsewhere in *Philippic Six* (cf. *Phil.* 6.1; 6.14). Besides, the notion

12.25.1),¹⁹⁰ on 8 April 43 (cf. *Fam.* 10.11.1; 10.12.2–3; *Ad Brut.* 2.2.3),¹⁹¹ on 9 April 43 (cf. *Fam.* 10.11.1; 10.12.2–4; *Ad Brut.* 2.2.3; cf. Quint. *Inst.* 6.3.48)¹⁹² and on 14 April 43 (cf. *Ad Brut.* 2.5.3–4),¹⁹³ after *Philippic*

‘to make less effort’ in Cicero’s remark *quo etiam, ut confitear vobis, Quirites, minus hodierno die contendi, minus laboravi, ut mihi senatus adsentiens tumultum decerneret, saga sumi iuberet.* (*Phil.* 6.16) does not mean that Cicero did not deliver a speech in the Senate on 4 January 43, but rather that he spoke less forcefully and less emphatically for his cause. – However, the description of this Senate speech need not reflect the truth faithfully due to the context; thus it does not allow the conclusion that Cicero’s own characterization of this speech explains why this Senate speech is not mentioned elsewhere, probably has not been published and therefore has not been preserved. The reason for its loss or suppression is rather the fact that this speech repeats issues also presented in *Philippic Five* and is a clearer indication of Cicero’s failure. – On the basis of the allusions in Cicero’s *Philippic Six* (*Phil.* 6.5; 6.16) in connection with the speech put into Cicero’s mouth for 4 January 43 by Appian (cf. *B Civ.* 3.213–220), Simon (1911; approved by Luterbacher 1922, 89) inferred that this Senate speech was the real ‘*Philippic Six*’ and that there were fifteen *Philippics* in fact, smoothly followed by the quotations from a ‘*Philippic Sixteen*’ and a ‘*Philippic Seventeen*’ in Arusianus Messius. He assumed that the real ‘*Philippic Six*’ had been lost and consequently the numeration became incorrect (contra Schöll [1916] 1918, XXXIV; Marinone 2004, 255 n. 2). Even if one posited the existence of a speech between *Philippics Five* and *Six* (in the transmitted numeration), the assumption of such a severe corruption of the transmission would be rather unlikely, particularly since other authors, contemporary with Appian, use the present numbering when quoting from the *Philippics*. The main question about this speech would be whether it could be called a ‘*Philippic*’ in Cicero’s sense. Against the thesis of a lost ‘*Philippic*’, Humbert (1925, 270 n. 1) objected that Cicero had integrated elements from speeches delivered in the Senate during the days after 1 January 43 BCE into the published version of *Philippic Five* and therefore these speeches could not have been published (cf. Intr. 3.2.1.; Comm. 3.1.). That further speeches were not published is a plausible assumption; the potential reason, however, is based on inferences in line with Humbert’s theory of a major reworking of speeches before publication. – Marinone’s (2004, 253, 255, 257) remarks are somewhat unclear: he believes that Cicero delivered a speech in the Senate on 4 January 43 (253), but objects to its inference on the basis of *Phil.* 6.2–3 or *Phil.* 6.5 (257; 255 n. 2); however, he does not say on what evidence his view is based.

189 Cf. Crawford 1984, 259, (6) (*De re publica in senatu*); cf. e.g. King 1878, 197; Sternkopf 1913, 41; Stein 1930, 84; Marinone 2004, 253, 257, 499.

190 Cf. Crawford 1984, 252–253 (*De Q. Cornificio in senatu*).

191 Cf. Crawford 1984, 259, (7) (*De supplicatione Planci*); on the date cf. Crawford 1994, 289; cf. Stein 1930, 88–89.

192 Cf. e.g. Schöll (1917) 1918, 467; Puccioni 1972, 117; Crawford 1994, 289–293 (*In P. Servilium Isauricum*); cf. Stein 1930, 89; Marinone 2004, 254, 256, 499.

193 Cf. Crawford 1984, 259, (8) (*De imperio Antoni*); cf. Stein 1930, 89.

Fourteen on 27 April 43 (cf. *Ad Brut.* 1.5.1),¹⁹⁴ soon after the battles of Mutina (cf. *Fam.* 11.10.1; *Ad Brut.* 1.15.8) and at further meetings in late April 43, which dealt with honours for the successful fighters and measures against Antonius and Lepidus (cf. *Brut.* 1.3a; 1.15.8–11).¹⁹⁵ Besides, later in 43 Cicero gave speeches on various occasions that relate to the conflict with Antonius only indirectly or not at all.¹⁹⁶

Several points make these speeches less suitable for spreading the intended picture of Cicero and his policy than those preserved in the corpus: the speech given before a *contio* after the Senate meeting at which Cicero delivered *Philippic Eleven* (cf. *Fam.* 12.7.1) cannot provide further arguments beyond *Philippic Eleven*. If included in the corpus, it would only present Cicero's attempt to inform the People of a senatorial decree disapproved of by him after he had opposed it in the Senate without success; the decree is not so central that a speech before a different audience is needed to explain Cicero's position and to prepare for the developments to come. *Philippic Eleven*, however, positively develops Cicero's alternative concept and leaves the outcome open; this oration demonstrates that Cicero vigorously supported the cause of the Liberators in the Senate and thereby helps to define the political alliances of the time.¹⁹⁷

194 Cf. Crawford 1984, 259, (9) (*De re publica in senatu*), (10) (*De re publica in senatu*); cf. Stein 1930, 91; Marinone 2004, 257, 499 – The available evidence does not support the division into two speeches.

195 Cf. Crawford 1984, 259, (12) (*In Antonium et Lepidum*); cf. Stein 1930, 89–90. – The Senate speeches on 2 February, 8 April, 9 April, 14 April and 27 April as well as on other occasions in late April 43 are subsumed under 'possible speeches' by Crawford (1984, 259). As regards the various speeches in late April 43 an identification of individual orations is indeed difficult since in his letters Cicero tends to mention only motions and results, without attributing them to specific Senate meetings. For the other speeches, however, Cicero's remarks demonstrate the fact of a speech as well as its date and content. – Boulanger / Wuilleumier (1972, 28) mention another speech on 13 April 43 by referring to *Ad Brut.* 2.4. But the speech mentioned in this letter is not an unknown speech, but *Philippic Eleven*, delivered in the second half of February 43.

196 Cf. e.g. *Ad Brut.* 1.18.6; cf. Crawford 1984, 259 (*De liberis Lepidi*).

197 On the possible political function of *Philippic Eleven* cf. also Hall 2007. Further, in Hall's view (2002, 281) Cicero regarded the negotiations in the Senate as more important and influential, and the fact that Cicero did not publish a speech received well by the People according to himself (cf. *Fam.* 12.7.1) could indicate that the audience was not as positively disposed towards Cicero's speech as he claimed. Naturally, in his letter to Cassius, for whom he had argued in the Senate without success, Cicero presents the attitude of the People (not documented

The possible *contio* speech on 20 April 43 (cf. *Phil.* 14.12; 14.16; *Ad Brut.* 1.3.2) mainly concerned Cicero himself. And remarks about himself, if not immediately relevant to his policy, might have been counter-productive in relation to the image of Cicero as a servant to the *res publica*. Besides, the moment of this speech is closely connected with a triumphant situation, which does not agree with the general aim of the *Philippics* to defend the endangered *res publica*.

The Senate speech on 4 January 43 (cf. *Phil.* 6.5; 6.16) probably took up arguments also given in the published *Philippic Five* of 1 January 43. The same is true for the Senate speech of 2 February 43 (cf. *Phil.* 8.1; 8.32) in relation to *Philippic Eight*. Within the corpus, both speeches would only demonstrate Cicero's continued opposition to motions that were eventually accepted by the Senate. However, *Philippic Six*, interpreting the recent Senate decree and its genesis before the People on 4 January, and *Philippic Eight*, criticizing the Senate decree of the previous day and repeating Cicero's own position, are more effective in transmitting a coherent image of a sensible and superior policy (cf. Intr. 3.2.1.).

In the Senate speech on 19 March 43 (cf. *Fam.* 12.25.1) Cicero talked about the provincial governorship of Africa Vetus. The Senate decree of 20 December 44 (cf. *Phil.* 3.37–39) had rearranged the distribution of provincial governorships: with respect to Africa Vetus it confirmed that Q. Cornificius, appointed by Caesar, should continue to hold this office and not hand it over to C. Calvisius Sabinus, Antonius' candidate. Yet, in this province the situation seems to have been particularly difficult because Calvisius, also Cornificius' predecessor, had left legates behind and continued to exert his power through them (cf. *Phil.* 3.26 and n.; *Fam.* 12.25.2). Thus Cicero's speech is a supplement to the decree achieved by *Philippic Three* with reference to a particular province (cf. similarly *Phil.*

elsewhere) as approving of his cause, irrespective of the actual extent of this support; yet he could have done the same by means of a published speech. – That the Senate speech was published, but not the *contio* speech, is regarded by Crawford (1984, 250–251) as an indication of the fact that Cicero's envisaged audience was more of a senatorial bent; besides, only two of the fourteen published speeches are *contio* speeches. Of course Cicero is likely to have directed his published speeches to the fellow members of his class rather than to the populace as a whole. But since *contio* speeches were included in the cycle, an agreement between the original audience and the expected readership cannot have been a decisive reason for the selection of speeches. Their function within the concept of the whole corpus also plays a part; orations before different bodies can sometimes be particularly conducive to spreading the orator's views, and they show that he can call on support from both the Senate and the People.

10); and Cicero himself describes it as less important than *Philippic Three* in a letter to Cornificius (cf. *Fam.* 12.25). This speech probably contained no progress or developments in relation to *Philippic Three* as regards the general assessment of the situation.

The Senate speeches on 8 April (cf. *Fam.* 10.11.1; 10.12.2–3; *Ad Brut.* 2.2.3) and on 9 April 43 (cf. *Fam.* 10.11.1; 10.12.2–4; *Ad Brut.* 2.2.3) dealt with honours for L. Munatius Plancus, which were supported by Cicero and opposed by P. Servilius Isauricus. This was a rather personal and perhaps unpleasant conflict for Cicero; the move was intended to win Plancus for the Republican cause; and the speeches were probably less relevant to the general conflict with Antonius and to the aim of clarifying the respective political positions.

In the Senate meeting on 14 April 43 (cf. *Ad Brut.* 2.5.3–4)¹⁹⁸ two (allegedly forged) letters of M. Iunius Brutus and of M. Antonius were discussed; and according to his own description Cicero extensively spoke about or against Antonius. Yet the occasion is a letter as in *Philippic Thirteen* delivered on 20 March 43, which would be the immediately preceding speech if both were part of the corpus. And the letter discussed in *Philippic Thirteen* is politically more important since its contents offer greater opportunity for a comprehensive attack on Antonius.

The Senate speech delivered on 27 April 43 after *Philippic Fourteen* (cf. *Ad Brut.* 1.5.1) concerned military measures against Antonius and his followers, who had been declared public enemies in the meantime (on 26 April). At this point in time Cicero thought he had reached his goal; the subsequent speeches rather deal with organizing the political consequences. Various speeches in late April 43, by which Cicero tried to push through honours and punishments for the main protagonists respectively (cf. *Fam.* 11.10.1; *Brut.* 1.3a; 1.15.8–11), are also documents of the outcome of the military conflict with Antonius; they no longer have an essential function in realizing and portraying Cicero's policy of defending the *res publica* against Antonius.

This overview suggests that Cicero's speeches delivered during the conflict with Antonius and not included in the transmitted corpus are not as relevant to the intended image of Cicero's policy as those preserved, which can be shown to form a coherent whole (see below). Hence, the *orationes Philippicae* assembled in the corpus are not simply defined by their reference to the same political context, but also by their description of important stages in the conflict and their paradigmatic presentation of

198 Cf. Ortman 1988, 286–290.

Cicero's position. Accordingly, rather than pointing to additional lost 'Philippics', the 'Philippic Sixteen' and the 'Philippic Seventeen' mentioned by Arusianus Messius (cf. *Gramm. Lat.* VII, p. 467.15–18) may simply be further speeches connected with Antonius; and they bear their title and number since Arusianus Messius or his source numbered further speeches from the same context continuously, regardless of the underlying concept of selection for the core corpus.

Details about other speeches belonging to the conflict with Antonius and possible reasons why these speeches might not have become part of the corpus indicate a potential purpose of the collection. This result will have to be checked by explaining why the very speeches found in the corpus might have been regarded as suitable for inclusion.

The parallel case of the speeches delivered during Cicero's consular year (63 BCE)¹⁹⁹ provides the starting point: in this instance too Cicero did not select all the speeches given during that year for a corpus of *orationes consulares*, outlined in a letter to Atticus of 60 BCE (cf. *Att.* 2.1.3), but rather a cycle consisting of a selection of twelve speeches after the model of Demosthenes' speeches against Philip in ancient editions (cf. *Intr.* 3.1.).²⁰⁰

199 On Cicero's consular speeches cf. Cape 2002.

200 Cf. *Att.* 2.1.3 (about 3 June 60 BCE): *oratiunculas autem et quas postulas et plures etiam mittam, quoniam quidem ea, quae nos scribimus adulescentulorum studiis excitati, te etiam delectant. fuit enim mihi commodum, quid in eis orationibus, quae Philippicae nominantur, enituerat tuus ille civis et quod se ab hoc refractariolo iudiciali dicendi genere abiunxerat, ut σεμνότερός τις et πολιτικώτερος videretur, curare, ut meae quoque essent orationes, quae consulares nominarentur. quarum una est in senatu Kal. Ian. [Leg. agr. 1], altera ad populum de lege agraria [Leg. agr. 2], tertia de Othone [cf. Schöhl (1917) 1918, 433–434; Puccioni 1972, 81–82; Crawford 1994, 209–214], quarta pro Rabirio [Rab. perd.], quinta de proscriptorum filiis [cf. Schöhl (1917) 1918, 434–435; Puccioni 1972, 82–83; Crawford 1994, 201–207], sexta, cum provinciam in contione deposui [cf. Schöhl (1917) 1918, 481; Puccioni 1972, 139; Crawford 1984, 82–84], septima, quom Catilinam emisi [Cat. 1], octava, quam habui ad populum postridie quam Catilina profugit [Cat. 2], nona in contione, quo die Allobroges indicarunt [Cat. 3], decima in senatu Non. Decembris [Cat. 4]. sunt praeterea duae breves, quasi ἀποσπασμάτια legis agrariae [Leg. agr. 3; <4>: cf. Puccioni 1972, 138; Crawford 1984, 79–81]. hoc totum σῶμα curabo ut habeas; et quoniam te cum scripta tum res meae delectant, iisdem ex libris perspicies, et quae gesserim et quae dixerim; aut ne poposcisses. ego enim tibi me non offerebam.* – Although Cicero mentions twelve speeches, Canfora (1974, 49–51) infers from this passage that both Demosthenes' speeches against Philip and Cicero's consular speeches formed groups of eleven speeches (cf. *Intr.* 3.1.). Therefore he expects eleven Ciceronian *Philippics* if Cicero had intended to imitate Demosthenes. Dugan (2005, 336) talks of a corpus of ten speeches

Some further political and forensic speeches are extant separately (cf. *Pro Murena*), while others, whose existence can be inferred from mentions elsewhere, have not been preserved and were probably not published.²⁰¹ In putting together speeches from his consular year Cicero obviously did not simply intend a chronological and / or factual collection of all speeches of a certain period, but rather made a conscious selection determined by literary and / or political reasons. Such a principle of selection is obvious for the *orationes Catilinae*, a subgroup of the *orationes consulares*: during the conflict with Catilina Cicero delivered more speeches than those preserved; but those that are mentioned in the letter and have survived, if read as a group, suffice to give a comprehensive picture of the events and of Cicero's efforts in his interpretation and at the same time avoid repetitions.²⁰²

The *orationes consulares* as a whole seem to be intended as a paradigmatic demonstration of the aims and successes of Cicero's consulship: all the speeches published as *orationes consulares* are political speeches or forensic speeches of more general importance, which show Cicero's political and moral principles. This interpretation is supported by the recapitulation of Cicero's consulship in the *In L. Calpurnium Pisone* of 55 BCE, which recalls the respective situations of the *orationes consulares* (cf. *Pis.* 4–7; cf. also Plin. *HN* 7.116–117).²⁰³ In setting up this collection, Cicero explicitly refers to the model of Demosthenes and says that the orations against Philip marked a change in Demosthenes' oratorical career, since they showed how he moved away from argumentative

delivered in 63; but the two short pieces mentioned at the end of the list also belong to the group.

201 Cf. e.g. *Pro C. Calpurnio Pisone* (cf. *Flac.* 98; *Sall. Cat.* 49.2; cf. Schöll [1917] 1918, 480; Puccioni 1972, 139; Crawford 1984, 77–78); Senate speech on the plans of the Catilinarians / *De coniuratione Catilinae in senatu* on 21 October 63 BCE (cf. *Cat.* 1.7; cf. Crawford 1984, 88–89); Senate speech about Catilina on 4 December 63 BCE (cf. *Sall. Cat.* 48.3–9); speech on the provincial government of Metellus Celer / *Pro Q. Caecilio Metello Celeri* (cf. *Fam.* 5.2.3–4; cf. Crawford 1984, 85–87).

202 Cf. Classen 1985, 5–6. – In the *Agrarian Speeches*, another subgroup of the *orationes consulares*, Cicero explicitly refers to the fact that he mentions different issues before different audiences (cf. *Leg. agr.* 1.21; 3.4). That could be read as pointing to the fact that the published speeches were arranged to match and to avoid repetitions (cf. Classen 1985, 6 n. 16). Alternatively, such remarks might be interpreted as rhetorical and tactical moves intended to influence the respective audiences.

203 Cf. Stroh 1983a, 42 n. 27.

forensic oratory to appear in the more elevated role of a statesman. Accordingly, apart from the number, the similarity between the corpora of the two orators consists in the speeches' significance, which allows Cicero to compare himself with Demosthenes and to suggest the role of a senior statesman for himself.²⁰⁴

This compiling of *orationes consulares* in a letter to Atticus (cf. *Att.* 2.1.3) took place three years after their delivery (at a time when Cicero was concerned about the memory of his consulship), while a possible individual publication may have happened soon afterwards. Therefore it is a matter of debate whether in addition to a separate publication (doubted by some scholars) these speeches were actually edited as a corpus of twelve speeches later or whether Cicero merely outlined such a collection as a concept towards Atticus.²⁰⁵ It is obvious at any rate that Cicero developed such a structure for himself and his literary friend. Therefore, assembling a selection of politically important speeches into a corpus with certain literary and political aims can be regarded as a procedure familiar to Cicero.

With respect to the *orationes Philippicae*, Cicero does not enumerate the speeches covered by that name or explain his principles of selection. But it is a plausible assumption that in the case of these speeches too he was governed by specific and probably similar criteria, particularly since he alluded to the Demosthenic model by the title (cf. *Intr.* 3.1.). As Cicero chose twelve *orationes consulares* and explicitly referred to the model of Demosthenes' orations against Philip in this context, he is likely to have intended a corpus of twelve *orationes Philippicae* as well. That these twelve speeches, the *Philippics* proper, are *Philippics Three to Fourteen* in modern

204 Cf. Kelly 2007. – A similar distinction between different levels of speeches is also found in Isocrates (cf. *Isoc. Or.* 4.11–12; 12.11; 15.3; 15.276).

205 Views on the revision and publication of the consular speeches differ: Helm (1979, 6–8, 265) assumed that these speeches were published in 60 BCE only after having been revised (cf. also Bleicken 1995, 64; Léovant-Cirefice 2000, 53 n. 58). Settle (1962, 127–133) and Kelly (2007) also believe that the speeches were published for the first time with a delay of three years. Fuhrmann (1993a, 708, 713–714) posits a thorough reworking for the edition of the consular speeches in 60 BCE (cf. also Monteleone 2005, 170 n. 82). Laurant (1936–40, 1.9–10) on the other hand drew attention to the fact that there was no evidence for reworking, but only for the publication of a corpus so that previous individual publication remained a possibility. This is Stroh's (1983a, 41–42) opinion; he supposes an individual publication and the editing of a corpus (cf. also Steel 2005, 49–54). By contrast McDermott (1972) believed that there was no edition of a corpus in addition to individual publications.

numbering seems plausible for a number of reasons, some of which have already been mentioned by Wilfried Stroh (1983a).²⁰⁶

Stroh supports this theory by the observation that *Philippic Three* has a fundamental character, mentions topics that determine all further speeches and follows the first speeches of Demosthenes' cycle in structure and motifs, whereas *Philippic Two* is modelled after Demosthenes' speech *On the crown* and was quoted as *In Antonium* in antiquity (cf. Intr. 3.1.). Besides, the retrospective account of Cicero's activities in the conflict with Antonius and therefore of this cycle of speeches in *Philippic Fourteen* starts with 20 December 44, the day of *Philippics Three* and *Four* (cf. *Phil.* 14.20).²⁰⁷

Further, between *Philippics Two* and *Three* a fundamental change in the situation and thus of the organization of the argument takes place: for

206 According to Stroh (1983a, 36–37, 48–50), the intention to imitate Demosthenes could have been present right from the beginning, since *Philippic Three* already showed the full range of Demosthenic topics. However, irrespective of the possible reasons for this similarity, the outline of a particular (relatively early) speech does not provide evidence for the compilation of the corpus. – Because of their political and rhetorical aims, Cicero's *Philippics* are insufficiently characterized by being generally called 'invectives' (so Dugan 2005, 336).

207 This view on the structure of the corpus was already hinted at in Dal Santo (1950a, 7) and Kennedy (1972, 270, 274), but not developed further. – Without indicating that other positions exist, Leonhardt (1997, 1197 / 2003, 322) took up Stroh's view in his article on Cicero for *The New Pauly* and presents it as generally accepted (in both the German and the English versions, however, '3–12' being printed as a slip for '3–14'). – The theory was approved by Loutsch (1994, 438 and n. 65) and Pinkernell-Kreidt (1997, 332). – Monteleone (2005, 121–133) now confirms that *Philippic Three* is "la prima Filippica in senso demostenico": he describes certain features of situation and argument that distinguish *Philippics One* and *Two* from *Philippics Three* to *Fourteen* and mentions some motifs that can be observed throughout *Philippics Three* to *Fourteen*. Although Stroh's thesis is referred to, it is not actually discussed (cf. Monteleone 2005, 132–133; also in Newbound 1986, 145); and Monteleone does not talk about the structure of the corpus as a whole. – In his review of the works of Wooten (1983) and Stroh (1983a) Gamberale (1984) seems to have been somewhat sceptical about Stroh's view (cf. 1984, 502: "... ipotesi suggestiva e ben argomentata. Ma bisognerebbe allora supporre che l'originario gruppo di orazioni pubblicato come tale da Cicerone avesse subito anche un altro ampliamento sì Arusiano Messio cita, come sembra, una *Phil.* 16 (...) e una *Phil.* 17 (...), e bisognerebbe anche spiegare perché la tradizione manoscritta ci ha conservato insieme (e solo) le quattordici Filippiche che leggiamo intera. Riesce comunque difficile pensare che, nel vivo della battaglia politica, Cicerone abbia potuto sviluppare un 'programma' di orazioni.").

Philippics One and *Two* Antonius is present in Rome or envisaged to be so; the first oration therefore is (at least ostensibly) a speech of advice to Antonius, meant to move him to a certain way of action,²⁰⁸ and the second one is a vehement harangue directed to him. *Philippics Three* to *Fourteen*, however, are delivered after Antonius left Rome; therefore they are indirect invectives with respect to Antonius and function as advice to the populace and the Senate.²⁰⁹

Accordingly, only from *Philippic Three* onwards is the central term *hostis* ('public enemy') used as a political and official catchword referring to Antonius (cf. *Phil.* 3.6 and n.).²¹⁰ This expression does not occur in *Philippic One*, and *Philippic Two* talks more generally about Antonius' position and conduct as a *hostis rei publicae*, *hostis patriae* or *dis hominibusque hostis* (cf. *Phil.* 2.1; 2.2; 2.51; 2.64; 2.89). The foundations for the specific use of the term *hostis* with reference to Antonius are laid in *Philippic Three* and strengthened in *Philippic Four*, which interprets and intensifies the message of *Philippic Three*. More generally too, *Philippic Three* is the starting point for Cicero's fight against Antonius since it outlines his overall strategy: on the basis of this focused presentation of Antonius all further *Philippics* are consistently oriented to disjunctive pairs such as 'war or peace', 'republic or tyranny' and 'liberty or slavery'.²¹¹

208 Yet Cicero is aware of its potential invective quality and its effects on Antonius, who reacted with a vigorous reply (cf. *Fam.* 12.25.4).

209 Interestingly, the structure of the *Philippic* corpus bears several similarities to the *Catilinarians*, a subgroup of the *orationes consulares*. For instance, the opponent leaves Rome after the first few speeches (after *Cat.* 1 and *Phil.* 1–2), and the cycle (or the cycle proper) opens with a pair of a Senate and a *contio* speech closely connected by time and content (*Cat.* 1–2 and *Phil.* 3–4).

210 There is no reason, however, to single out *Philippic Thirteen* because of a particularly frequent use of the term *hostis* with reference to Antonius (but cf. Novielli 2001, 24 n. 87). – Opelt (1965, 130–131) believed that the term *hostis* consistently referred to Antonius and announced Cicero's aim to have him declared a public enemy from *Philippic One* onwards.

211 The fundamental significance of *Philippic Three*, which opens a new stage and starts the actual conflict with Antonius, has frequently been observed (cf. e.g. King / Clark 1908, intr. to *Phil.* 3; Syme 1939, 140, 162; Achard 1981, 503–504; Ortmann 1988, 180; van der Blom 2003). As this view is usually arrived at on the basis of the historical events, it does not lead to considerations of the structure of the corpus. – In his paradigmatic analysis of some of Cicero's speeches May (1988, 148–155) chose *Philippic Three* (besides *Philippic Twelve* [cf. May 1988, 155–161]) and stressed that it contained the fundamental themes and motifs of the corpus. – Settle (1962, 271–287) distinguished the first two *Philippics* from the rest of the speeches, on the basis of the dates and the assumed history of publication (cf. 1962,

Christoph Schäublin (1988) additionally drew attention to the fact that the phrase *nescio animi an ingenii tui maior in his libellis laus contineatur*. ('I don't know whether these pieces say more for your spirit or for your genius.' [trans. Shackleton Bailey]) occurred in the letter in which M. Iunius Brutus reacted to a letter from Cicero containing the (probable) first use of the term *Philippici* (*Ad Brut.* 2.3.4; cf. *Intr.* 3.1.) and that the similar expression *magis animi quam ingenii viribus* ('more by will power than by oratorical skill' [trans. Shackleton Bailey]) was found in another letter by Cicero of 3 February 43 (*Fam.* 10.28.2), in which it referred to *Philippic Three*. Schäublin thus confirmed Stroh's assumption that Cicero coined the term '*Philippics*' in connection with *Philippic Three*, which presents the basic tenets of his policy. He suggested that Cicero might have used a similar phrase with reference to *Philippic Three* in the (unpreserved) letter to M. Brutus in which he introduced the term '*Philippics*' and on which M. Brutus commented.²¹²

The subsequent speeches assembled in the corpus develop the concept outlined in *Philippic Three* in relation to the course of events and consistently fight for Cicero's ultimate goal; they present Cicero as a successful orator and a superior politician. For this purpose the corpus also exhibits orations delivered on occasions when Cicero's main aim was not carried, such as *Philippic Five*, *Philippic Eight*, *Philippic Eleven* or *Philippic Twelve*.²¹³ But these speeches are arranged in a way so that they detail Cicero's policy, define his alliances and show his position to be superior. Thus they help to spread this view, which should have been accepted immediately and is proved to have been right later.

272). Wooten (1983) and then Newbound (1986) discussed only *Philippics Three* to *Fourteen* in their studies, since *Philippics One* and *Two* came from the period before the final breach with Antonius (cf. Wooten 1983, 51 n. 15 [p. 183], 57; Newbound 1986, 3–8); but they did not provide wider-ranging or literary reasons for this decision and did not talk about the structure of the corpus. Burnand (2000, 146, 148–149) attributed the separation of the first two *Philippics* from the rest of the corpus to Wooten and Newbound, but regarded the first two *Philippics* as belonging to a preparatory phase, in which Cicero built up his political position (cf. Fuhrmann's 'exposition' [see below]), and therefore analysed the complete transmitted corpus. – On the basis of the extant corpus Drumann (1899, 1.141) believed that *Philippic One* formed the nucleus of all the *Philippics* since it already contained typical themes and motifs. Since this speech belongs to the conflict with Antonius, it is obvious that it mentions some frequent topics, but (like *Philippic Two*) it lacks central features of Cicero's concept.

212 Cf. Stroh 1983a, 49–50 (without reference to this evidence).

213 The inclusion of setbacks is also noted by Steel (2005, 144).

One might perhaps object that because of the two *contio* speeches, *Philippics Four* and *Six*, in which preceding Senate decrees are conveyed to the People, the corpus includes repetitions (of *Philippics Three* and *Five*). This point could perhaps be refuted by the observation that the corpus was designed to include *contio* speeches as well so that Cicero's interaction with the People and their attitude can also be demonstrated. However, this notion does not yet explain why there are just two *contio* speeches and why these very orations have been chosen. Hence, there must be further literary and political reasons: most likely the apparent 'repetitions' are essential to the design of the corpus.²¹⁴

Both *contio* speeches, *Philippics Four* and *Six*, allow Cicero to comment on the debate in the Senate and to interpret the resulting decrees from his point of view, since he exploits the occasions for his purposes and does not inform the People objectively. Thereby he integrates these decrees into his own policy and provokes the support of the populace to his political concept; he thereby emerges as the superior politician.

Philippic Four shows Cicero's basic beliefs, when he says that the recent Senate decree triggered by *Philippic Three* has laid the groundwork for future operations (cf. *Phil.* 4.1; cf. also *Phil.* 5.30; 6.2; 14.20; *Fam.* 10.28.2; 12.25.2) and that Antonius has basically been declared a public enemy thereby (cf. *Phil.* 4.1).²¹⁵ In *Philippic Six*, Cicero manages to present the decision to send an embassy to Antonius, actually opposed and disapproved of by him, as a successful development of his war policy, since he interprets it as a declaration of war due to the conditions imposed on Antonius and the consequences to be expected. Hence, including this speech does not mean a presentation of Cicero's defeat (in contrast to the Senate speech of the same day). Instead, by the rhetorical structure of the speech, Cicero turned a failure into a source of increased authority in relation to the People. By Cicero's careful rhetorical shaping, this

214 Cf. also Steel 2006, 25 n. 5 (from a more practical point of view): "Exact repetition of material is not found ...; the different audiences required different handling, and on these occasions communication with both was important."

215 Since this function of *Philippic Four* (adumbrated in Steel 2005, 145) was not realized for a long time, its supposed 'unimportance' was one argument for its alleged spuriousness (cf. Comm. 2.1.). – The corpus of the *orationes consulares* too opens with a Senate speech and a *contio* speech on the same issue (*Leg. agr.* 1–2). However, because of the relevance of *Philippic Four* for outlining Cicero's concept, this parallel structure cannot be explained by literary and compositional aspects only (cf. Stroth 1983a, 43–44); there are also factual and political arguments to be taken into account.

immediate political failure did not prevent a positive impression being conveyed by the corpus to a distanced audience.²¹⁶

Besides, both the dates to which these pairs of speeches refer (20 Dec. 44 / 1 Jan. 43) are presented as important several times, and both are mentioned in Cicero's retrospective account in *Philippic Fourteen* (cf. *Phil.* 14.20). Within the collection, both dates are thereby highlighted by a pair of speeches.²¹⁷ The retrospective account in *Philippic Fourteen* (*Phil.* 14.20) and the reference to Cicero's fight as *a principio huius belli* ('from the outset of this war') at the beginning of *Philippic Thirteen* (*Phil.* 13.1) also confirm that 20 December 44, the day of *Philippics Three* and *Four*, is seen as the beginning of his efforts.²¹⁸ On the other side, the summarizing character of *Philippic Fourteen* suggests that it is intended to be the final speech of the corpus. That means that the collection finishes just before the final victory at Mutina, which importantly contributes to its unity: thus all the speeches are naturally concerned with preserving the *res publica* and defeating Antonius since this goal is not reached even by the end of the collection.²¹⁹

Although it has to remain open whether a corpus of twelve *Philippics* was ever edited by Cicero or anyone else, the evidence presented makes it very plausible that such a collection consisting of *Philippics Three* to *Fourteen* in their present form was intended by Cicero.²²⁰ Such a concept is

216 Cf. Steel 2007.

217 That Cicero regarded these two dates or the two Senate speeches on these occasions as fundamental, may perhaps also be inferred from his correspondence with M. Iunius Brutus (see below).

218 On *Phil.* 13.1 cf. Novielli 2001, 53. – Cf. also *Fam.* 12.24.2 (late Jan. 43 BCE): *ego tamen, ut primum occasio data est, meo pristino more rem p. defendi, me principem senatus populoque R. professus sum nec, postea quam suscepi causam libertatis, minimum tempus amisi tuendae salutis libertatisque communis*. [Since the time is given as *primum occasio data est* in *Fam.* 12.24.2 and since this phrase occurs in similar form in *Fam.* 10.28.1–2 and clearly refers to 20 December 44 BCE there, the same date is probably meant in this letter even if it is given in a less specific way (cf. Shackleton Bailey 1977, 500, ad loc.).]

219 Cf. also Stroh 1983a, 38.

220 There is nothing to prove that Atticus was responsible for the publication of the corpus (but cf. Remy 1941, I.IX; Martin 2001, 66–67); only with regard to *Philippic Two* does Cicero put the question of the right time of its proper publication to Atticus. For the time being Cicero asks him to send copies to some people, but to keep it away from others; at that stage distribution could still be controlled (cf. *Att.* 15.13.1; 15.13.7 [= 15.13a.3]; 16.11.1–2).

independent of an individual circulation of speeches soon after their delivery and their transmission in the manuscripts.²²¹

A letter from C. Cassius Parmensis to Cicero written on 13 June 43 (*Fam.* 12.13.1) has been interpreted as an indication of the fact that the sender had received the *Philippics*.²²² That would be an important testimony since at that point in time, after the (preliminary) end of the conflict with Antonius, it might refer to a group of speeches and thus point to the compilation of a corpus by Cicero before this date. Indeed, Cassius talks about the whole course of events, Cicero's efforts and successes and the final result, and in alluding to the famous verse from Cicero's epic *De consulatu suo* (fr. 11 *FPL*³: *cedant arma togae, concedat laurea laudi*) he makes it clear that the result for the *res publica* was achieved by the *toga* and not by *arma*. However, there is no clear proof in this letter that Cassius' remarks are based on his reading of Cicero's speeches against Antonius, since they only presuppose a general knowledge of the events. Thus Cassius' observations in this letter provide interesting evidence of the assessment of Cicero and of his conduct towards Antonius by contemporaries, but do not say anything about the publication history of the *Philippics*.

Descriptions of the typical characteristics of a '*Philippic*' and of the original or intended outline of the corpus are closely related to views on the internal structure of the collection. Fundamental analyses of its structure have been put forward by Manfred Fuhrmann and Wilfried Stroh; a brief overview is also given by Jon Hall.²²³ All of these correspond with each other in a number of details, but essentially differ in approach.

Fuhrmann takes the whole corpus in its transmitted form as the basis and looks at it from a factual and historical perspective. He says that the cycle of the *Philippics* was never completed since Cicero interrupted it in view of the political situation, but that the extant speeches showed a remarkable coherence and formed a unified whole. In his view the

221 Settle (1962, 272) remarks: "Although Cicero thus named the speeches as a group, he did not publish them as a group." and assumes that the speeches were published individually in succession soon after their respective delivery. But naming the speeches as a group suggests that they are regarded as a group and that there is at least the intention to assemble them accordingly. – Eich (2000, 215 n. 214) states that in autumn 43 BCE the *Philippics* had already been published for several months; but there is no evidence for this assumption.

222 Cf. Schöll (1916) 1918, 123, on this testimony: "*acceptis ut vid. Philippicis*".

223 Cf. Fuhrmann 1982, 103–109 = 1993, 609–616; 1997, 287–289 / 1992, 205–206; Stroh 1982, 4, 26 and n. 2; 1983; 2000; Hall 2002, 274–278.

speeches mirror the political events, and he divides them into groups accordingly. Since he regards the course of events as a dynamic and dramatic development, he calls these groups 'five acts', forming a 'drama in fourteen scenes'.

The 'first act' comprises *Philippics One* and *Two*; they form the exposition, in which the break between the two main protagonists Cicero and Antonius occurs and the personal preconditions of the bitter fight are established. This is followed by the 'second act', consisting of *Philippics Three* and *Four*, in which Cicero's overall concept is outlined. As Cicero's war policy provoked protests from opponents, the project of a (first) embassy to Antonius came up, disapproved by Cicero. This topic, like a delaying factor, dominates *Philippics Five* to *Nine*, which form the 'third act'. The failure of the embassy means that the events in the Roman and Italian theatres come to a standstill, and action starts in the provinces. News from the eastern provinces is the topic of *Philippics Ten* and *Eleven*, the 'fourth act'. The last three speeches, *Philippics Twelve* to *Fourteen*, return to the western sphere, particularly to Italy and Rome; they refute renewed opposition to Cicero's war policy. These three speeches and the simultaneous military operations form the 'fifth act', which looks towards the future.

Stroh, however, highlights the importance of the Demosthenic model in various respects and takes this literary perspective in connection with ancient evidence as the basis for his analysis of the structure. He believes that only *Philippics Three* to *Fourteen* are actual 'Philippics' and form the original corpus. The resulting group of twelve speeches can be divided into 2 + 5 + 5 speeches. The two opening orations on the same day and on the same topic (*Philippics Three* and *Four*), delivered at the end of 44, are followed by two blocks or mini-cycles, symmetrically constructed in themselves, from 43. The first group, *Philippics Five* to *Nine*, concerns the (first) embassy to Antonius, the second one, *Philippics Ten* to *Fourteen*, focuses on the events in the East and the military conflict with Antonius. The last speech, *Philippic Fourteen*, was delivered on the day of the decisive victory in the battle of Mutina on 21 April 43 (before the news reached Rome). However, Cicero does not talk about the reaction to this event and thus does not end the cycle victoriously, but rather in the expectation of victory since otherwise the generic character of 'Philippics' influenced by Demosthenes would have been contradicted.

Without explaining his structure or comparing it with others, Hall divides Cicero's *Philippics* into five groups: *Philippics One* and *Two*, *Philippics Three* to *Six*, *Philippics Seven* to *Nine*, *Philippics Ten* and *Eleven* and

Philippics Twelve to Fourteen. This structure agrees with those mentioned, particularly with that of Fuhrmann, in a number of details. A basic difference, however, lies in the fact that Hall distributes the speeches referring to the (first) embassy to Antonius over two groups and that thus the two fundamental speeches, *Philippics Three* and *Four*, do not constitute a group of their own.²²⁴

All three scholars basically agree in dividing Cicero's *Philippics* into subgroups, even if they use different terminology and apply different perspectives; and that is no coincidence, but rather a consequence of the factual situations and the respective topics covered. In all models the first two speeches, *Philippics One* and *Two* are separated from the rest. Fuhrmann and Stroh note that by *Philippics Three* and *Four* the foundations of Cicero's political strategy are laid. A fundamental difference, however, exists in assessing the position of the first two speeches in relation to the cycle as a whole: in Fuhrmann's view *Philippics Three* and *Four* form one 'act' out of several, which make up the course of events, whereas Stroh identifies *Philippic Three* as the important opening oration of the actual corpus. And all scholars start a new subsection with *Philippic Ten*: at this point the series of speeches concerned with the (first) embassy to Antonius and thus with the question of immediate war or negotiation ends; the focus changes to activities outside Italy and to military power relations.²²⁵

If an original cycle of twelve speeches can be assumed, its internal structure has to be constructed accordingly, which suggests Stroh's schema as the more probable one. His model has the additional advantage over that of Fuhrmann that it explains some remarkable features of the corpus (e.g. the unusual character of *Philippic Two*, the use of different speeches by Demosthenes as models, the fundamental character of a speech in third place). For instance, like Fuhrmann, Stroh notices that the

224 Wooten (1983) analyses Cicero's *Philippics Three* to *Fourteen* with respect to their relation to Demosthenes, dividing them into the groups *Phil.* 3–6, 7, 8–11 and 12–14. However, he does not explain this organization or turn the question of structure into a topic of its own. Therefore Gamberale (1984, 500) comments in his review: "per gruppi di orazioni, in un modo che risulta un po' meccanico".

225 Thus the speeches assembled in the present commentary constitute independent subsections as acknowledged by all scholars discussing the structure of the corpus: they represent the fundamental introductory speeches and the group of orations referring to the (first) embassy to Antonius.

cycle aims at a target not yet achieved,²²⁶ but he refers this feature to the influence of the Demosthenic model and does not simply state that Cicero broke off the cycle when nothing important could be done by him and the Senate any more, although after *Philippic Fourteen* Cicero delivered at least one further speech belonging to the conflict with Antonius (cf. *Ad Brut.* 1.5.1: Senate speech on 27 April 43).

Besides the possible plan of a comprehensive corpus for a general readership, Cicero sent single speeches from this context to individuals soon after they were finished and even seems to have arranged specific selections for individual addressees.²²⁷ Even if it is uncertain whether Cicero sent further speeches to the same or other friends in addition to those for which there is evidence, it is obvious that he also relied on this immediate and limited way of ‘publication’ besides or before the collection of a corpus. The speeches distributed in this way, their addressees and Cicero’s comments in the accompanying letters might give further indications of his view of these occasions.

The first two speeches in the present corpus, probably not included originally, *Philippics One* and *Two*, seem to have been sent individually to different friends: Cicero may have sent *Philippic One* (2 Sept. 44) to C. Cassius Longinus, since in a letter to him written in late September 44 Cicero talks of *sententia et oratio mea* (‘my motion and oration’), which were approved by the addressee (cf. *Fam.* 12.2.1 [between 19 Sept. and 2 Oct. 44]). Cicero mentions the oration in connection with comments on Antonius’ measures and his own reaction to them. However, Cicero neither uses the term ‘*Philippicae*’ nor describes the content of the speech precisely. Therefore it is likely to be one of the speeches referring to the conflict with Antonius, but it cannot be established beyond doubt whether it is indeed *Philippic One*, the only known speech against Antonius delivered before the date of the letter. Besides, it is not clear whether Cassius has only heard about this speech or has received a written

226 Cf. Fuhrmann 1982, 103, 107 = 1993, 609, 613; 1997, 287, 289 / 1992, 205, 206; Stroh 1983a, 38, 50; 2000, 96–97. – However, Cicero acknowledges a partial success in *Philippic Thirteen* (cf. *Phil.* 13.29).

227 Besides, some scholars think that soon after their delivery the individual *Philippics* were brought into written form and copies were sent to leading men throughout Italy in order to strengthen their adherence to the Republican cause (cf. e.g. Brunt 1988, 48–49; Monteleone 2005, 165–166 n. 74). This might have been the case; but there is no evidence for the *Philippics* that they were sent to other people besides Cicero’s friends.

version. At any rate, Cicero seems not to have laid emphasis on the details of the oration, but rather on his general attitude expressed in it and on the circumstances of the situation with a view to the development of the conflict.²²⁸

If Cicero sent *Philippic One* to Cassius without using the term '*oratio Philippica*' in an accompanying letter, various explanations would be possible. Cicero may have assumed that the addressee had more limited literary interests than M. Iunius Brutus; or in Cicero's view *Philippic One* was not an actual '*Philippic*', which would imply Cicero's expectation even at this early stage that he would be able to develop a series of speeches after the model of Demosthenes; or at this point in time Cicero could not foresee the course of the conflict and imagine that it would offer him the chance to deliver a series of speeches and give them a distinctive character by referring to the Demosthenic model. Therefore, because of all these uncertainties, this letter most likely does not provide evidence for Cicero's idea of the corpus.

Further remarks in Cicero's letters show that *Philippic Two*, finished by 25 October 44 (dramatic date: 19 September 44), was also sent to a friend, to Atticus, an established literary critic and editor of Cicero's (cf. *Att.* 15.13.1; 15.13.7 [= 15.13a.3]; 16.11.1–2). Cicero advised him to pass the text on to other friends, but to withhold it from his opponents. Besides, Cicero hesitated to give the oration wider distribution immediately because of its politically explosive force. Cicero obviously wanted his

228 In this context *sententia* can hardly denote 'opinion'; hence the phrase *sententia et oratio mea* most likely means 'my motion and my speech' (cf. *Phil.* 8.1; *Verr.* 2.1.68; *Fam.* 3.13.1). However, there is no specific motion in the extant *Philippic One*; perhaps the term refers to another senator's motion supported by Cicero (cf. Shackleton Bailey 1977, 481, ad loc.). At any rate, Cicero seems to be most interested in the general tenor of the speech indicating his position in the developing conflict (cf. Eich 2000, 204 and n. 170), since the next sentence *qua si saepius uti liceret* does not describe his hope to use the same speech another time, but to be able to base his actions on the same views again (cf. *OLD*, s.v. *utor* 7: 'To base one's actions on, use (an argument, authority, opinion, etc.).'). – If this letter actually talked of a written version of *Philippic One* known to the addressee, it would indicate that this speech was distributed to friends at this point in time already (cf. Settle 1962, 272–274; Gelzer 1969, 346; Newbound 1986, 148 and n. 19 [p. 328]; Monteleone 2005, 87–88, 121; Steel 2005, 105; Kelly 2007). – Marinone (2004, 236 n. 2) seems to refer this letter to *Philippic Two*, which is unlikely for chronological reasons. Besides, Cicero appears to talk about a speech actually delivered and does not yet mention his oratorical reaction to Antonius' Senate speech on 19 September.

friend Atticus to realize his view of the political situation as well as his literary achievement, and he seems to have been aware of the special character of this speech.²²⁹

Hence, the (present) *Philippics One* and *Two* (like some other *Philippics*) seem to have been originally distributed separately. Because of their thematic and temporal correspondence, these speeches might later have been added to a corpus of speeches against Antonius (in the correct chronological position) even if the initial outline of the collection did not allow for them. At any rate, the fourteen speeches as transmitted must have been assembled relatively early since later ancient authors already follow the modern numbering when quoting from the *Philippics* (cf. Intr. 3.1.).

Several of the *Philippics* 'proper' were sent to the same addressee, to M. Iunius Brutus, successively: significantly, M. Iunius Brutus had received *Philippics Five* and *Ten* and talked about these speeches in one letter; later, probably prompted by this reaction, Cicero promised to send him *Philippic Eleven* (cf. *Ad Brut.* 2.3.4; 2.4.2). That suggests that Cicero sent M. Brutus *Philippics Five* and *Ten* as one instalment, but none of the speeches delivered between these two orations, and that he later (after M. Brutus' reaction) decided to add *Philippic Eleven* (though not *Philippics Twelve* and *Thirteen*, which had already been delivered by this time). Obviously Cicero regarded the speeches chosen as complementing each other, and he put together a specific selection out of all available orations for his friend.²³⁰ The shared literary and political interests of the two men can explain why Cicero sent some *Philippic Orations* to M. Brutus at all. Further, the contents of the selected speeches may point to the reason why these very samples were chosen.

Philippic Ten is described by M. Brutus in his letter as: *altera de litteris meis, quae habita est abs te contra Calenum* ('and the one concerning my

229 The first extant letter referring to *Philippic Two* dates from 25 October 44, when Cicero wrote to Atticus: *orationem tibi misi* 'I have sent the speech to you' (cf. *Att.* 15.13.1). The past tense is probably chosen from the point of view of the addressee as it is common in letters (cf. K.-St. I 156–158). That means that this was the covering letter and the speech was enclosed with this letter; only then does the statement make good sense. This conclusion is supported by the fact that in another letter, written three days later, Cicero assumed that Atticus would have received the speech (cf. *Att.* 15.13.7 [= 15.13a.3]). Hence, *Philippic Two* must have been finished by 25 October at the latest (which is the *communis opinio*). Monteleone (2005, 121–122), however, thinks that the speech was sent to Atticus before 25 October, which would move forward the date for the completion of this speech by a few days.

230 Cf. Settle 1962, 283–285; cf. also Strohm 1983a, 49–50.

dispatch which you delivered against Calenus' [trans. Shackleton Bailey]). In response to a report by M. Brutus about his successful military exploits in the eastern provinces, Q. Fufius Calenus had moved in the Senate that M. Brutus should give up his army and the provinces under his control. In reaction to that, Cicero criticized this motion in *Philippic Ten* and proposed that M. Brutus' actions be approved and his authority be recognized. This course of events and M. Brutus' description of the situation suggest that Cicero wanted M. Brutus to know how he had intervened on his behalf and defended him against Calenus. A similar reason can be assumed for *Philippic Eleven*, which is characterised by Cicero as *de te etiam dixi tum quae dicenda putavi* ('I also said what I thought proper about yourself.' [trans. Shackleton Bailey]) in his letter to M. Brutus. In this speech too Cicero eulogized M. Brutus; at the same time, he proposed that an extraordinary command for the fight against P. Cornelius Dolabella be given to C. Cassius Longinus. In this speech Cicero stressed that M. Brutus was equal to Cassius in all respects, but called to mind that he was tied up in Greece. By sending this speech to M. Brutus, Cicero obviously wished to inform the addressee of his opinion of him and of the situation as well as of his purely practical reasons for not giving the extraordinary command to him.

M. Brutus' more neutral description of *Philippic Five*, called *altera Kal. Ian. usus es* ('the one you made on the Kalends of January' [trans. Shackleton Bailey]), shows that he recognized that this speech did not affect him personally. As Cicero sent it to M. Brutus nevertheless, it must have been selected for different reasons: Cicero's political attitude, the measures he believed should be taken and the possible honours for those opposing Antonius are made very clear in this fundamental speech. Cicero thereby probably hoped to convey them to M. Brutus and thus to influence his political and military activities.

Further, if the assumption is correct that the phrase *nescio animi an ingeni tui maior in his libellis laus contineatur*. ('I don't know whether these pieces say more for your spirit or for your genius.' [trans. Shackleton Bailey]) in M. Brutus' letter is to be connected with the expression *magis animi quam ingenii viribus* ('more by will power than by oratorical skill' [trans. Shackleton Bailey]) used by Cicero with reference to *Philippic Three* in another letter (*Fam.* 10.28.2) and probably also in a further (unpreserved) letter to M. Brutus,²³¹ one may suppose that Cicero sent

231 Cf. Schäublin 1988 (see above).

Philippic Three to M. Brutus before *Philippics Five* and *Ten* or at least discussed this speech with him.

M. Brutus would then have received two fundamental speeches of the corpus (*Philippics Three* and *Five*), which would be an indication of their significance in Cicero's view, and two speeches that concerned him personally (*Philippics Ten* and *Eleven*); that would give a plausible selection. For the intended impact on M. Brutus, the two *contio* speeches, *Philippics Four* and *Six*, which continue and interpret *Philippics Three* and *Five*, or more general statements like *Philippic Seven* were probably not relevant to the same degree.²³²

3.3. Strategic elements

3.3.1. Political strategy

Cicero's political strategy in dealing with Antonius as reflected in the *Philippics* (and his contemporary letters) was determined by the available means of taking action and of exerting influence and by his assessment of the people involved. Generally, he aimed at defending the traditional *res publica* (as understood by him) against the present powerful leaders, who endangered the system in his view.²³³

Cicero did not hold an office in 44–43 BCE, but was an (influential) member of the Senate by virtue of his status as a consular, although he was not the first senator to be called upon throughout 43. Hence, Cicero did not have the chance to initiate immediate action on his own; the only (constitutional) strategy open to him was to rely on his rhetorical virtuosity and thereby make the Senate, regarded as the governing body, decree the necessary measures proposed by him (cf. *Fam.* 11.14.1). After the main struggle was over, Cicero lamented in a letter to D. Iunius Brutus of 7 June 43 (*Fam.* 11.14) that he had not been able to exert the same power in the Senate as he used to. In earlier letters, however, Cicero

232 In a letter to D. Iunius Brutus Cicero mentioned *Philippics Three* and *Four*, which concerned the addressee (cf. *Fam.* 11.6a.2); and he recalled his appearance in the Senate on 20 December 44 (*Philippic Three*) in letters to other correspondents (cf. *Fam.* 10.28.2; 12.24.2; 12.25.2).

233 On Cicero's assessment of the situation and his resulting strategy cf. e.g. Bellincioni 1974; Bennett 1995; Gotter 1996, 107–172; van der Blom 2003.

proudly talked about his efforts and his leading position in the Senate; and he continued his strategy against objections by friends (cf. e.g. *Fam.* 10.28.2; 11.6a.2; 12.24.2; *Ad Brut.* 1.3.3; 2.5.5). Even Antonius seems to have acknowledged Cicero's standing when he reproachfully described Cicero as a *dux* ('leader') in the Senate (cf. *Phil.* 13.30).²³⁴ According to his views of what was beneficial to the *res publica*, Cicero seems to have based his claim to leadership on the fact that he had been the first to oppose Antonius and to fight for the restoration of liberty in the interest of the Roman People.²³⁵

At least within the range of action open to him, Cicero obviously tried to achieve immediate results: eight out of the eleven speeches delivered in the Senate include concrete motions (cf. *Phil.* 3; 5; 8; 9; 10; 11; 13; 14).²³⁶ These motions do not always call for Cicero's actual far-reaching objective (to declare M. Antonius a public enemy and to wage war upon him), but more often for limited and preparatory measures, which can be accepted more easily and thereby further the actual goal in the long run. And by not immediately making the maximum demands, but only calling for what was reasonable in view of the political situation and of the preceding negotiations, Cicero ensured that almost all his formal motions put forward in the *Philippics* were accepted by the Senate. Although Cicero did not always approve of the majority opinion in the Senate, he tried not to impugn the credibility of its decision-making (cf. e.g. *Phil.* 7.14; 13.23), since that remained the only basis he could rely on. One has to bear in mind, however, that some issues on which Cicero's view differed from that of the majority of the Senate were not included in the final motions and that some speeches from this period, which led to failures, did not become part of the corpus (cf. *Intr.* 3.2.2.).

Cicero's proclaimed aim was to defend the *res publica* and the liberty of the Roman People against those who strove for sole rulership and violated

234 Cf. *Phil.* 13.30: '*victum Ciceronem ducem habuistis.*' *eo libentius 'ducem' audio quod certe ille dicit invitus; nam de victo nihil laboro. fatum enim meum est sine re publica nec vinci posse nec vincere.* – Whereas Cicero interprets the term *dux* positively, Antonius probably understood it as a political catchword of the Late Republic with negative connotations meaning 'leader of a gang' (on the meaning of *dux* cf. Hellegouarc'h 1972, 324–326).

235 Cf. Gotter 1996, 168.

236 Cf. Hall 2002, 280.

basic Republican principles.²³⁷ Accordingly, Cicero's main opponent was Marcus Antonius, who is presented by Cicero as his third arch-enemy after Catilina and Clodius and frequently compared to them.²³⁸ Even if Cicero claims that he used to be Antonius' friend, that need not refer to a close personal relationship against the background of Roman conventions (cf. *Phil.* 5.3 and n.). At any rate they had broken with each other completely after (according to Cicero) Antonius had called off their 'friendship' and thus had become an 'enemy'.²³⁹

This development concerned not only the level of personal enmity between the two men. Antonius' political activities also demonstrated in Cicero's view that he intended to injure Roman citizens and to destroy the *res publica* (cf. e.g. *Phil.* 2.50–2.51; 2.72; 3.3–5); Cicero therefore also depicted Antonius as a *hostis*, a 'public enemy' (cf. e.g. *Phil.* 3.1; 4.14–15; cf. also *Phil.* 2.1; 2.17; *Off.* 1.57).²⁴⁰ On this basis the term *hostis* becomes a catchword and term of abuse, which succinctly summarizes Antonius' attitude and paradigmatically describes Antonius as envisaged by Cicero; it contrasts with Cicero, the *conservator rei publicae*, the 'saviour of the *res publica*' (cf. e.g. *Phil.* 2.2; 2.51; 2.60; 3.6; 3.28; 4.5; 4.8; 5.4; 14.24).²⁴¹ Cicero felt justified in this assessment since he believed that Antonius himself, by setting himself and his army against the *res publica*, had forfeited all right to being regarded as a consul or consular (cf. e.g. *Phil.* 10.12; cf. *Phil.* 3.6; 3.21; 4.6). By applying these categories and constructing an appropriate portrait of Antonius, Cicero tried to shake his opponent's

237 For brief definitions of Republican institutions and values (including bibliography) cf. the glossary in Kaster 2006, 415–430.

238 Cf. e.g. *Phil.* 2.1; 2.11; 2.17; 2.118; 4.15; 12.21; 12.24; 13.22. – Cf. e.g. Fuhrmann 1997, 254, 290 / 1992, 181, 206. On the depiction of these three men and of the connections between them in the *Philippics* cf. Evans 2007. – Cf. Tac. *Dial.* 37.6: *nec Ciceronem magnum oratorem P. Quinctius defensus aut Licinius Archias faciunt: Catilina et Milo et Verres et Antonius hanc illi famam circumdederunt.*

239 Cf. *Phil.* 1.11; 1.12; 1.26; 1.27; 1.28; 2.2–3; 2.6; 2.7; 2.34; 2.90; 5.3; 5.19; 11.3; *Fam.* 11.5.2; 12.28.3; 16.23.2.

240 On the meaning and function of *hostis* and of *inimicus* in the Late Republic cf. Bleicken 1975, 507–508; Saner 1988, 291. – Cf. *Dig.* 50.16.118: '*hostes*' *hi sunt, qui nobis aut quibus nos publice bellum decrevimus: ceteri 'latrones' aut 'praedones' sunt.* : on the distinction between *inimicus* and *competitor* cf. *Off.* 1.38: *ut enim cum cive aliter contendimus si est inimicus, aliter si competitor (cum altero certamen honoris et dignitatis est, cum altero capitis et famae), sic cum Celtiberis, cum Cimbris bellum ut cum inimicis gerebatur, uter esset, non uter imperaret, cum Latinis Sabinis Samnitibus Poenis Pyrrho de imperio dimicabatur.*

241 On this argumentative technique of using comparisons and contrasts to reinforce a particular characterization cf. Seager 2007.

legally powerful position and to exclude him from the community.²⁴² Still, Cicero seems to have been aware of the fact that this assessment was not generally shared: he first cautiously aimed at Senate decrees by which Antonius was declared a *hostis* in substance and only later called for the formal confirmation of this assessment (cf. *Phil.* 14.6–7; 14.9–10; 14.12; 14.21–25).

In Cicero's view Marcus Antonius was the main cause of danger to the *res publica*; he therefore ran his campaign like a fight against an individual. Accordingly, an important element of his strategy was to make the audience oppose Antonius personally. Thus in line with general rhetorical techniques, Cicero described not only Antonius' present political actions as directed against the *res publica*, but also painted a comprehensive portrait of his character, covering his private life and his whole career, since Antonius' previous conduct already showed his disposition. Therefore, besides the politically focused expression *hostis*, Cicero also referred to Antonius by more general terms of abuse like *latro* or *pestis* (cf. *Intr.* 3.3.2.). Additionally, Cicero included Marcus' brothers Lucius and Gaius in this negative picture, in order to exploit further details for drawing analogies with Marcus Antonius or to condemn the whole family (cf. *Ad Brut.* 1.3.3). The same method works for the introduction of further followers of Antonius (cf. *Intr.* 3.3.2.), who paradigmatically illustrate the character of the party opposed (cf. *Phil.* 11.10; 11.14; 12.17; 13.2–3; 13.10; 13.28).

As a contrast to Marcus Antonius (and his brothers) Cicero particularly promoted Octavian, since he expected to influence the young man and hoped to win sufficient military strength in support of the *res publica* by siding with him (cf. *Nic. Dam. Aug.* 111). Thus in the *Philippics* Cicero presented Octavian as a sudden, effective and reliable support of the community: he described him as an unexpected gift from the gods, who, on his own initiative, saved the *res publica* in an emergency. Therefore Cicero suggested joining forces with him as a preferable option to the inactive Senate; by calling for an official acknowledgement of Octavian's activities and proposing honours for him, he tried to tie Octavian to his cause and to document the justification of opposing the incumbent consul

242 Cf. also Harries 2006, 204, 207, 212–213, 216–218.

Antonius (cf. e.g. *Phil.* 3.3–5; 3.7; 3.27; 3.38–39; 4.2–3; 5.23; 5.42–51; 11.20; 13.19; 13.46; 14.4).²⁴³

On the whole, however, Cicero's attitude to Octavian was not unambiguous: it is well known that a sweepingly positive picture of Octavian is given only in the speeches. In private letters to some of his friends the picture is different or at least more differentiated: this evidence shows that Cicero considered Octavian the lesser evil in comparison with Antonius and valued him as a counterweight (cf. *Att.* 16.1.1). Therefore he wished to include Octavian in a great Republican coalition against Antonius. In the present political and military situation Cicero regarded collaboration with Octavian as the only sensible possibility since the Republicans could thus acquire the necessary military force. At the same time Cicero made it clear that he intended this collaboration with Octavian to be short-lived and purpose-built with a view to the fight against Antonius (cf. e.g. *Att.* 15.12.2; 16.9). Quite early he foresaw a confrontation between Octavian and Antonius (cf. *Att.* 14.10.3; 16.8.1).

In places the letters also contain almost unlimited praise of Octavian (cf. e.g. *Att.* 16.8.1), similar to that in the *Philippics* as regards wording and the aspects highlighted (cf. e.g. *Fam.* 11.14.1; 12.23.2). For instance, in both cases the term *puer* ('boy') is used; this characterization plays down Octavian's potential power and at the same time emphasizes his achievements (cf. e.g. *Phil.* 3.3; 4.3; 5.47; 14.28; *Att.* 14.12.2; 16.8.1; 16.9; 16.11.6; 16.15.3; *Fam.* 10.28.3; 11.7.2; 11.14.1; 12.25.4; *Ad Brut.* 1.3.1). Cicero is obviously aware of the fact that he has constructed a positive meaning of *puer*; so he objects when Antonius disrespectfully calls Octavian *puer* (cf. *Phil.* 13.24; cf. *App. B Civ.* 3.43.176; Cass. Dio 46.30.1).²⁴⁴

On the other hand, one of Cicero's first preserved remarks about Octavian, dating from 12 April 44, says that Octavian is not to be taken seriously (cf. *Att.* 14.6.1; cf. *Att.* 16.14.2). At this early stage (on 21 April 44) Cicero believed that Octavian might be led by him (cf. *Att.* 14.11.2; cf. *Fam.* 12.25.4; *Ad Brut.* 1.3.1; 1.15.6). Even when Octavian assembled military force in early November 44 and made overtures to Cicero, he still was in doubt about his success because of Octavian's political inexperience

243 On Cicero's relationship to and presentation of Octavian in the *Philippics* cf. Bellen 1985; Newbound 1986, 236–253; Ortmann 1988, 171–175, 180–186, 527–528; Humpert 2001, 245–270.

244 On Cicero's designation of Octavian as *puer* (on the basis of the *Philippics* and the letters) cf. McCarthy 1931. – On Cicero's views of *adulescentia* cf. Humpert 2001.

and naivety (cf. *Att.* 16.8; 16.11.6). That means, shortly before he forcefully argued for an alliance with Octavian in the speeches, Cicero remained sceptical about it (cf. *Att.* 16.8). For Cicero was aware of the fact that Octavian originally was a Caesarian and consequently unlikely to become a true Republican immediately (cf. *Att.* 14.12.2; 15.12.2; 16.14.1). It was clear to Cicero that Octavian had to be brought to the side of the Republicans by assiduous efforts, not least by himself, but that there were other powerful influences, which were always likely to win Octavian over (cf. e.g. *Ad Brut.* 1.10.3; 1.10.5).

Eventually, after M. Antonius had been defeated without lasting success, Cicero realized that his unlimited vouching for Octavian (cf. *Phil.* 5.51; *Ad Caes. iun.* fr. 11) had been premature because one could never safely vouch for an individual, particularly since events had developed differently from what he had wished (cf. *Ad Brut.* 1.18.3–4; cf. generally *Ad Brut.* 1.1.1). For in the end, Octavian did not obey the power of the Senate as Cicero had expected. And when Octavian noticed how he had been assessed and exploited, he turned against the disparaging term *puer* (cf. Cass. Dio 46.41.4; Suet. *Aug.* 12; Serv. on Verg. *Ecl.* 1.42); in realizing the full force of Cicero's famous dictum '*laudandum adulescentem, ornandum, tollendum*' ('the young man must get praises, honours, – and the push' [trans. Shackleton Bailey]), he attempted to maintain his position and to oppose such plans (cf. *Fam.* 11.20.1; Suet. *Aug.* 12; Vell. Pat. 2.62.6). In sum, after the situation had become more favourable to him, Octavian aligned himself with Antonius.²⁴⁵

Friends of Cicero, such as Atticus, M. Iunius Brutus or Varro, were more sceptical about Octavian from the outset (cf. e.g. *Att.* 14.10.3; 16.9; 16.15.3; *Ad Brut.* 1.4a.2–3).²⁴⁶ For instance, M. Iunius Brutus regarded an agreement with Antonius as still possible and saw the danger in Octavian,

245 Cf. the assessment of Cicero's strategy in Augustine (*De civ. D.* 3.30): *huius [i.e. Caesaris] deinde potentiam multum moribus dispar vitiisque omnibus inquinatus adque corruptus adfectare videbatur Antonius, cui vehementer pro eadem illa velut patriae libertate Cicero resistebat. tunc emergerat mirabilis indolis adulescens ille alius Caesar, illius Gai Caesaris filius adoptivus, qui, ut dixi, postea est appellatus Augustus. huic adulescenti Caesari, ut eius potentia contra Antonium nutriretur, Cicero favebat, sperans eum depulsa et obpressa Antonii dominatione instauraturum rei publicae libertatem, usque adeo caecus adque improvidus futurorum, ut ille ipse iuvenis, cuius dignitatem ac potestatem fovebat et eundem Ciceronem occidendum Antonio quadam quasi concordiae pactione permitteret et ipsam libertatem rei publicae, pro qua multum ille clamaverat, dicioni propriae subiugaret.*

246 Cf. also *Ad Brut.* 1.16; 1.17, whose authenticity is in doubt (cf. Shackleton Bailey 1980, 10–14).

whom he viewed critically and with resentment; therefore he disapproved of Cicero's strategy.²⁴⁷ Still, Cicero continued his policy, of whose validity he seems to have been convinced, till its failure became obvious (cf. e.g. *Att.* 16.9; *Ad Brut.* 1.15.9; *Plut. Cic.* 45.2).

Cicero's policy was determined by his assessment of the political situation and its protagonists: although he was aware of the fact that a civil conflict was going on and that the opponents were domestic enemies (cf. *Ad Brut.* 1.10.1), he regarded them as attacking the whole *res publica*: he therefore called them public enemies and regarded war against them as justified (cf. *Phil.* 13.35).²⁴⁸ He aimed at forming a coalition with Octavian against them, particularly against Marcus Antonius, resting on a legal basis established by senatorial decrees. For this purpose, Octavian's private initiatives had to be legitimized, while Antonius, still the incumbent consul, had to be declared a public enemy and a state of war be proclaimed.²⁴⁹ In his rhetorical argument Cicero presented himself as working for the *res publica* disinterestedly; in fact, he pursued a strategy governed by his own opinion of the present political situation and of the ideal to be aimed at. He did not admit to the fact that he offered a special view, but claimed that his assessment of Antonius corresponded with the generally shared one (cf. *Fam.* 10.5.3).

As remarks in the letters and other writings show, Cicero's basic aim was to maintain or re-establish the *res publica* and the *libertas populi Romani*, since he believed that the true *res publica* had been lost by the governments of Caesar and M. Antonius (cf. e.g. *Fam.* 10.1.1; *Off.* 1.35; 2.29; cf. similarly *Har.* 54; *Rep.* 5.1); he supported the plausibility of his position by stressing that he had always been working towards this goal (cf. e.g. *Phil.* 2.1–2; 2.119; 14.20–21; *Fam.* 9.24.4; 12.7.1; 12.22.2; 12.24.2). Accordingly, the ideal of *libertas populi Romani* is an important concept in the *Philippics*:²⁵⁰ in Cicero's view *libertas* does not merely describe a personal

247 Cf. Ortmann 1988, 531–533.

248 Cf. Albert 1980, 21–22.

249 This strategy caused Cicero to contradict some of his earlier convictions and to change his methods of political fight (cf. e.g. Mäkel 2002, 19–63). – On Cicero's political views and methods as reflected in the *Philippics* cf. Maroscheck 1970.

250 On *libertas* in the Roman Republic cf. Wirszowski 1950; Brunt 1988, 281–350; on *libertas* in Cicero cf. Dermience 1957; on *libertas* in the *Philippics* cf. e.g. Dermience 1957, 166–167; Bleicken 1962, esp. 11–17; Ortmann 1988, 439–465, esp. 450–452; Fogel 1994, 249–250; Gotter 1996, 169–171; Dognini 1998, 85–92; Cowan 2007.

situation, but is rather a characteristic of the Roman People and an essential element of a proper *res publica* and its responsible citizens; it thus paradigmatically defines the issue at stake. Therefore it had to be recovered or defended against Antonius' attacks, since the political system intended by Antonius would mean the loss of *libertas*; some private initiatives had already contributed to this goal because interventions against M. Antonius, for the *res publica* or for *libertas* all were basically the same for Cicero. Accordingly, the *Philippics* often contrast *libertas* with *servitus*, the condition under a king or tyrant.²⁵¹ The abolition of tyranny entails appreciation of the power of the Senate; hence *libertas populi Romani* and *auctoritas senatus* are frequently combined.²⁵² Cicero obviously regarded the two elements as complementing each other and as constituents of a functioning *res publica* (cf. also *Rep.* 2.57).²⁵³

Clearly, Cicero's argument was based on a certain view of the *res publica* and its concomitant civic and political values. Although Cicero was usually quick to adapt general truths and established customs to his policy if that suited his purposes, he did not modify the traditional view of the *res publica*, which he tried to maintain. On the premise that a free *res publica* was the highest value for everybody, he accepted all kinds of measures, even those contradicting the constitution, in order to achieve this goal; he thus adapted general political values to his purposes since he set the ultimate aim above the means ('the end justifies the means').²⁵⁴

251 Cf. e.g. *Phil.* 3.9; 3.12; 3.29; 3.34–36; 4.3; 4.11; 5.6; 5.21; 5.38; 6.19; 8.12; 8.32; 10.18–20; 11.3; 11.24; 12.2; 12.9; 12.14; 12.15; 13.2; 13.17–18; 13.31; 14.11; 14.37.

252 Cf. e.g. *Phil.* 3.8; 3.19; 3.28; 3.29; 3.32; 3.33; 3.36; 3.37; 3.39; 4.1; 4.2; 4.4; 4.5; 4.7; 4.8; 4.10; 4.11; 4.16; 5.3; 5.34; 5.37; 5.41; 5.42; 5.44; 5.46; 5.49; 5.53; 6.9; 6.19; 7.11; 7.12; 7.21; 7.22; 7.27; 8.8; 8.10; 8.12; 8.29; 8.32; 10.19; 10.20; 11.3; 13.6; 13.15.

253 Cf. Brunt 1988, 323–324 and n. 106; somewhat differently Dognini 1998, 89–92; cf. Hellegouarc'h 1972, 542–559; Bleicken 1975, 493.

254 On the power of speeches to confirm or shatter generally established values cf. Braun 2003. – There is no basis for the assumption that Cicero did not notice that he and the men supported by him violated constitutional rules (so Mäkel 2002, 57–59). On the contrary, the fact that Cicero took great care to explain how these activities supported the *res publica* shows that he still wished to preserve it and adhere to the constitution. It is only that he could not easily move the political bodies to support it by corresponding decisions and therefore allowed people 'to be their own Senates', whereby he transferred the constitutional system to individuals.

Accordingly, Cicero interpreted all actions of the protagonists in this conflict in relation to the objective of re-establishing the *res publica* (cf. *Phil.* 11.27–28). He even encouraged and supported others to act of their own initiative for the liberty and welfare of the Roman People as if authorized by the Senate or in anticipation of Senate decrees, particularly when these interventions were in line with the (alleged) view of the Senate, who was presently unable to fulfil its duties due to the circumstances (cf. *Phil.* 8.5; *Fam.* 10.16.2; 11.7.2–3).²⁵⁵ For Cicero believed that the welfare of the *res publica* rested in right-minded people such as the Liberators, who represented the *res publica* as it were (cf. *Phil.* 2.113). His expectation, however, that one would return to the Republican constitution after abolishing the danger (which justified these extraordinary measures) did not materialize.²⁵⁶

Cicero's own principles of assessment become particularly obvious when he stated that M. Antonius, by his own deeds, had forfeited the right to be regarded as consul. On this basis Cicero concluded that private initiatives against Antonius and for the public welfare were justified and had to be authorized by the Senate.²⁵⁷ Although the prestigious office of consul demanded acknowledgement and obedience from other citizens, Cicero asserted that not the official status, but the deeds of the consul determined his assessment; by this logical construction he justified Antonius' opponents and proved unconstitutional actions to be constitutional ones.²⁵⁸ Cicero not only acted according to these premises himself, but also granted the right of deciding on the correct assessment to other

255 Cf. Bleicken 1975, 503–504; Monteleone 2005, 110–113 and n. 297; Christian 2007.

256 On this complex cf. Habicht 1990, 97–99 / 81–83; critically Drumann 1899, e.g. 1.139.

257 Cicero generally approved of private initiatives without official authorization, when they were beneficial to the community in his view, and even judged them necessary and required (cf. e.g. *Mil.* 77; 82–83; *Fam.* 11.7; *Rep.* 2.46; *Tusc.* 4.51; *Off.* 1.76; 3.19; *Brut.* 107; 212; cf. Gelzer 1969, 368 and n. 146; on the role of *privati* in Cicero's view cf. Béranger 1958), but he disapproved of them when he regarded them as directed against the *res publica* (cf. *Phil.* 13.14).

258 Cf. Galinsky 1996, 51: "By the very fact that Brutus had proceeded *privato consilio*, 'he judged, and judged most correctly, that [Antony] was not consul' (*Phil.* 3.12) – though, in fact, there could not be the slightest doubt about the legality of Antony's consulate. It was a triumph of deconstructionist politics: one could simply deny the legitimacy of an elected official with whose views one did not agree. It all hinged on one's definition of 'the public interest'."

citizens and to the legions (cf. e.g. *Phil.* 3.6; 3.12; 4.5–9; 5.4; cf. *Phil.* 11.27).²⁵⁹

Hence, activities of *privati* acquired an increased importance. However, Cicero still refrained from empowering mere *privati* without any actual current legal power (cf. *Phil.* 11.19–20). Nevertheless, even granting extraordinary rights to private citizens after the event, since they actually have an army and thereby virtually exercise this power and because they need this authorization to continue their operations on an official basis (cf. *Phil.* 5.45; 11.20; *Ad Brut.* 1.15.7), was unheard of and illegal according to Republican rules.²⁶⁰ The established law then no longer has an organizing function as a guideline for political activity; it is the individual speaker's interpretation of law and decrees that matters. The precedence of political matters over traditional law becomes clear when Cicero defends the trespassing of basic constitutional traditions by the present emergency: the actions of the defenders of the Republic were not based on positive law, but Cicero still regarded them as *legitimum* and *iustum*, since they followed the higher and more important divine law or law of nature, according to which all deeds in the interest of the *res publica* are said to be lawful and proper. The decisive criterion for lawfulness on this level is the subjectively determined benefit for the welfare of the state and the cause of the Senate and the People of Rome; any action undertaken in defence of the *res publica* is right, regardless of its legal status according to formal law (cf. *Phil.* 11.27–28). That means that positive law is said to have been 'suppressed' by the present circumstances, which allows disregarding it in order to preserve the *res publica* according to the law of nature. However, this is not just a slight adaptation for immediate purposes, but attacks the basis of political life. For positive law is not replaced by hallowed and perpetual divine law, but by an arbitrarily defined law of nature according to the beliefs of individuals.²⁶¹

259 Cf. also Bleicken 1962, 12; Gotter 1996, 104–105, 243–244; Monteleone 2005, 124–125, 162–163; Christian 2007.

260 Cf. Franchi 1953, IX: "Cosi all'azione illegale ed arbitraria di Antonio Cicerone, il difensore della legalità repubblicana, rispondeva con un'azione non meno illegale ed arbitraria, consentendo a quel giovane, di cui ancora non si conoscevano le intenzioni politiche, di armare delle truppe irregolari per combattere contro le legioni del console."; cf. also Pabst 1997, 121–123.

261 On the relationship between law of nature and positive law in this conflict and on the violations or adaptations of traditional law cf. Nörr 1974, 43; Bleicken 1975, 491–508; Classen 1979, 288–289 and n. 81; Gotter 1996, 282–284; Harries 2006, 224–228; cf. slightly differently Girardet 1993, 227–232. – The premise that a

In Cicero's view such a strategy was temporarily justified in order to re-establish the *res publica*; since it did not lead to the expected result, the violation of traditional law remained and prepared the way for a more fundamental change.²⁶² Cicero, however, did not intend such a change: although he regarded the policy of the Senate as inadequate, he did not call for changing its members or the system. He only tried to confront this body with his own version of reality, which forced the Senate to act as he intended and thereby to give the traditional legal backing to the initiatives he supported.²⁶³

In the *Pro Milone* Cicero had already argued that in order to defend oneself and to preserve the *res publica* threatened by *latrones* ('brigands') even killing the opponent was allowed.²⁶⁴ In this context he referred to 'a law, which is a law not of the statute-book, but of nature' (cf. *Mil.* 10: *non scripta, sed nata lex* [trans. N.H. Watts]) and asserted that 'when arms speak, the laws are silent' (cf. *Mil.* 11: *silent ... leges inter arma* [trans. N.H. Watts]). That corresponds to Cicero's general support of the law of resistance for citizens oppressed by a tyrant (cf. *Rep.* 2.46–48). The judicial argument in the *Pro Milone* may be compared to the political exposition in the *Philippics*: it is regarded as possible and legitimate to deviate from positive law in certain circumstances for the sake of a 'higher goal', which is defined individually. In Cicero's view the right of resistance against tyrants and *latrones* applied to the case of M. Antonius as well. Besides, there were precedents for private citizens who had acted in the public interest and were therefore praised by Cicero, for instance L. Brutus, the founder of the Republic (cf. *Rep.* 2.46), or Scipio Nasica (cf. *Phil.* 8.13 and n.).²⁶⁵ So, the argument applied to Octavian and D. Iunius Brutus was not new, but

private individual may trespass written laws on the basis of natural law if that is of use to the community and required by the circumstances, may be regarded as an anticipation of the ideology of the Principate (cf. e.g. Béranger 1958; Saner 1988, 250–253; Kienast 1999, 32–33; Dugan 2005, 342). The irregular granting of power and offices as well as assessing a magistrate's status by his conduct also contributed to weakening the Republican system and its established preconditions of authority (cf. Gotter 1996, 243–244). – In principle, Cicero disapproved of those who aspire to sole rulership and therefore disregard all public laws and of trespassing the established customs and conventions of a community (cf. *Off.* 1.64; 1.148).

262 Cf. Bleicken 1975, 505–506.

263 Cf. Christian 2007.

264 Cf. Pina Polo 1996, 151. – Even killing a fellow citizen can be justified and morally right if he is a tyrant (cf. *Off.* 3.19; 3.32).

265 Cf. Galinsky 1996, 49–52.

the quality of the struggle was different, since the military situation and Cicero's assessment of the validity of Antonius' consulship had prompted it.

Although Cicero viewed the private initiatives against Antonius as justified by a 'superior law', he wanted official and formal authorization of these illegal, yet beneficial activities, in order to provide the campaigners with obvious and technically correct legitimization as required by the reality of the situation (cf. esp. *Phil.* 11.29).²⁶⁶ Cicero primarily worked towards an acknowledgement by the Senate; this was easiest to obtain for a non-magistrate, and the Senate had become more and more powerful in the Late Republic. Still, by his *contiones* before the popular assembly, Cicero tried to include the populace in the coalition and to provoke their approval of the measures against Antonius even though official *comitia* did not take place.²⁶⁷ By inviting the assent of these two bodies, Cicero demonstrated the constitutionality of his measures; this policy is documented by his extant speeches.²⁶⁸

In the early stages of the conflict Cicero regarded Antonius as intending war (cf. *Att.* 15.4.1 [24 May 44]); he therefore noted with disapproval that many of the *optimates* feared peace while he dreaded nothing more than war (cf. *Att.* 14.21 [11 May 44]). For Cicero was aware of the inequality of the fight against Antonius, since he wondered what could be done against force without force (cf. *Fam.* 12.3.1 [soon after 2 Oct. 44]); he knew that he could only oppose weapons by the word (cf. *Fam.* 12.22.1 [after 19 Sept. or 2 Oct. 44]; cf. also [*Ad. Brut.*] 1.17.2). Soon, however, he realized that the traditional ideals no longer applied and that Antonius' weapons had taken the place of civil power (cf. *Phil.* 2.20); under these circumstances oratory alone was without effect, while peace and liberty could only be achieved by weapons (cf. *Phil.* 2.113; *Ad Brut.* 2.5.1).²⁶⁹

Hence, Cicero started to pursue a strict war policy himself. When he argued for war against Antonius, his opposition by means of the word was designed to set up weapons against him. Cicero's sole aim was to bring about a final resolution of the conflict with Antonius by a military struggle

266 Cf. Christian 2007.

267 Cf. Habicht 1990, 101 / 84; cf. slightly differently Bleicken 1962, 13–14; 1975, 503–504.

268 Cf. Harries 2006, 220.

269 Cf. Pina Polo 1996, 151–156. – In a later rhetorical context, Cicero regarded caring for the city of Rome together with the Senate (as opposed to waging war) as the appropriate sphere of action for him (cf. *Phil.* 12.24).

since he believed that this was the only way to preserve any form of *res publica* and to avoid slavery in an apparent peace (cf. *Ad Brut.* 1.15.10); since the *res publica* was threatened by Antonius, a war would be a justified action of defence (cf. *Phil.* 13.35).²⁷⁰ This war strategy had to be pushed through an indecisive and inactive Senate; Cicero himself called his policy *vehementior* ('more forceful') in relation to that of M. Iunius Brutus (cf. *Ad Brut.* 2.5.1).

Within this framework Cicero argued for *honesta pax* ('honourable peace') and against any kind of compromise or delay; peace achieved by negotiations would lead to *servitus* in his opinion; thus he aimed at a *bellum necessarium* ('necessary war') for the sake of *depulsio servitutis* ('warding off slavery').²⁷¹ In this case Cicero described himself as the first to call for war, whereas he used to be an advocate of peace and to be proud of his peaceful settling of conflicts, particularly in his consular year. As he seems to have been conscious of this discrepancy, he felt obliged to explain this change of attitude and to demonstrate that there were good reasons for it (cf. e.g. *Phil.* 7.7–8; 12.17).²⁷²

In his philosophical works Cicero says that deciding conflicts by war should only be a last resort when negotiations have proved impossible or unsuccessful; war is justified merely as a way to peace and when revenge is to be taken or enemies are to be beaten back (cf. *Off.* 1.34–36; 1.80; *Isid. Etym.* 18.1.2–3 [*Rep.* 3.35]). Such wars contrast with wars against one's fatherland, which lack a just cause (cf. *Phil.* 2.53). However, there need not be a contradiction: one may infer that in Cicero's interpretation of the conflict with Antonius the preconditions for a just war were fulfilled, since he considered Antonius a 'public enemy' threatening the *res publica* and a partner with whom one could not negotiate; therefore peace could only be achieved by war. It is merely the demand that war has to be announced in advance that was not actually observed, unless Cicero regarded the first embassy (in his interpretation) as serving this function or considered such an action unnecessary in a situation of defence.²⁷³ Still, the Senate had

270 On the Roman concept of the *bellum iustum* cf. Albert 1980; Loreto 2001.

271 Cf. esp. *Phil.* 5.2–3; 5.25; 5.32–33; 6.1; 6.3; 6.16–17; 7.14; 7.19; 8.12; 12.1–2; 12.14; 12.29; 13.1–2.

272 In his argument on peace and war Cicero made use of some of the elements mentioned in rhetorical handbooks as points suitable for convincing an audience of the necessity of war, such as mentioning the defence against wrongdoers, the advantage to be gained by the *res publica* or the situation in favour of a successful campaign (cf. Arist. [*Rh. Al.*], ch. 2, 1425a).

273 Cf. also Albrecht 1980, 17–21.