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Preface

This volume collects a series of papers delivered at the International Conference “Portraying Cicero/Ritratti di Cicerone”, held in Rome on May 15th – 17th 2019. The papers deal with the reception of Cicero and offer different perspectives on the reconstruction and re-use of the image of Cicero throughout the centuries, from the early imperial age to modern times. Some of them are concerned with Cicero’s self-portrait and analyze how Cicero’s exemplary status was re-worked in different cultures and ages. Others take a fresh approach to the impact exercised by Cicero on politics and society in the last centuries of modern era. We do hope that this volume will encourage scholars and readers to further delve into the fascinating world of the reception of one of the most discussed and loved men in antiquity.

We would like to thank all the speakers participating in the conference for making such a great contribution to our understanding of several, hitherto neglected, aspects of the reception of Cicero. The three-day conference, organized by the Department of Ancient World Studies and the Department of Philosophy at Sapienza, University of Rome, in cooperation with the Société Internationale des Amis de Cicéron (SIAC, Paris), was hosted by the Imperial Forums Museum and Trajan’s Markets (May 15th), the Faculty of Humanities at Sapienza (May 16th) and the “Radici del Presente” Museum, located in the Assicurazioni Generali Building in Piazza Venezia, Rome (17th May). To those who made all these places accessible to Ciceronian scholars go our warmest thanks. The conference would not have taken place without the generous support of Dr. Paolo Omodeo, the President of AIF (Italia Fenice Association), who came up with the idea of an international congress gathering Ciceronian scholars from all over the world and promoted it with a substantial financial help. We are deeply grateful to him. We also wish to thank the board of the De Gruyter’s Cicero-series and the anonymous peer-reviewers for their suggestions and comments. A special word of thanks is due to Ermanno Malaspina, the chief editor of the series (and President of the Advisory Board of SIAC), who has always been patient and encouraging, making this volume a better one by his attentive reading. Many thanks to Veronica Revello, member of the Editorial Office, for her tireless revisional work. A final word of thanks is also due to Martina Russo, Patrizio Pitzalis and all the students who so actively helped us in the organization of the conference.

The conference opened with an act of homage paid to the greatest orator of our history by a representative group of students from the High School “Liceo Classico Visconti” (Rome), an educational institution already cooperating with
AIF in several cultural projects. And there is no better way to start this scholarly collection than this solemn salutatio ad Marcum Tullium Ciceronem.

Salutatio ad Marcum Tullium Ciceronem celebrandum.

Professores optimi, hospites clarissimi, discipuli studiosi, salvete omnes! Cum hic Hodie ad Marcum Tullium Ciceronem celebrandum simus, opus est nobis quaerere cur tanto opere hoc homine adhuc delectemur. Adducti ipsius summum viri multis praecertis multisque libris, intellegimus studia humanitatis cotidie suppetere nobis posse in tanta varietate rerum adversarum; si animos nostros doctrina excolemus, ferre tantum contentionem poterimus. Marci Tulli vita monstravit nihil esse magno opere expetendum nisi laudem atque honestatem, in ea autem sequenda omnes cruciatus corporis, omnia pericula mortis atque ex sili parvi esse ducendum. Semper, usque ad finem, pro salute patriae in tot ac tantas dimicationes atque in profligatorio hominum cotidianos impetus se obiecit; dicacitate sua multos sibi inimicos paravit. Atqui frequenter ipse ab amicis postulabat, ut non oratorem se, verum philosophum appellarent. Sine doctrina naturae ipsius habitu prope divino nos – fateamur – pauperiores essemus: nam – ut ipse praedicit – haec studia adulescentiam alunt, senectutem oblectant, secundas res ornant, adversis perfugium ac solaciun praebent, delectant domi, non impediunt foris, pernoctant nobiscum, peregrinantur, rusticantur. Ex his studiis haec quoque crescit ratio perscrutendi et facultas dicendi. Ut illo imagines non solus ad intuendum, verum etiam ad imitandum fortissimorum virorum expressas scriptores et Graeci et Latini reliquerunt, sic nobis illius verba lucem, solacium et stimulum ferunt. Quantum suavitatis eloquentia rebus honestis conciliaret atque, quod iustum esset, si recte oratione exprimeretur, invictum esset, eius exemplum Romanis ostendit; id quod rectum est nobis quoque praefert et in his temporibus ad virtutem consequendum nos dicit. Inter omnes qui sapientiae cultores se iudicant, horum nemo est, qui non Ciceronis eloquentiam, facundiam virtutemque laudibus efferat. Doctus vir et patriae amans nobis princeps et ad suscipliendum et ad ingrediem dum rationem exstat. Dignum est igitur praecpta eius, libros et vitam libenter exquirere, colere, tradere.
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Augustine’s sentence, a reassessment of the grandeur of Cicero’s eloquence, echoes general admiration for the intellect and mastery of Latin language by the new man from Arpinum.¹ Appreciated as the nomen eloquentiae from Quintilian onwards,² remembered and reputed as the supreme model of Latin prose, Cicero embodied the essence of Latinitas, classical Latin whose learning was thought as essential to the intellectual maturation of the young.³ Augustine was just one of the countless admirers of Cicero. Within an extensive use of Cicero’s works, from the lost Hortensius in the Confessions to the De re publica in the recreation of the civitas Dei in the City of God, he looked at Cicero as a source of wisdom and model of correct speaking and writing, re-adapting Cicero’s thoughts and rhetorical precepts to Christian philosophy and education and redirecting readings of the republican orator towards the instruction and cultural formation of male élite students.⁴ Yet Augustine also points to another significant aspect of the reception of Cicero, that is, criticism on Cicero's life and morals. As it has been noted, Cicero as a writer was distinct from Cicero as a man. Eulogized as the icon of Roman eloquence,⁵ Cicero encountered reproval for his ambiguous involvement in Roman politics and his lack of self-control and steadfastness, constantia.⁶ In particular, his dealing with the experience of exile,⁷ from the one hand, and the role he played in the transition from the Republic to the principate,⁸ on the other, placed him at the heart of a fierce debate, revolving around his perceived absence of morality and the behavior he held towards the leading political figures of his time.

---

¹ Clark 1995, 143.
² Quint. 10.1.112 (non hominis nomen, sed eloquentiae); Clarke 1965.
³ La Bua 2019, 125–130.
⁴ McCormack 2013. For the “Christian Cicero”, see Kendeffy 2015.
⁵ On the transformation of Cicero into an abstraction, pure intellect, in the declamation schools, see Kaster 1998.
⁶ Sen. contr. 2.4.4.
⁷ See Kaster and Pierini in this volume.
⁸ Dench 2013. The recent volume edited by Pieper/van der Velden 2020 sheds light on the interpretation of the political Cicero in the years following the death of Caesar.
A controversial man and, at the same time, an undisputed model of Latin prose: the reception of Cicero had centered around the oscillation between praise and censure throughout the ages, from Cicero's lifetime to modern times. Modern scholarship has long concentrated on the ambivalent approach to Cicero in early Empire and Late Antiquity. Gowing and McCormack have illuminated significant aspects of the re-use of Cicero in the early Imperial age and during the first centuries of the Christian era. Good attention has also been paid to the detachment of Cicero as a historical figure from Cicero as the embodiment of a classic in the schoolrooms and to the related inclusion of Cicero as idoneus auctor in the school curriculum. Altman's *Companion to the reception of Cicero* has enormously contributed to our understanding of how the republican orator, statesman and philosopher has been recast and reworked over the centuries. Since the reception of an author starts with the author himself, recent scholarly works have placed emphasis on Cicero's strategy of self-fashioning, showing also that Cicero's construction of his *persona*, as both ideal orator and politician, serving the republican institution by his words and actions, impacted on later reception and elicited different, contrasting reactions from intellectuals and men of culture over the time.

Adding to this impressive mass of Ciceronian bibliography, this volume collects papers on the reception of Cicero in literature, philosophy and politics in a time span which goes from Late Republic to 21st century. It offers a new and fresh perspective of the multiple, divergent ways by which Cicero was received throughout the centuries. It sees Cicero not as much as an author as a character. The title itself of the volume, *Portraying Cicero*, intends to attract attention to a specific aspect of the reception of Cicero, that is, the ‘re-creation’ of the figure of the republican orator in different times and cultures. It is not the reception of Cicero’s textual corpus that triggers interest from the contributors to this book. Cicero’s literary output, a wondrous assemblage of speeches, philosophical and rhetorical essays, and epistles, serves here as a means of understanding and evaluating the multiplicity of portraits of Cicero throughout the ages. Most significantly, taking Cicero’s self-portrait as a jumping-off point for our reconstruction of what it might be called the ‘art’ of portraying Cicero, we are also able to revisit significant moments of Western culture and politics. As Zieliński

9 Gowing 2013; Degl’Innocenti Pierini 2003; La Bua 2019, 100 – 182. On the reception of Cicero in the early imperial age see also Richter 1968; Winterbottom 1982.
10 Gowing 2013; McCormack 2013.
11 Keeline 2018; La Bua 2019.
12 Altman 2015. See also Kapust/Reimer 2021 (on Cicero in modern political theory).
clarified in his seminal study more than hundred years now, every age had its own Cicero. Appreciated as an exemplary orator and a master of language from the early empire onwards, Cicero also emerged as a philosopher and a source of wisdom, as it appears in late antiquity and the Medieval times. Cicero as a wise statesman and politician became the dominant paradigm during the Humanism and Renaissance. Likewise, in the Enlightenment and the two following centuries intellectuals and men of culture interpreted Cicero as the embodiment of republican values, the ‘new man’ ennobling his persona by personal talents. Dictatorial regimes, however, silenced Cicero, never regarded as a politician worth emulating. Amid setbacks and lavish praises, invectives and positive judgments, every age reacted to Cicero with its own sensibility. So, every age had its ‘portrait’ of Cicero.

Following in the footsteps of Zieliński’s suggestion, this volume aims to shed further light on how Cicero was seen and depicted by intellectuals, men of culture, politicians, and artists over the ages. It focuses on the reception of Cicero as a ‘character’ from old and new perspectives, by approaching Cicero not only as a model of prose writing and icon of Latinitas from early empire to the Renaissance but also examining the influence he exercised on the formation of modern political and philosophical thought. Many essays in this volume point to the role Cicero played in modern and contemporary politics (from the Enlightenment to the 20th century dictatorial regimes). The representation of Cicero in art and his character in modern fiction stories and movies are also considered. Portraying Cicero is a book that offers new possibilities in the study of the reception of the republican orator. It allows scholars to look at the impact exerted by the persona of Cicero on history, literature, rhetoric, politics, art, and culture from antiquity to modern times. A common thread links all the essays in the volume: the ‘art of portraying Cicero’ is a way through which we are enabled to understand how Cicero was reworked and re-imagined over the times and, above all, how changes in culture, politics, and aesthetics affected divergent responses to the personality and character of the ‘new man’ from Arpinum.

1 Portraying (and Defending) Himself

A self-referential author, Cicero devised a coherent long-term strategy of self-fashioning designed to construct his public persona of orator and statesman. No-

---

14 Zieliński 1912.
15 See Ward 2015 (on Cicero in the Middle Ages).
tably, he was a sophisticated narrator of himself. He himself laid the groundwork for canonizing his persona by providing his contemporary and future readers with an idealized version of his public and private life experiences. The opening essay of this volume, *Cicero Portraying Cicero* (Robert A. Kaster), introduces the figure of Cicero as a brilliant first-person storyteller. It shows that, by building a private narrative of his exile in the letters and offering a different public story of his ‘heroic’ return to Italy in the *post reditum* speeches, Cicero presented a two-sided image of himself. Contrasting with Cicero’s private self-portrait as a feeble and timid man, terribly aware of inflicting sufferance on himself and his beloved Terentia and children because of his cowardice, the story narrated in the speeches depicts Cicero as a good man and good citizen, a patriot destroying his civic self for the sake of the Republican liberty. Adapting his narrative to present needs Cicero did for himself what later intellectuals and writers would do over the course of many centuries. He built – and propagated – different personae of himself.

Cicero’s texts are also an exercise in self-justification. Repeatedly under attack for his ambiguous deeds and his controversial political choices, Cicero felt obliged to defend himself by revisiting – and propagating – his image in self-gratulatory terms. This first section of the volume illuminates Cicero’s policy of self-defense as an integral part of his art of ‘narrating himself’. As Cicero states on more than one occasion, popular consensus played a key role in the acquisition of power and prestige by the orator. Re-examining a brilliant passage from the dialogue *Brutus* (sections 183–200), the second contribution (Alfredo Casamento, *Mihi cane et populo. Cicerone el autorappresentazione del successo oratorio. La questione del consenso popolare*) focuses on Cicero’s self-presentation as the ideal orator and reconsiders the relevance of the *audientium adprobatio* to the creation of the ‘good man skilled in speaking’ (*vir bonus dicendi peritus*). Though admitting to the decadence of eloquence in current times, in the *Brutus* Cicero integrates the key issue of the popular consensus into his self-fashioning strategy. Good eloquence relies on public approbation. In treating such a delicate and controversial topic Cicero paves the way for future debates on the nature of eloquence and rhetoric, debates perceived as ‘Ciceronian’ by generations to come.

Building essentially upon Cicero’s private correspondence, the third contribution of the section (Alejandro Díaz Fernández, *A Ciceronian exemplum? Cicero’s Portrait as Provincial Governor Throughout his Letters*) explores Cicero’s experience as governor of the province of Cilicia (52–51 BCE), interpreted as a good example of provincial administration in late Republic. Through an accurate reading of the letters, it appears that Cicero depicted himself as the ideal governor, exercising his power with *aequitas, continentia* and *moderatio*. Cicero offered
his deeds as models of political virtue. Within this process of self-canonization Cicero eulogized his governorship as an exemplary case of virtuous administration, radically opposed to past provincial commands and the praetorship in Asia held by his brother Quintus (Q. fr. 1.1). In presenting himself as a positive model and blaming predecessors for their negligence and irresponsibility, Cicero championed a Stoic-sounding ideal of governance sharing canonical elite virtues and showing leniency towards the provincial population.

Cicero’s paradigmatic experience as exiled, a privileged target of criticism in later receptions, elicits further reflections on his strategy of self-fashioning. The fourth essay of this section (Rita Degl’Innocenti Pierini, Cicerone esule: dall’autorappresentazione all’esemplarità letteraria (da Livio a Petrarcha e Ortensio Lando) points to Cicero’s negative, non-philosophical attitude towards exile, defined in tragic terms as calamitas. Refusing consolations from Atticus and his family and, at the same time, playing up his dolor, Cicero portrayed himself as a ‘tragic hero’, afflicted with physical and mental illness and not capable of overcoming adversity. This impacted unavoidably on later receptions of Cicero’s exile. From Livius (Camillus’ exile is probably modeled on Cicero’s self-portrait as exul) and declamatory texts (the spurious Pridie quam in exilium iret) to Petrarch and Ortesio Lando’s Cicero relegatus et Cicero revocatus, Cicero never achieved the status of exemplary exul. It might be tempting to say that Cicero himself was responsible for the flop of his strategy of self-justification.

Cicero’s self-gratulatory portrait is advocated by Quintilian. As is well known, Quintilian’s Ciceronianism put an end to the early empire debate over Cicero’s style and the perceived mismatch between his perfection of language and his disputable personal and political life. The last contribution of the section (Rosalie Stoner, The Difficult Defense of Cicero’s Goodness in Institutio Oratoria 12.1), focuses on Quintilian’s rehabilitation of Cicero as both a man and orator in Book 12 of the Institutio Oratoria. Replying to earlier criticisms of Cicero as a ‘good man’ Quintilian portrays Cicero as a complex personality who acted in the supreme interest of the collectivity and committed himself to the common good with courage. In so doing Quintilian justifies and minimizes Cicero’s flaws of anxiety, self-glorification, and questionable actions as advocate and consul, at the same time protecting his definition of the orator as vir bonus dicendi peritus.

2 Ciceros’ Exemplarity

If it is true that Cicero never entered the canon of exemplary Republican heroes, it is undeniable that his charismatic personality elicited admiration throughout
the centuries. His astonishing achievements represented a source of inspiration for generations of intellectuals and politicians. From the early empire to the Renaissance, men of culture, philosophers and artists depicted him not only as an icon of eloquence but also as a symbol of wisdom and sapientia, an intellectual never concealing his thirst for knowledge. At the same time, Cicero’s heroic death, revisited and manipulated by declaimers and poets from the late republic onwards, offered an example of ‘good death’, teaching how to die and, above all, how to react to forms of political despotism.

Cicero’s life provided the prominent reference point for debates about politics and society. Cicero embodied the ideals of a new political elite: his status as homo novus ascending the pinnacle of political career by virtue of his personal merits encouraged reflective musings on the significance of nobility and the development of a modern idea of society (and state), in which the acquisition of power depended on the public display of personal talents and the exercise of ancestral virtues. The first contribution of this second section (Giuseppe La Bua, Homo Novus and Nobilis: Cicero and the Formation of the ‘Modern’ Aristocracy) demonstrates that Cicero’s persona as a new man played a key role in the formation of a modern ideology of nobility. Starting from a fresh reading of Velleius Paterculus (2.128.1–4) and Juvenal’s praise of Cicero as the ‘true’ nobilis in Satire 8, it argues that the status of Cicero as ‘new man’ and ‘new nobilis’, a model of political man acting for the conservation of the res publica by virtus and ingenium, impacted on later reflections on human dignity and nobility throughout the Middle Ages and the Early Italian Renaissance.

Cicero’s death at the hands of Antony represented a watershed in the history of his reception. Historians, poets, and declaimers read Cicero’s final moments as the extreme manifestation of the Republican orator’s fight for Republican liberty. The second contribution (Tom Keeline, Cicero at the Symposium XII Sapientium) elaborates on this topic and examines the cycle of twelve ‘epitaphs’ for the dead Cicero contained in the Anthologia Latina (Anth. Lat. 603–614 R²), themselves part of a larger twelve-part cycle of twelve poems each, the Carmina XII Sapientum (Anth. Lat. 495–638 R²). Doubtless originating in the late-antique rhetorical schoolroom, these poems provide a mostly unexamined window onto Cicero’s early reception. These epitaphs focus mostly on three themes: Cicero’s heroic death, his eloquence and literary immortality, and his suppression of the Catilinarian conspiracy as consul. They offer an interesting view on later receptions of Cicero in the rhetorical schoolroom.

The two following contributions deal with Cicero’s status as exemplar and model of style as well as good behavior, with emphasis on the reception of Cicero in figurative art and political literature. The third contribution (Cristina Martín Puente, Iconografía de Cicéron en manuscritos), analyzes portraits of Cicero in
manuscripts from the 13th to the 15th centuries. As Cicero’s image appears next to the personification of Rhetorica on more than one occasion, it follows that Cicero belonged to the medieval literary canon, especially as rhetorician and, to a lesser extent, as philosopher. This paper also considers a miniature in the French version of De casibus virorum illustrium by Boccaccio, portraying Cicero as a statesman before he was murdered and beheaded.

The fourth contribution of this section (Fabio Gatti, Il “santissimo” Cicerone. La Quaestura di Sebastiano Corradi (1555) nella tradizione biografica sull’Arpinate), illustrates the most important biography of Cicero of the 16th century, the Quaestura composed by the Venetian ecclesiastic and humanist Sebastiano Corradi, an imaginary dialogue between some learned men of the Renaissance, transposed in the late Roman Republic. Drawing on ancient (Plutarch, Cassius Dio, Appian) and modern (Bruni) sources, the dialogue rejects censure of Cicero along times and points to his moral integrity and intellectual level, depicting him as a vir sanctissimus, in tune with the pedagogic guidelines of the contemporary Counterreformation.

Shifting the focus to the early political history of the United States of America, the fifth contribution (Joanna Kenty, Tully the Naïve: John Adams on Cicero), discusses the reception of Cicero in John Adams, the second president of the United States. As an avid lifelong reader of Cicero’s works, the ‘new man’ Adams was inspired from De re publica in the composition of his Defense of the Constitutions. As attested by several letters written in 1808–1809, he explained the American political scene by relying on Cicero and comparing his contemporaries to Caesar, Catiline, and Clodius. To Adams’ eyes, Cicero embodied the ideal politician, a simple and innocent man acting for the safety of his fellow-citizens.

The last contribution (Kathryn H. Stutz, Law and Orator: Depicting Cicero through Modern Mystery Fiction), gets away from politics to confront contemporary narrative and tv series, showing another, captivating aspect of Cicero’s afterlife. In the form of mystery stories, many modern fictions cast Cicero as a heroic all-in-one lawyer-detective, or at least as the patron to some lesser-known sleuth. This contribution argues that the mystery tropes appearing in modern receptions of Cicero show a preoccupation with the question of Cicero’s morality. Whether Cicero is portrayed as the morally corrupt defender of a guilty client, or as the brilliant Sherlockian detective searching for the truth amidst the chaos of late Republican Rome, the fusion of detective tropes with popular portrayals of Cicero reveals a tension between Cicero’s own competitive and persuasive priorities and our modern valorization of truth and virtue in our legal ‘heroes’.
3 The Portrait of the Ideal Orator

Abstulit una dies aevi decus, ictaque luctu / conticuit Latiae tristis facundia linguae ("A single day snatched away the glory of the age, and, struck by grief, the eloquence of the Latin tongue sadly fell silent": FRP 219.10–11 H.). In the funeral eulogy of the orator, killed by Antony, Cornelius Severus laments the loss of the voice of Roman eloquence, a standard formula for identifying and immortalizing the memory of Cicero. One of the Roman historians and declaimers relating the death of Cicero (in Suasoria 6 of Seneca the Elder), Severus testifies to the process of reduction of Cicero to intellect and pure form in the schools. It was in the school environment, as demonstrated by Robert Kaster, that Cicero was transformed into the embodiment of a classic, entering the canon of idonei auctores as the symbol of Latin’s stylistic excellence. In reconfiguring him as verbal ingenium, students turned the Republican orator into a new authorial figure. And ‘becoming’ Cicero was thought as essential to the acquisition of power and prestige in Roman elite society.

Needless to say, no one had never questioned Cicero’s prominent role in Latin language and in the intellectual formation of the young. The third section of this volume (The Portrait of the Ideal Orator) tries to shed further light of the reception of Cicero as a master of the Roman language, at the same time exploring the impact exercised by Ciceronian Latinitas on ancient and modern education. The first contribution (Catherine E. W. Steel, The Reception of Cicero’s Speeches in the Early Empire) reads the reception of Cicero’s speeches in Seneca the Elder’s collection, Asconius Pedianus’ historical commentary and Quintilian’s pedagogical handbook as instrumental in determining the diversity of Ciceronian images which cultured readers were familiar with. As demonstrated by the variety of approaches by which students and scholars looked at the Pro Milone, in the early empire there were different ways to be a reader of Cicero’s speeches. Textual Cicero was not only used for didactic purposes. It was open to a plurality of readings reflecting the complexity of Cicero’s figure.

The second contribution (Henriette van der Blom, Quintilian on Cicero’s Deliberative Oratory) is specifically centered on Quintilian and his presentation of deliberative speeches. By re-examining Quintilian’s discussion of deliberative oratory (3.8) and observing how and at what extent changes in deliberative speeches and contiones mirrored new power dynamics in the Imperial age, this paper argues that Quintilian’s use of Cicero as a primary source for under-
standing Republican and Imperial deliberative oratory sets out rhetorical theory and oratory in historical perspective, serving as well the purpose to train contemporary would-be orators under a monarchical regime. For Quintilian, Cicero’s speeches in the Senate and contiones illustrate the true nature of great oratory and represent a perfect example of how the vir bonus dicendi peritus displays his oratorical qualities in debate speeches at best. In portraying a multi-faceted Cicero, deeply influenced by Cicero’s self-presentation and later reworkings of the Republican orator, and stressing the importance of deliberative speeches for Republican and contemporary society, Quintilian advocates the ideal of good oratory and instructs his pupils in building their careers as orators on Cicero, the undisputed champion of deliberative oratory.

In the third contribution (Andrew J. Sillett, Quousque tandem: The Reception of a Catchphrase) Cicero’s consular persona is revisited through the reception of the famous motto opening the first Catilinarian speech, quousque tandem, a catchphrase becoming synonymous with Cicero in the modern world. Looking at contemporary resonances and echoes of Cicero’s words, acquiring a canonical status through the times, this paper follows the fascinating journey of the Ciceronian formulation, starting with Sallust’s inversion in the mouth of Cicero’s archetypical foe (Sall. Cat. 20.9) and Livy’s redeployment in Manlius’ speech (6.18.5) to end with Pliny the Younger (ep. 2.10.1–2), Tacitus (Ann. 1.28–4–6; 1.13.4) and the unusual, parodic treatment in Apuleius Metamorphoses (3.27). It suggests that the manipulation of Cicero’s phrase in different works and times reflects the moral ambivalence of its author, at the same time responding to the early empire process of simplification of Cicero into a caricatural figure.

The following contribution (Barbara Del Giovane, Da iocosus a consularis scurra. Rappresentazioni del Cicerone umorista), analyzes a minor but interesting aspect of Cicero’s reception, i.e., the portrait of Cicero as a humourist. Starting from a re-examination of the ancient literary judgments on Cicero as a master of irony, it points to the commonly perceived absence of moderation in Cicero’s use of jests and verbal jokes and observes that later receptions tended to focus on the opposition between the ideal of wit declared by Cicero in his works and the irony displayed outside theoretical and ‘programmatical’ contexts of his rhetorical corpus.

In the last contribution (Leanne Jansen, Christoph Pieper, Bram van der Velden, Reperforming Cicero’s Voice: Constructions and Negotiations of His Vox Publica), Cicero’s public persona as orator is revisited in connection with his self-portrait as a textualized ‘voice’. After examining how the orator staged and re-invented his voice in his speeches, this paper turns its attention to the restaging and rewriting of Cicero’s voice in later authors, also offering a comparative Renaissance example of re-vocalizing Cicero.
4 Cicero in Politics

The last section of the volume (Cicero in Politics) provides readers and scholars with a fresh account of the history of the reception of Cicero as a statesman in the latest centuries. Cicero as historical and political figure was crucial to the interpretation of some of the most dramatic political events occurring in the latest centuries of our era. Idealized as the ideal politician and at the same time heavily censured for his political deeds, Cicero represented a constant point of reference for intellectuals and politicians from the Enlightenment to the dictatorial regimes of the 20th century. The first contribution (Igor Moraes Santos, Montesquieu on Cicero. Historiographical, Political and Philosophical Dimensions of a Modern Portrait) illustrates Montesquieu’s portrait of Cicero and its relevance to European culture of the following two centuries. It highlights three aspects of the French philosopher’s interpretation of Cicero: Cicero as historiographical source, historical figure, and philosopher. By examining Montesquieu’s several works, in which Cicero’s life and ideas are discussed or his texts are used for argumentation, this paper is purposed to offer a comprehensive view on the role played by Cicero in Montesquieu’s historical and political thought.

The second contribution (Francesca Romana Berno, Cicero in the Shadow of the Bastille), concentrates on modern politics, focusing on that critical moment of Western history which was the French revolution. Indeed, the révolutionnaires tried hardly to show their affinity with the most renown Republic at all – the Roman one. Hence the idealization of Cicero, for his Republican ideals and battles against Clodius, Catilina and Antony. This paper shows how everyone, from every side, tried to present himself as Cicero, and his enemy as Catilina. Special focus is given to the famous trial against the King, which presents striking affinities with the trial against the Catilinarians, and to another, less known trial against a professor of Latin who was accused of reading Cicero in a dangerous way. In a similar way, this paper touches upon the figure of Robespierre, whose fascinating and controversial character was compared to both Cicero and Catilina.

The third contribution (Philippe Rousselot, Cicéron face aux dictateurs, 1920–1945), finally, calls our attention to Europe and dictatorship and totalitarianism of the first decades of the 20th century, a period that witnessed a significant lack of interest in the personage of Cicero. In three different ways, but with salient common features, the regimes of Stalin, Mussolini and Hitler forgot Cicero. While celebrating other figures of Antiquity, an Antiquity disguised by totalitarian ideology – Spartacus, Caesar, Augustus – they showed radical indiffer-
ence to Cicero, reputed as a man incapable of understanding the reasons behind historical and political changes.

As we said at the outset of this Introduction, every age had its Cicero. Appre-ciated and despised, eulogized for his mastery of eloquence and at the same time heavily censured for his ambiguous involvement in politics, acclaimed as a mar-tyr of the free Republic yet criticized for the limits of his endurance in unpleasant life experiences: Cicero had been at the very center of the debate over morality, politics, and literature since his lifetime. Nonetheless, Cicero had never ceased to be read, reworked, imitated, and depicted in different, often contrasting, ways. The multifaced portrait of Cicero is the portrait of one of the most discussed, yet most read, writers in Antiquity. The long history of the reception of Cicero demonstrates that it had never existed a single Cicero. Different personae in differ-ent cultures and ages: the wide spectrum of portraits of Cicero, from orator and model of sapientia to statesman and defender of Republican ideals, teaches us that when we look at the reception of Cicero, we must first think about what Cicero we are reading and examining, a ‘special’ Cicero, constantly revisited in tune with the social, political, and aesthetic changes occurring throughout the times. With a very few classical authors, Cicero has exerted so a durable impact on European and Western culture. Our civilization would not have been the same without Cicero. We might add that Western culture would not have been the same without such a great, fascinating variety of ‘Ciceros’.
SECTION I: Portraying (and Defending) Himself
Robert A. Kaster

Cicero Portraying Cicero

1 Introduction

Surely one of the most common forms that reception takes is simply story-telling: constructing characters plucked from a paradigmatic past and building narratives around them that suit the story-tellers’ present needs. So the declaimers of the early first century CE portrayed a Cicero ready to choose death to preserve his oratory. So Petrarch portrayed Cicero as the high-minded sage who transcended politics (or so it seemed until certain correspondence came to light).¹ And so Theodor Mommsen portrayed a Cicero who could serve as a craven foil to Caesar, the man of action.² It is this paper’s purpose to suggest, in fact, that each in his own way was doing much the same thing for Cicero that Cicero had done, any number of times, for himself.³

2 Cicero’s exile: preliminary remarks

So let us turn to a pair of parallel stories that together can serve as an example. The stories begin on March 20, 58 BCE, when Cicero is on the run. A day or two earlier his great enemy, the tribune Publius Clodius Pulcher, had passed a law in the assembly of the plebs under which anyone who put a Roman citizen to death, save at the will of the people, was to be “interdicted from fire and water” – declared an outlaw. In its intent, the measure only reaffirmed a principle of Roman legal thought already sketched in the Twelve Tables and enacted in the lex Sempronia of 123; its special novelty lay in the fact that it was to be effective retroactively – and that is where the peril lay for Cicero, who in December of 63 had of course overseen the execution, without trial, of five of Catiline’s leading lieutenants. Cicero had seen Clodius’ move coming for some time, but when the law was first proposed, several weeks earlier, he was thrown into a panic. He put on mourning dress, as though already on trial with his caput – his life as a

¹ For a recent study with further references see McLaughlin 2015.
² On this see Rousselot (p. 392–393) in this volume.
³ On the Cicero of the declaimers and his place in Roman education and rhetorical culture more generally, see La Bua 2019 and Keeline 2018. About exile, which is the main topic of this paper, see also Rita Degl’Innocenti Pierini (p. 61–81) in this volume.
citizen – at stake; he sought support from those he thought willing and able to help, above all Pompey; and he took counsel with his friends: should he wait to be charged and prosecuted under the law, as he surely would be? should he prepare to resist any attempt to implement the law at his expense, using force if necessary? should he discreetly remove himself from Rome and wait for the storm to blow over? or – as his mood sometimes urged – should he even choose suicide, to forestall the dishonor of condemnation? The advice of his friends inclined toward a discreet withdrawal, and toward assurances that support would be mobilized to secure a triumphant return in a matter of days. When Cicero saw that such support was not immediately at hand – indeed, when Pompey literally turned his back on him, not even bidding him to rise when Cicero prostrated himself in supplication – he decided that discretion was the better part of valor.

So he went out from Rome on the day Clodius’ law was passed, leaving behind his wife and children and heading south. Almost immediately, Clodius proposed a second law, which only increased Cicero’s panic when he received a copy of it on his journey. For this measure took his departure as an admission of guilt and declared him an exile, by name: once the law was passed, in a few weeks’ time, his property would be confiscated and auctioned off, his family rights would be lost, and he could be executed on sight if found within 400 miles of Italy. What to do? where to go? Sicily? Malta? After a certain amount of time spent dithering in the toe of Italy, Cicero made his way to Brundisium, where he arrived on April 17 and from which he sailed for Dyrrachium on April 29; since Clodius’ second law was almost certainly passed on April 24, Cicero had technically spent his last days on Italian soil as an outlaw. From Dyrrachium he traveled to Thessalonica in Macedonia, where he was sheltered by the quaestor of the province, Gnaeus Plancius, until mid-November of 58; at that point he returned to Dyrrachium, where he stayed until his restoration in August of 57.

Now, I should note that I have been very selective in my use of sources in preparing this stripped-down narrative: for reasons that will soon become clear, I intentionally made no use of the so-called post reditum speeches, delivered in the first six months after Cicero returned to Rome in September of 57; in-

---

5 Beyond the correspondence, the main sources for the exile are the four “post-return” speeches delivered between early September 57 and early March 56: see the first paragraph of section 4. The most elaborate account appears in Pro Sestio 14–92; 96–135: for commentary, with full references to ancient sources and modern discussions, see Kaster 2006; on the post-return speeches as a group, see Riggsby 2002.
6 For a detailed account of the chronology followed here and below, see Kaster 2006, 393–408; for Ciceronian chronology more generally, Marinone/Malaspina 2004 is fundamental.
stead, I restricted myself almost entirely to the correspondence that survives from the exile itself, the letters Cicero wrote to Atticus, his wife Terentia, and his brother Quintus during the first year he was away. And that correspondence is plainly the work of a man nearly unhinged by grief, shame, fear, and rage.⁷

3 Cicero’s exile in his letters

For very soon after he left Rome, while he was still in Italy, Cicero decided that he had made a terrible mistake. No, he should not have given way, should not have yielded: why had he done it? what did it say about him as a man that he had done it? why had his so-called friends advised him to do it? and what in God’s name was going to happen to him now? From such questions his emotional responses followed, and from his emotions came the recriminations, of himself and others, that are the steady drumbeat in his letters.

Those recriminations elaborate a limited number of repeated themes. Most important is the theme of betrayal: the friends who advised him were obviously no friends at all, but enemies in disguise. Pretending to act in his interest, they were instead merely envious of his success, waiting for the chance to bring him low, and seizing the chance when they saw it. So he writes to Atticus, in a letter composed as he is on the verge of leaving Italy (Att. 3.7.2):

Non faciam ut enumerem miserias omnis in quas incidii per summam iniuriam et scelus non tam inimicorum meorum quam invidorum.

I shall not list all the forms of wretchedness I have fallen upon thanks to the complete and wicked criminality not so much of those who hated me as of those who were jealous of me.⁸

And in future letters he makes plain that he includes, for example, the orator Quintus Hortensius among those who “plotted my destruction within my very walls”.⁹ What he means by this is made plain when, five months into his exile, he writes to his brother, “[My present circumstance] is not the prospect that was painted for me when I left Rome – no, I was often told that I’d return in supreme glory after three days”¹⁰ – often told, that is, by false friends who

---

⁷ For passions in Cicero's epistles from exile see Claassen 1992; Garcea 2005.
⁸ The text of Cicero’s letters is from Shackleton Bailey: translations are my own.
⁹ Att. 3.10.2: Intrap arietes meos de mea pernicie consilia inirentur, cf. Att. 3.9.2.
¹⁰ Q. fr. 1A.4: Haec mihi profisciscenti non proponebantur, sed saepe triduo summa cum gloria di-cebar esse rediturus.
came to his house on the Palatine and advised him to take the disastrous course he took.

But the false friends do not bear sole responsibility, for after all they could not have succeeded without the collaboration of Cicero’s own folly and cowardice. Again and again he berates himself for *stultitia* or the like: so to Atticus (*Att. 3.8.4*):

> Ex epistularum mearum inconstantia puto te mentis meae motum videre, qui, etsi incredibili et singulari calamitate adflictus sum, tamen non tam est ex miseria quam ex culpae nostrae recordatione commotus [...]. qua re cum adflictum et confectum luctu audies, existimato me stultitiae meae poenam ferre gravius quam eventi.

I imagine that the inconstancy of my correspondence allows you to glimpse my mind’s upheaval: it’s not my unhappiness that’s the cause – though no one has ever suffered the unbelievable disaster that I have – but rather my reflection on my own fault [...]. And so when you hear that I’m prostrate with grief and cannot rise, you may suppose that I am more oppressed by the penalty for my own stupidity than by the outcome.

At the same time, at some level Cicero realizes that the false friends were telling him what he wanted to hear – that there was a safe and easy way out – and that he took that way because he had not had the fortitude to do otherwise: and so he condemns himself for cowardice and repeatedly laments that he had let slip the opportunity for an honorable death, at one point actually blaming Atticus for keeping him from suicide – in effect, another of the betrayals he had suffered.¹¹

But because he had not died, he had to live with the guilt, shame, and remorse in which his letters are drenched. When Quintus was returning from his governorship of Asia, Cicero urged him not to make the detour that would bring him to Thessalonica for a reunion; here is what he tells Atticus in explaining why (*Att. 3.10.2*):

> Quem [sc. fratrem] ego, ut novum calamitatis genus attendas, cum pluris facerem quam me ipsum semperque fecissem, vitavi ne viderem, ne aut illius luctum squaloremque adspicerem aut ne me, quem ille florentissimum reliquerat, perditum illi adflictumque offerrem.

As for [my brother] – so you might appreciate a novel aspect of my ruin – though I prize him more than myself, and always have, I’ve avoided seeing him, lest I either look upon him in his grief and mourning [the state, that is, to which Cicero’s disaster had reduced him] or present myself to him in my ruin and affliction, after he left me at the height of my success.

More self-lacerating still are his four letters to Terentia from exile,¹² and none more so than this passage from the last of the extant letters, written at the end of November in 58 (fam. 14.3.1–2):

Conficior enim maerore, mea Terentia, nec meae me miseriae magis excruciant quam tuae vestraeque. ego autem hoc miserior sum quam tu, quae es miserrima, quod ipsa calamitas communis est utriusque nostrum, sed culpa mea propria est. Meum fuit officium vel *** vitare pericum vel diligentia et copiis resistere vel cadere fortiter. hoc miserius, turpius, indignius nobis nihil fuit. Qua re cum dolore conficiar, tum etiam pudore. pudet enim me uxori [mae] optime, suavissimis liberis virtutem et diligentiam non praestississe. Nam mi ante oculos dies noctesque versatur squalor vester et maeror et infirmitie valetudinis tuae.

I am undone by grief, dear Terentia, and my own sorrows do not torture me more than those of all of you there. Still, in this one respect I am more wretched than you, who are utterly wretched: for we both have a share in the disaster, but the fault is wholly my own. It was my duty either to avoid the danger [...] or to resist it with the care and resources at my disposal, or to die bravely. No alternative was more wretched, more disgraceful, more unworthy than the present state of affairs. For that reason I am overcome by pain and especially by pudor. Indeed, it causes me pudor not to have displayed courage and care for my excellent wife and my sweet, sweet children. For the grief and mourning of all of you, and your own poor health, are before my eyes night and day.

As these passages suggest – and they are utterly characteristic – Cicero does deserve some credit. Though he is given to extravagant gestures of self-pity – the claim that “no one had ever lost so much” is a constant refrain – he is not merely self-pitying: he is horribly aware that his suffering has been the cause of suffering for Terentia and the children, for Quintus, and even for Atticus. And yet: he is a man beside himself and not wholly in control of himself, for example snapping at Atticus in exasperation at one point, “It is thirty whole days [...] since I heard anything from you!”¹³ And even when he accepts responsibility for what has happened, his remarks cut both ways: “If I have behaved badly toward you”, he writes to Atticus (3.15.4):

Si quid in te peccavi, ac potius quoniam peccavi, ignosce; in me enim ipsum peccavi vehementius [...] Quod si non modo tu sed quisquam fuisset qui me [...] a turpissimo consilio revocaret, quod unus tu facere maxime potuisti, <aut honeste occubuissemus> aut victores hodie viveremus. hic mihi ignosces. me enim ipsum multo magis accuso, deinde te quasi me alterum, et simul meae culpae socium quae.<ro>.

Or rather, because I have badly toward you, forgive me; I have behaved much worse toward myself [...] But if you or anyone else, for that matter, had called me back [...] from a most

¹² On the letters to Terentia, see Grebe 2003.
¹³ Att. 3.21: Triginta dies erant ipsi cum has dabam litteras per quos nullas a vobis acceperam.
disgraceful plan of action – as you alone were chiefly able to do – either I could have died honorably or we would be enjoying our victory today. Here you will forgive me: for I blame myself much more, and you as my second self; and at the same time I’m looking for someone to share my blame.

So from this welter of emotions and conflicting impulses there emerges a coherent narrative, one that Cicero had plainly – though not necessarily consciously – constructed to make sense of what had happened to him, a story that hinges not on fate or luck, but rather on choices that could have been made better but were instead made worse, because of various vices and other shortcomings. Because of the very brilliance of his earlier career, there were those who envied him, some of them even men who had posed as his friends. These wolves in sheep’s clothing had given him bad advice, pushing him not to make a stand but to yield, discreditably and disastrously. He had taken this advice in part because of his own good nature, which did not allow him to question friends’ motives, and in part – he does not wholly duck this part – because of cowardice. And so he had made one bad choice after another, starting from his decision to put on mourning dress when Clodius proposed his first law: as he says (Att. 3.15.5):

Quam [sc. legem] si, ut est promulgata, laudare voluisset aut, ut erat neglegenda, neglegere, nocere omnino nobis non potuisset. Hic mihi primum meum consilium defuit, sed etiam obfuit. Caeci, caeci inquam, fuimus in vestitu mutando, in populo rogando, quod, nisi nominatim mecum agit coeptum esset, fieri perniciosum fuit.

If I had chosen to praise [that law], when it was proposed, or to ignore it, as it should have been, there is no way that it could have harmed me. But here is where my tactics failed me, or rather got in my way; I was blind – blind, I say – to put on mourning and appeal to the people, a perilous thing to do, absent some action taken against me by name.

Very well: keep your eye on the mourning dress in particular as we turn from the story that Cicero told in exile to the story he told after his return; for that detail – the putting on of mourning dress – is virtually the only link between the two stories, which otherwise have almost nothing in common.

4 Cicero’s exile in the Post reditum speeches

The law reversing Cicero’s exile and recalling him to Rome was passed on August 4 in 57; on August 5 the ship carrying him from Dyrrachium docked at Brundisium, and after a stately and triumphal progress up the Appian Way he re-entered Rome on September 4, the first day of the ludi Romani. Over the next six months he delivered 4 still-extant speeches that revisit the events that led up to his exile
and then to his return: two speeches of thanksgiving, one to the senate and one to the people, delivered within a few days of his return; the speech *De domo sua* delivered to the college of *pontifices* on September 29; and in the second week of March, 56, the speech delivered at the trial of Publius Sestius, who as tribune had worked to secure Cicero’s recall.¹⁴ The speeches are addressed to a variety of audiences and deal with several apparently different subjects in several different settings. Despite those differences, however, each speech incorporates the story of his exile in substantial detail, and it is the same story in each case – the “standard version”, it might be called – which Cicero had plainly settled on by the time his exile was drawing to a close and his recall was foreseeable.¹⁵ It is a story intended to reconstruct and rehabilitate Cicero as a public person after his disaster; and it is a story, as I said, that bears virtually no relation to the story found in the correspondence from exile.

Gone are the recriminations made against false friends, gone – it goes without saying – are the self-recriminations, gone are the regrets for decisions badly made, the acknowledgment of fault, the acceptance of blame. In their place we have all the components needed to present the drama of Cicero’s exile and return as a late Republican morality play. The play is organized around a central conflict between personal interests and communal interests, between individual willfulness and the subordination of one’s will to the common good; it reaches its crisis in the triumph of the few over the many that sends Cicero out of Rome, and it finds its resolution in the triumph of the many over the few that brings him home. The *dramatis personae* are shaped to suit the plot. The role of the ego that knows no bounds – the individual who willfully pursues his own advantages while ignoring the just claims of others and of the community – is played to the hilt by Clodius: he is the *latro* – the “brigand” – who is prepared to use violence, in defiance of the community’s laws, for merely personal ends. To play off the brigand we have the men who embody the proper use of power and authority, and those who should do so but fail. The failures are the consuls of 58, Lucius Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus and Aulus Gabinius, who personify the perversion of public office: a hypocritical hedonist and a debauched wastrel, respectively, they take the power delegated to them by the people, and – instead of using it for the common good under the guidance of the senate’s authority – they prostitute it to Clodius’ ends, not just turning a blind eye but actually shielding and aiding him in his assault on Cicero and the commonwealth. Fortu-

¹⁴ The exile also appears prominently in *De haruspicum responsis* (8 or 9 or 14 May 56), *De provinciis consularibus* (late May / mid-June 56), and in *In Pisonem* (summer 55).
¹⁵ On this see Rita Degl’Innocenti Pierini in this volume (p. 61–81).
nately for Rome, these men are balanced by two figures of consular righteousness, Cicero himself and Publius Cornelius Lentulus, his champion in 57. It was Cicero’s own use of consular power, exercised as the minister of the senate in suppressing the threat to the civil community, that had saved Rome and set the drama in motion; and it was Lentulus’ use of consular power, orchestrating the senate’s authority and the people’s will, that in the end produced the consensus of all patriots, the outpouring of the *populus Romanus universus* that called Cicero back in honor.

Within the story as Cicero tells it, his own actions illustrate the patriot’s obligations and his reward. The good man must not hesitate to risk his *caput* for the *res publica*, whether it entails the literal sacrifice of his *caput*, his life, or the sacrifice of his metaphorical *caput*, his life as a citizen. It was exactly the latter that Cicero claims he voluntarily chose to give up when he decided to leave Rome rather than subject his fellow-citizens to the mayhem that resistance would have brought: he thereby destroyed his civic self for the sake of the common good. That is the central moment of this new version: not a decision made hesitantically and out of expedience, urged by false friends and later regretted, but the product of poised and patriotic deliberation, achieved in heroic isolation. When the good man has satisfied his obligation to the *res publica* in this way, the only thing he should expect and accept in return is glory, the good opinion of other patriots. And as Cicero liked to note, few if any Romans before him had been gifted with glory like his own.¹⁶

That, as it happens, is where the adoption of mourning dress returns to claim our attention. For in the standard version that gesture is not the fundamental error of judgment that sends events careening toward disaster, as Cicero described it from exile. Quite the opposite: it is an opportunity for his fellow-citizens to make their sentiments unmistakably clear, including precisely the sentiment that Cicero’s civic well-being was inseparable from, in fact identical with, the well-being of the civil community as a whole. Here is the picture as Cicero presents it in one telling of the story, at just the moment when Clodius has proposed the first of the laws aimed against him, and the crisis has begun to build (*Sest.* 25–27):

```
Hic tum senatus sollicitus, vos, equites Romani, excitati, Italia cuncta permota, omnes de
nique omnium generum atque ordinum cives *summae rei publicae* a consulibus atque a
summo imperio petendum esse auxilium arbitrabantur [...]. Flagitabatur ab his cotidie
cum querellis bonorum omnium tum etiam precibus senatus, ut *meam causam* susciperent,
```

¹⁶ As for Cicero’s strategy of depicting his exile as an act of self-sacrifice (*devotio*) for the safety of his fellow-citizens, see Dyck 2004.
agerent aliquid, denique ad senatum referrent: non modo negando, sed etiam inridendo amplissimum quemque illius ordinis insequebantur. Hic subito cum incredibilis in Capitolium multitudo ex tota urbe cunctaque Italia convenisset, vestem mutandam omnes meque iam omni ratione, privato consilio, quoniam publicis ducibus res publica careret, defendendum putarunt. erat eodem tempore senatus in aede Concordiae, [...] cum flens universus ordo [...] consulem orabat [...]. Venistis ad senatum, vos, inquam, equites Romani et omnes boni veste mutata vosque promeo capite ad pedes lenonis impurissimi roiecistis, cum vestris precibus ab latrone illo repudiatis, [...] L. Ninnius, ad senatum de re publica rettulit, senatusque frequens vestem pro mea salute mutandam censuit. O diem illum, iudices, funestum senatui bonisque omnibus, rei publicae luctuosum, mihi ad domesticum maerorem gravem, ad posteritatis memoria gloriousum! Quid enim quisquam potest ex omni memoria sumerei nlustrius quam pro uno ci ve et bonos omnis privato consensu et universum senatuum publico consilio mutasse vestem?

At this the senate grew concerned; you, gentlemen of the equestrian order, were aroused; all Italy together was thrown into a tumult. In short, all citizens of every sort and rank thought that in this matter, where the public interest was critically at stake, aid should be sought from the consuls and their high office [...]. Daily they were called upon, by the laments of all patriots and especially the senate’s entreaties, to look after my interests, to do something, finally, to refer the matter to the senate. [The consuls] took the offensive, not just refusing these requests but even laughing in the faces of all the most substantial men of the senatorial order. Hereupon, when a crowd of unbelievable size had gathered on the Capitol from every part of the city and all of Italy, a unanimous decision was taken to put on mourning-dress and to defend me in every way possible, as a matter of individual initiative, seeing that [the consuls] had failed the public interest. At the same time, the senate met in the temple of Concord [...] and there the entire senatorial order, in tears, made its appeal to the [...] consul [Gabinius] [...]. You came to the senate – I mean you, gentlemen of the equestrian order, and all patriots with you – dressed in mourning, and for the sake of my life as a citizen you prostrated yourselves at the feet of that utterly filthy pimp; and when your entreaties had been spurned [...], Lucius Ninnius [a tribune loyal to Cicero] brought the issue before the senate as a matter touching the public interest, and a packed meeting of the senate voted to assume mourning dress for the sake of my well-being. What a day that was, judges, mournful for the senate and all patriots, a source of woe to the commonwealth, a grievous one for me in the sorrow it brought my household – but for the memory that posterity will have of me, glorious! For what greater distinction could anyone find in all history than this, that all patriots, on their own and in concert, and the entire senate, as a matter of public policy, took on the dress of mourning for one of their fellow-citizens?¹⁷

What greater distinction, indeed? In the past the senate or a segment of the people had sometimes put on mourning dress in public demonstration, to signal their profound distress at some circumstance that threatened the public interest – the res publica – as a whole: so, for example, the opponents of Tiberius Grac-

chus donned mourning to protest his actions in 133. But now the senate, as a matter of “public policy”, and the people, in a display of passionate consensus, had together acted out their belief that a threat against the civic status of a single man was tantamount to a threat against them all. It is in fact unlike any public demonstration that we know of in Roman history down to this point.

5 Conclusion

And if you were to ask me which of these versions is true – the version in which the mourning dress symbolizes Cicero’s key mistake, or the version in which it symbolizes his supreme value as a citizen – I would say that I see no need to decide in those terms. I am prepared to believe that in the despondency of exile, in the private narrative he developed to explain himself to himself and to those closest to him – wife, brother, and friend – Cicero saw the decision to take on mourning as a fundamental error and sign of weakness. I am also prepared to believe that in his recovery from disaster, in the public narrative he developed to reclaim his standing and authority, Cicero saw the same events as proof that he had been right all along. Telling such stories is something for which we humans are hard-wired, an impulse arising from two kinds of awareness with which we alone of animals are burdened – an awareness of time, and of the fact that we must die, that the story will have an end. Making patterns of events in sequence is just what we do; inevitably, we make just the patterns we need just at the time we need them.

18 Plut. Ti. Gracch. 10.6–7; the gesture was answered when Tiberius himself donned mourning and commended his wife and children to the people’s care (Plut. Ti. Gracch. 13.5).
19 On this “passionate display of consensus” and similar demonstrations, see Kaster 2009.
Alfredo Casamento

Mihi cane et populo: Cicerone e l’autorappresentazione del successo oratorio. La questione del consenso popolare (Cic. Brut. 183 – 200)

1 Introduzione

Come si rappresenta il proprio successo? La tradizione poetica greca e latina conosce straordinarie immagini di consacrazioni delle virtù di poeta, elaborate con ricche ornate costruzioni, la cui persistenza nella memoria letteraria ne assicura la vitalità. A fronte di tali esibizioni virtuosistiche, che dichiarano l’orgoglio del successo,\(^1\) ve ne sono altre, costruite altrettanto finemente ma dall’architettura più complessa, perché fondata su una più mediata strategia. Su una di queste, proveniente da un testo in prosa, ma da un autore quale Cicerone che ambiva non a caso anche al riconoscimento come poeta, vorrei provare a riflettere. Il passo in questione è un’ampia sequenza del Brutus (§§ 183 – 200), in cui l’Arpinate affronta la questione nodale del giudizio popolare, questione tutt’altro che ampiamente condivisa, ma che a suo giudizio risulta fondamentale per operare una valutazione corretta del perfetto oratore. Si tratta di una considerazione, che, come vedremo, consente a Cicerone stesso un’ulteriore ribalta alle proprie scelte stilistiche, ribadendo le indiscutibili qualità. Parlare degli altri, dunque, per parlare (anche) di sé.

2 Nihil de me dicam: come parlare di sé fingendo di non farlo

Sollecitato e spinto dagli attacchi degli Atticisti, negli anni 40 particolarmente in auge,\(^2\) Cicerone elabora nel Brutus una particolarissima strategia difensiva, che è in realtà un’appassionata autocelebrazione delle proprie capacità oratorie.\(^3\)

---
\(^{2}\) Sul diffondersi di correnti atticiste a Roma in particolare negli anni 40 e comunque dopo la composizione del De oratore cf., oltre a Norden 1986, 161–167 e Wilamowitz 1900, che hanno di

OpenAccess. © 2022 Alfredo Casamento, published by De Gruyter. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110748703-004
Il *Brutus*, infatti, può essere letto come il progetto ciceroniano più ambizioso di *self-fashioning* ottenuto mediante gli scritti.⁴ Si tratta di una strategia di lungo corso che in qualche misura amplia e dilata un’esperienza pregressa, ormai più che decennale, cui Cicerone attende a partire dagli anni 50 e segnatamente dal *De oratore*; strategia che, nella mente di chi l’aveva progettata, doveva fare il paio con quella un tempo altrettanto ambiziosa dell’auto-accreditamento come uomo politico e generale solerte e determinato. Cicerone insomma parla di sé, come oratore esperto e competente, anche quando sembra parlare di altro.⁵ Disquisire del genere dell’eloquenza, dalle nebulose origini fino all suo lento ma inesorabile affermarsi, è infatti un’acuta disposizione di tasselli, che s’incastrano con precisione: il segno di una trama estesa, che raccoglie il meglio della propria esperienza, sviluppandola all’interno di un discorso preso da lontano, dalle origini stesse di un’arte destinata a illuminare chi la pratica. Da abile comunicatore qual è, la rappresentazione del successo nell’eloquenza è come filtrata, riletta in maniera mediata attraverso il motivo del progresso della disciplina.

Emblematico di questa sorta di doppia struttura che anima e sorregge la scrittura, appassionata e sorvegliata insieme, è il noto passaggio nel quale Cicerone, dopo aver esaminato brevemente gli errori in cui era incorso Ortensio (*quid tamquam notandum et animadvertendum sit in Hortensio breviter licet dicere, Brut. 319*),⁶ si arresta rievocando il 66 a.C., anno in cui fu eletto – *primus*, primo, cioè con una chiara maggioranza di voti – pretore (*et praetor primus et incredibili populari voluntate sum factus, Brut. 321*).⁷ Il riferimento alla pretura è posto in correlazione diretta con il successo ottenuto nell’eloquenza, a partire...
dal celebre patrocinio dei Siciliani di quattro anni prima. «Difatti, per l’assiduità e lo zelo che dimostravo, nelle cause e più che altro per un genere di eloquenza assai originale e proprio fuori dell’ordinario, avevo attirato su di me l’attenzione della gente con un’oratoria dai caratteri del tutto nuovi» (nam cum propter adsiduitatem in causis et industriam tum propter exquisitus et minime volgare orationis genus animos hominum ad me dicendi novitatem converteram, Brut. 321). Proprio a questo punto, Cicerone inverte bruscamente la rotta e quando sembrava che avviasse la trattazione su di sé, precisa: nihil de me dicam: dicam de ceteris, «non dirò nulla di me, dirò degli altri». La brillante formulazione, un piccolo capolavoro di stile e cura dell’espressione, sigla come un patto narrativo con i partecipanti al dialogo oltre che, ovviamente, con il lettore. Come se Cicerone stesse dicendo: «Non aspettatevi che adesso la trattazione volgasu di me, perché, al contrario, mi limiterò a parlare di quelli che restano». Una brusca interruzione alle strategie di self-fashioning, dettata dall’auto-imposizione, che Cicerone intende rispettare, di non parlare dei vivi?

La scelta del silenzio è in realtà un expediente raffinato, che aumenta il desiderio del lettore di reperire spie testuali profonde di questa complessa architettura. Cicerone, in realtà, continua a parlare di sé mentre dichiara che non lo farà e in questa maniera così smaliziata consiste, in fondo, l’essenza stessa del trattato. La formula adottata – nemo qui, «non c’era nessuno che» – scandisce un rigoroso elenco di priorità, costruito in forma di decalogo. La successione indica che tipo di orazione fosse mancato, secondo l’idea, implicita ma ben evidente, che solo Cicerone era destinato a colmare un vuoto, viceversa destinato a restare incolmabile. Ecco dunque che alla fondamentale menzione del bagaglio culturale dell’oratore – fatto di passione per le lettere, filosofia, diritto, storia – fa seguito un insieme di elementi tecnici come la capacità di rilassare l’animo dei giudici, di ampliare il discorso portandolo dal particolare all’universale, di suscitare l’ira o la compassione e, infine, di spingere l’animo in qualunque direzione le circostanze richiedessero, elemento ritenuto la caratteristica principale dell’oratore (Brut. 322):

Nihil de me dicam: dicam de ceteris, quorum nemo erat qui videretur exquisitus quam volgus hominum studuisse litteris, quibus fons perfectae eloquentiae continetur; nemo qui philosophiam complexus esset matrem omnium bene factorum beneque dictorum; nemo qui ius civile didicisset rem ad privatas causas et ad oratoris prudentiam maxumeme necessariam; nemo qui memoriam rerum Romanarum teneret, ex qua, si quando opus esset, ab

8 Qui e altrove le traduzioni del Brutus sono tratte da Narducci 1995.
inferis locupletissimos testes excitaret; nemo qui breviter arguteque inclusu adversario laxaret iudicum animos atque as everitatep aulisper ad hilaritatem risumqu et raduceret; nemo qui dilatar ep osset atque ap ropria ac definita disputatione hominis ac temporis ad communem quaestionem universis generis orationem traducere; nemo qui delectandi gratia digredi parumper a causa, nemo qui ad iracundiam magno opere judicem, nemo qui ad fletum posset adducere, nemo qui animum eius, quod unum est oratoris maxume prop-rum, quocumque res postulaet impellere.

Di me non dirò niente: dirò degli altri, tra i quali non vi era nessuno che apparisse essersi applicato più a fondo della gran massa degli uomini allo studio delle lettere, che rappresentano la fonte di un’eloquenza pienamente matura; nessuno la cui formazione abbracciasse la filosofia, madre di tutte le belle azioni e le belle parole; nessuno che avesse appreso il diritto civile, materia quanto mai necessaria per le cause private e per la competenza dell’oratore; nessuno che fosse padrone della storia romana con la quale al bisogno evocare dagli inferi attendibilissimi testimoni; nessuno che, messo alle strette l’avversario con una argomentazione breve e fine, ricreasse l’animo dei giudici, e dalla severità li facesse passare per un poco all’ilarità e al riso; nessuno che fosse capace di ampliare il discorso, e da una trattazione propria e definita, limitata a una persona e a una circostanza, di tramutarlo in una questione comune di ordine generale; nessuno che, per divertire gli ascoltatori, sapessero fare delle digressioni, allontanandosi per un po’ dalla causa; nessuno che fosse in grado di indurre vigorosamente il giudice al riso, o al pianto; nessuno – e questa è, da sola, la caratteristica principale di un vero oratore – che sapessero spingerne l’animo in qualunque direzione le cose richiedessero.

Siamo dinnanzi al ritratto perfettamente compiuto dell’oratore, privo solo del nome del soggetto rappresentato. In esso non si stenta tuttavia a riconoscere il profilo dell’Arpinate stesso; il che si potrebbe agevolmente dimostrare ricostruendo la fita rete di corrispondenze che ogni punto di questo decalogo intrattiene con gli scritti ciceroniani.¹⁰

In questa precisa strategia – che si dipana lungo tutto il trattato e secondo la quale parlare di sé, sia pur sottotraccia, è un modo per parlare dell’eloquenza stessa e del suo lungo cammino verso una sua sicura affermazione, o, al contrario, parlare dell’eloquenza tra la Grecia e Roma equivale a parlare della forma compiuta e definitiva che Cicerone le ha attribuito – occupano un posto significativo i §§ 183–200. In essi, infatti, Cicerone sviluppa un sottile ragionamento, su un motivo di rilevanza centrale qual è quello dei criteri con cui si deve giudicare l’oratore, presentandolo sotto forma di lunga digressione.¹¹ Che si tratti

---

¹⁰ Rinvio a Rathofer 1986, 123–126 per un’analisi più dettagliata del passo e dei rapporti con le altre opere retoriche ciceroniane.

di una questione di un certo interesse, cui Cicerone intende attribuire un ruolo centrale, appare confermato da una precisa spia testuale: l’avvio del discorso coincide con una emersione delle voci dei protagonisti che, come a rimarcare l’importanza di quanto si va a dichiarare, parlano mossi da un desiderio di chiarezza. Cicerone ha appena affermato che nella generazione di oratori di poco più giovani di Giulio Cesare Strabone ottennero il primato Cotta e Sulpicio e questo tanto a giudizio suo come di tutti. La formula adoperata, *cum meo iudicio tum omnium* (*ex his Cotta et Sulpicius cum meo iudicio tum omnium facile primas tulerunt, Brut.* 183), destà la curiosità di Attico (*Brut.* 183):

Hic Atticus: «Quo modo istuc dicis – inquit – cum tuo iudicio tum omnium? semperne in oratore probando aut improbando volgi iudicium cum intellegentium iudicio congruit? an alii probantur <a> multitutine, alii autem ab iis qui intellegunt?»

E qui Attico: «in che senso» fece «dici codesto a giudizio mio come di tutti?». Quando si tratta di esprimere approvazione o disapprovazione nei confronti di un oratore, il giudizio del volgò corrisponde sempre al giudizio dei competenti? O, al contrario, alcuni vengono apprezzati dalla moltitudine, altri invece da quelli che se ne intendono?».

È questo l’avvio di una conversazione appassionante su una materia delicata, che sta a cuore all’oratore e che vede un punto di forte disaccordo con gli Atticisti – ma probabilmente non solo con quelli – e con la linea di condotta da loro teorizzata: Cicerone adombrò infatti un dissenso (*audies ex me fortasse quod non omnes probent*). Proprio la finzione letteraria del dialogo, attraverso un garbato scambio di battute, consente a Cicerone di anticipare quale sarà la conclusione del proprio ragionamento. Se, incalzato da Attico, afferma che per una questione complessa come quella riguardante i criteri di giudizio *de oratore improbando aut improbando* il parere di esperti come Attico o Bruto è più che sufficiente, per quel che riguarda «la mia eloquenza – precisa Cicerone – vorrei che incontrasse l’approvazione del popolo» (*eloquentiam autem meam populo probari velim*). Cicerone continua poi esplicitando il proprio ragionamento (*Brut.* 184 – 185):

Et enim necesse est, qui ita dicat ut a multitutine probetur, eundem doctis probari. nam quid in dicendo rectum sit aut pravum ego iudicabo, si modo is sum qui id possim aut sciam iudicare; qualis vero sit orator ex eo, quod is dicendo efficiet, poterit intellegi. Tria sunt enim, ut quidem ego sentio, quae sint efficienda dicendo: ut doceatur is apud quem dicetur, ut delectetur, ut moveatur vehementius.

---

12 cf. Douglas 1966, 138 («the Atticist were unlikely to accept argument that the learned critic of oratory differed from the lay audience only in knowing how the effective orator got his results»), che rinvia al giudizio ciceroniano sull’eloquenza di Calvo in *Brut.* 283.
Infatti, chi parla in modo da incontrare l’approvazione della moltitudine, necessariamente incontra anche quella dei competenti. Quel che c’è di buono o di cattivo in un discorso lo giudicherò io, purché io sia tale da potere o sapere giudicare di ciò; ma la qualità dell’oratore, la si potrà intendere dai risultati che egli consegue con la sua parola.

Come sottolineava già Nettleship, Cicerone osserva che «this principle is, that, given fair time and opportunity, the recognition of the many is as necessary a test of excellence in an artist as that of the few».

Ciò che in buona sostanza Cicerone puntualizza è la necessità di un doppio giudizio: quello dell’esperto, sempre fondamentale come lo è nella fattispecie il parere auspicato di Attico e Bruto (disputationem hanc... multo malim tibi et Bruto placere), riguarderà il modo con cui l’oratore ottiene gli effetti sperati ed eventualmente per quali difetti non riesca ad ottenerli (Brut. 185):

> Quibus virtutibus oratoris horum quidque efficiatur aut quibus vitiiis orator aut non adsequatur haec aut etiam in his labatur et cadat, artifex aliquis iudicabit.

Grazie a quali pregi dell’oratore si ottenga qualsi voglia di questi effetti, oppure anche vacillii e cada nel tentativo, lo giudicherà un maestro dell’arte.

All’artifex, dunque, il compito di indagare su virtue e vitia dell’oratore, sui punti di forza e di debolezza della sua eloquenza: compito per un esperto che, con occhio critico, saprà sondare le manchevolezze al fine di migliorare o valutare positivamente le oratoriae virtues.

Il giudizio dell’artifex non è tuttavia sufficiente: nell’affermare che «la qualità dell’oratore la si può comprendere appieno dai risultati che ottiene» (qualis vero sit orator ex eo, quod is dicendo efficiet), Cicerone rivendica un preciso metro di valutazione, riposto nel giudizio delle masse. Un giudizio implicito, s’intende, situato nell’effetto cui deve tendere ogni sforzo suasivo e cioè

---

13 Cf. Nettleship 1890.
14 Cicerone qui riprende e sviluppa una posizione già espressa in de orat. 3.195 (illud autem ne quis admiretur, quonam modo haec volgus imperitorum in audiendo notet, cum in omni genere tum in hoc ipso magna quaedam est vis incredibilisque naturae) a proposito della prosa ritmica e della sensibilità naturale dell’uditorio nel valutare parole, ritmi e suoni senza avere una preparazione specifica (3.196: quotus enim quisque est qui teneat artem numerorum ac modorum?). Del passo si è occupato Schenkeveld 1988.
15 Il termine è spesso in ambito retorico contrapposto all’indoctus: cf. ad es. Cic. de orat. 1.51; 1.111; 1.248.
16 Anche altrove, ad esempio per le orazioni di Catone, l’espressione viene adoperata con riguardo alle qualità intrinseche del discorso oratorio (Brut. 65: Omnes oratoriae virtues in eis reperientur).
nell’adesione piena alla prospettiva messa in pratica dall’oratore, i cui tentativi saranno coronati dal successo solo se intervengano l’assenso della *multitudo*. La questione è espressa con chiarezza, sia pur mediante una perifrasi che sfrutta un singolare gioco di parole (Brut. 185):

> Efficiatur autem ab oratore necne, ut ii qui audiunt ita afficiantur ut orator velit, volgi adsensu et populari adprobatione iudicari solet.

Ma che l’oratore riesca o meno a fare in modo che quanti lo ascoltano provino le emozioni che egli desidera, di solito lo si giudica in base all’assenso del volgo o all’approvazione popolare.

Cicerone cita, per così dire, se stesso, riaffermando un principio lungamente teorizzato nel *de oratore* relativo alla capacità dell’oratore di *afficere* gli *auditores*, orientandoli dove egli voglia. Si tratta di un assunto di prioritaria importanza che in questa circostanza, a differenza di quanto non avvenga nel trattato del 55, pone in correlazione diretta *volgi adsensus*, l’assenso della massa, e *popularis adprobatio*, l’approvazione popolare. Un doppio nesso, quest’ultimo, che non può non colpire per l’insistenza con cui appare evocato qui e altrove nel trattato. Il vero *discrimen* sta nella capacità dell’oratore di suscitare il consenso, frutto di delicate e complesse strategie persuasive, rispetto alle quali solo *adsensus* e *adprobatio* potranno testimoniare il buon esito. Rispetto alle pagine del *de oratore*, in cui il medesimo concetto appare teorizzato, mi pare che il Cicerone del *Brutus* sia più ecumenico o, in altri termini, – si perdoni il neologismo – *perelmanamente* interessato a valorizzare la funzione indispensabile dell’uditorio.¹⁷ Ciò che nel *de oratore* appare quasi un processo di costrizione o un atto di forza, qui trova come una più delicata osservazione, proprio in ragione del riferimento al consenso popolare.¹⁸

Si confronti, ad esempio, un passo programmatico quale il discorso di esordio di Crasso in *de orat.* 1.30, nel quale l’oratore discute dell’importanza dell’oratoria per la società, osservando che «nulla è più insignie della capacità di avvincere con la parola l’attenzione degli uomini, guadagnarne il consenso, spingerli dovunque si voglia e da dovunque a piacimento distoglierli» (*neque vero mihi quicquam – inquit – praestabilius videtur, quam posse dicendo tenere hominum [coetus] mentis, adlicere voluntates, impellere quo velit, unde autem velit deducere*).

¹⁷ Intendo ovviamente riferirmi a Perelman-Olbrechts Tyteca 1966.
¹⁸ Più in linea con queste posizioni *orat.* 125: *Cum vero causa ea inciderit in qua vis eloquentiae possit expromi, tum se latius fundet orator, tum reget et flectet animos et sic afficet ut volet, id est ut causae natura et ratio temporis postulabit.*
Altrove, il discorso inclinerà in maniera più smaccata verso il ruolo dell’uditorio, segnando un pericoloso sbilanciamento nei riguardi delle inclinazioni degli ascoltatori. È il caso, ad esempio, dell’Orator, dove si segnala la necessità di considerare l’auditorium prudentia come criterio moderatore dell’eloquenza (orat. 24: semper oratorum eloquentiae moderatrix fuit auditorum prudentia), aggiungendo inoltre che chi vuol esser approvato deve osservare con intensità il volere degli ascoltatori, adattandosi e conformandosi ad ogni loro arbitrio e cenno del capo (omnes enim qui probari volunt voluntatem eorum qui audient intuentur ad eamque et ad eorum arbitrium et nutum totos se fingunt et accommodant).

3 Neppure Platone potrebbe bastare (ovvero della ricerca dell’uditorio)

Se posta a confronto con questi testi, la pagina del Brutus appare più equilibrata, ma, allo stesso tempo, più tesa e sostenuta. Ne sono prova la ricca serie di metafore, una costante dell’opera,19 qui particolarmente insistenti, oltre che un fitto ricorrere all’aneddotica, che puntella i ragionamenti ma anche, per così dire, li stimola e vivifica. Dopo aver infatti osservato che sommo oratore è colui che così pare al popolo (Brut. 186: id enim ipsum est summi oratoris summum oratorem populo videri), Cicerone spezza l’assiomaticità dell’assunto ricorrendo ad un’immagine che avrà fortuna: quella del flautista Antigenida20 che, ad un discepolo che lasciava freddo il suo pubblico, rivolgeva l’esortazione a continuare con le parole «canta per me e per le Muse».21 Cicerone lavora sull’aned-

19 Sul punto cf. Culpepper Stroup 2003, studio dedicato in particolare alle attestazioni dell’eloquenza in forma personificata nel quadro più ampio della rete di metafore presenti nel testo.


21 L’aneddoto è variamente citato in ambito latino: cf. Val. Max. 3.7 ext. 2; Symm. ep. 9.115, dove viene ricordato ad esempio del fatto che in sola conscientia est fructus et ratio virtutis (quodsi mihi ullus honor testimonii publici adfectandus foret, iudicio tuo et similium contentus esse deberem, vel fideinvis exemplo qui indignatus considerientium turbam sibi et Musis cantum ciebat); Hyer. ep. 3.50.3, in cui in polemica con Gioviniano si legge Iesu bone qualem et quantum virum: cuius nemo scripta intelligeret, qui sibi tantum caneret et musis; cf. anche Dio. 78.18. Delle eccellenti qualità di Antigenida parla Ap. flor. 4 (vi si dice che egli fu omnis voculae melleus modulator et idem omnimodis peritus modifier); in Gell. 15.17 è protagonista di un altro aneddoto riguardante Pericle alle prese con l’educazione di Alcibiade.
doto e, basandosi sulla simmetria polare maestro/allievo, ricorda come egli, invece, sia solito dire a Bruto, quando parla alla moltitudine, «canta per me e per il popolo» (Brut. 187: Quare tibicen Antigenidas dixerit discipulo sane frigenti ad populum: «mihi cane et Musis»; ego huic Bruto dicenti, ut solet, apud multitudinem: «mihi cane et populo, mi Brute», dixerim, ut qui audient quid efficiatur, ego etiam cur id efficiatur intellegam). Una correzione delle parole di Antigenida, ma anche, forse, una stoccata nei confronti del destinatario del trattato, poco convinto, se non recalcitrante, a replicare uno degli assunti di base delle teorie ciceroniane.\(^{22}\) Nella pagina si avverte poi un certo fastidio per il giudizio dei tecnici, ove l’opinione dell’artifex si erga a giudicare l’eloquenza con criteri di valutazione ritenuti estrinseci.

Il secondo aneddoto aiuta a chiarire ulteriormente il punto. Protagonista è il poeta Antimaco di Colofone, il cui poetare difficile era noto in antico al pari di una certa prolissità, oggetto di critiche già aperta da Callimaco (398 Pf.).\(^{23}\) Questi atti (Brut. 191):

Nec enim posset idem Demosthenes dicere, quod dixisse Antimachum clarum poetam ferunt: qui cum convocatis auditoribus legeret eis magnum illud, quod novistis, volume suum et eum legentem omnes praeter Platonem reliquisserunt, «legam – inquit – nihil minus: Plato enim mihi unus instar est centum milium». Et recte: poema enim reconditum paucorum adprobationem, oratio popularis adsensu vulgi debet movere. At si eundem hunc Platonem unum auditorem haberet Demosthenes, cum esset relictus a ceteris, verbum facere non posset. quid tu, Brute?

E infatti Demostene non avrebbe potuto dire quel che si tramanda abbia detto il celebre poeta Antimaco; di fronte ad un uditorio da lui invitato, costui leggeva quella sua voluminosa opera che voi conoscete; mentre leggeva, venne piantato in asso da tutti, eccettuato Platone. «Leggerò lo stesso, – disse – Platone da solo vale per me centomila ascoltatori». E aveva ragione: una composizione poetica sofisticata deve infatti suscitare l’approvazione di

\(^{22}\) Sul rapporto tra Cicerone e Bruto, tratteggiato nel corso dell’opera come quello ideale che lega un maestro all’allievo prediletto (Kaster 2020a, 7 lo inquadra efficacemente come «a cross between a son and a second self»), benché notoriamente tra i due le distanze fossero note e ben evidentì, cf. Dugan 2005, 234 «though Cicero presents Brutus throughout the dialogue as his fawning protégé, we know that Brutus joined with Calvus and the Atticists in voicing strong criticism of Cicero’s style». La scelta di dedicare l’opera al futuro cesaricida assume di conseguenza un valore ben diverso da quello di una dedica frutto di uno spirito di condivisione. Per ricorrere ancora a Dugan 2005, 236, si può osservare che «Cicero’s choice to dedicate the work to Brutus is a polemical strategy [...] setting one’s position in dialogue with a conspicuous opponent». Su Bruto nel Brutus cf. inoltre Marchese 2011, 40 – 42 e Martin 2014.

\(^{23}\) Per le critiche in ambito latino cf. Quint. 10.1.53: Contra in Antimacho vis et gravitas et minime vulgare eloquenti genus habet laudem. sed quamvis ei secundas fere grammaticorum consensus deferat, et affectibus et iucunditate et dispositione et omnino arte deficitur, ut plane manifesto appareat, quanto si aliud proximum esse aliud secundum.
pochi, un discorso di fronte al popolo, il consenso del volgo. Se però sempre lo stesso Platone lo avesse avuto come unico ascoltatore Demostene, e fosse stato piantato in asso da tutti gli altri, non avrebbe potuto proferire parola.

L’aneddoto relativo al poeta Antimaco,\(^2\) che gli Alessandrini ponevano al secondo posto del canon dopo Omero per la sua Tebaide (cf. ancora Quint. 10.1.55), sembra avere una precisa finalità, stabilendo un immediato quanto ovvio confronto tra un prodotto poetico raffinato ed esclusivo, che può godere del pubblico ristretto immaginato come suo destinatario ideale, e un’orazione che vive del fatto di essere fruibile ad un più ampio uditorio. Come si vede, sono ancora in volto in gioco le categorie dell’adprobatio e dell’adsensus, ma in questo caso per marcare un’evidente differenza: un poema reconditum potrà giovarsì dell’adprobatio paucorum, mentre una performance oratoria non potrà che mirare all’adsensus volgi. D’altra parte, nel passo in questione la caratterizzazione del discorso appare netta: l’oratio cui Cicerone si riferisce è quella popularis. Così, se nell’impiego del termine è forse possibile scorgere un richiamo a quella politica della concordia definita altrove come la condotta del vere popularis,\(^2\) rispetto alla quale l’oratio popularis\(^2\) costituirebbe un utile pendant, ad una corretta esegesi dell’aneddoto contribuisce un passo del secondo libro delle Tusculanae, di poco posteriore, che riprende il discorso, esplicitandolo in questi termini (Tusc. 2.3):\(^2\)

Etenim si orationes, quas nos multitudinis iudicio probari volebamus (popularis est enim illa facultas, et effectus eloquentiae est auditium adprobatio) – sed si reperiebantur non nulli, qui nihil laudarent nisi quod se imitari posse confiderent, quemque sperandi sibi, eundem bene dicendi finem proponerent, et cum obruerentur copia sententiarum atque verborum, ieiunitatem et famem se malle quam ubertatem et copiam dicerent, unde erat exortum genus Atticorum iis ipsius, qui id sequi se profitebant ignotum, qui iam conticuerunt paene ab ipso foro inrisi: quid futurum putamus, quum adiutore populo, quo utebamus antea, nunc minime nos uti posse videamus?

In effetti, prendiamo il caso dei discorsi: io volevo che incontrassero l’approvazione della massa – si tratta infatti di un’arte che riguarda il pubblico, e nell’eloquenza la misura del successo è l’approvazione degli ascoltatori – ma se si trovavano alcuni che non lodavano

---
\(^2\) cf. ad es. Cat. 4.9: Intellectum est quid interesset inter levitatem contionatorum et animum vere popularem saluti populi consulentem.
\(^2\) Per le cui caratteristiche, di difficile valutazione, cf. lo studio di David 1980, ma già Helleghouarc’h 1972, 534–538, sottolineava le differenti oscillazioni nell’impiego ciceroniano dell’aggettivo, osservando una maggiore preminenza dell’accezione negativa se riferito a persone.
nulla, tranne ciò che contavano di riuscire ad imitare, e facevano coincidere il modello della perfetta eloquenza con ciò che speravano di raggiungere; che, quando erano sommersi dalla ricchezza di frasi e di parole, proclamavano di preferire il digiuno e la fame alla ricchezza e all’abbondanza, – da qui aveva tratto origine la scuola degli Atticisti, ma in che cosa consistesse lo stile attico era ignoto persino a coloro che se ne dichiaravano seguaci, e che ormai si sono azzittiti, visto che perfino il foro arriva quasi a deriderli – ebbene, che cosa pensiamo che succederà ora che vediamo di non poter assolutamente contare sull’aiuto del popolo su cui prima contavamo?

La pagina ciceroniana, che origina da un’esaltazione dell’attività filosofica (secondo Ennio, Neottolemo riteneva di dedicarsi alla filosofia ma con moderazione), è in realtà animata da un certo disincanto e dal rimpianto per un tempo ormai andato, quale quello dei processi e delle cause. Tutto questo è reso manifesto dall’uso dell’imperfetto che segna un distacco da quella stagione ormai improponibile. Cicerone non ha però smarrito il tono polemico: il vero bersaglio sono ancora gli Atticisti, amanti del digiuno e della fame, rispetto ai quali Cicerone rivendica con forza di aver sempre perseguito l’unico criterio possibile nel giudicare i fatti di eloquenza, che è popularis facultas e la cui misura del successo è, come nel Brutus, l’audientium adprobatio.

L’astruso Antimaco, che già Catullo prendeva a bersaglio polemico di uno stile insopportabilmente gongio, incomparabile ai parva monumenta della poesia di Cinna (parva mei Cinnae mihi sint cordi monumenta / at populus tumido gaudeat Antimacho, c. 95.9–10), è insomma esempio antifrastico di quel che un bravo oratore deve evitare e cioè una lontananza pericolosa dall’adprobatio della moltitudine.

Le affermazioni condotte danno dimostrazione di un preciso posizionamento. Proprio il tono del passo sempre brillante e sostenuto, così come gli esempi trascelti, provano che Cicerone conosce e pratica criteri di giudizio su cui a Roma ci si eserciterà moltissimo. La posizione ciceroniana appare assai originale, molto diversa, tanto per fare un esempio noto, da quella di Orazio che parteggierà per una poesia che rifiuta programmaticamente di identificare nel popolo il proprio destinatario. Ma, appunto, l’orientamento di Cicerone è differente: l’eloquenza non è la poesia, i criteri di giudizio sono dunque da tenere ben separati.

29 Su questo motivo Cf. anche Brutus 290–291.
D’altra parte, la pagina ciceroniana testimonia qualcosa di più: una nuova stagione dell’eloquenza, i cui spazi d’azione sono assai ridotti, in quanto soffrono di una pericolosa deriva politica che ne limita l’esistenza. La voce autorevole di Cicerone ne è consapevole: sa bene che il cammino dell’oratoria è a Roma in serio pericolo. Il processo di letterarizzazione che ormai contraddistingue l’eloquenza ha in sé un germe di potenziale pericolo, di cui il Brutus stesso è testimone,\(^{31}\) come Cicerone stesso fa palesare non a caso allo stesso Bruto nei paragrafi iniziali del dialogo: «Per quanto riguarda tutto il disse resto ho i tuoi stessi crucci, e credo li si debbano avere; dell’eloquenza, però, mi piacciono non tanto i vantaggi e la gloria che procura, quanto lo studio e l’esercizio per loro stessi» (\textit{ceterarum rerum causa, inquit, istuc et doleto et dolendum puto; dicendi autem me non tam fructus et gloria quam studium ipsum exercitatioque delectat, Brut. 23}). Rispetto ad Attico, che ricorda la lamento ciceroniano per la desolazione dei tribunali e del foro, Bruto non può che condividere le paure, ma poi suggerisce una via di fuga, ipotizzando un esercizio gratificante, anche se fine a se stesso. Una soluzione, quella della bellezza dell’eloquenza come mezzo di autosufficienza e di appagamento, che Cicerone non può fare propria, anche se a più riprese anch’egli ne ha rivendicato la \textit{venustas}.\(^{32}\) Nondimeno, la partita che Cicerone sa essere in corso è per questo tanto più pericolosa: la sfida che l’oratore avverte di dover continuare a combattere sta nel ribadire il primato dell’efficacia persuasiva, nella quale si leggono il fine e l’essenza del mestiere stesso dell’oratore.

Non è dunque casuale che la conclusione dell’aneddoto su Antimaco stimoli Bruto, sollecitato da Cicerone, a prendere posizione espressamente confessando che per tutte le cause, anche per quelle in cui si ha a che fare con i membri di una giuria e non con il popolo, la presenza del pubblico è per lui a tal punto fondamentale da impedirgli di parlare nell’eventualità in cui fosse abbandonato dalla corona dei \textit{cives} (\textit{Brut. 192}):

«Quid tu, Brute? Possesne, si te ut Curionem quondam contio reliquisset?» «Ego vero – inquit ille – ut me tibi indicem, in eis etiam causis, in quibus omnis res nobis cum iudicibus est, non cum populo, tamen si a corona relictus sim, non queam dicere».

\(^{31}\) Narducci 1997b, 116–117.

\(^{32}\) Sulla \textit{venustas} come requisito fondamentale dell’eloquenza cf. ad es. \textit{de orat.} 1.17: \textit{Accedat eodem oportet lepos quidam facetiaeque et eruditio libero digna celeritasque et brevitas et respondendi et laessendii subtili venustate atque urbanitate coniuncta} (sul passo cf. Romano 2014); 1.130: \textit{Itaque ut ad hanc similitudinem huius histrionis oratoriam laudem dirigamus, videtisne quam nihil ab eo nisi perfecte, nihil nisi cum summa venustate fiat, nisi ita, ut deceat et uti omnis moveat atque delectet?} All’interno di una similitudine con lo stile di Roscio.
«E tu, Bruto? Ci saresti riuscito, se l’assemblea ti avesse piantato là, come fece una volta con Curione?». «In verità – disse – per mostrarmi che se ne andavo in giro, non avendo con me che il pubblico, non riuscirei a far parola».

4 L’oratore è come un flautista, l’uditorio come un cavallo

Cicerone lavora sul consenso per così dire estorto a Bruto e lo commenta a suo modo con una lussureggiante immagine che ricorre ad una doppia similitudine (Brut. 192):

Ita se, inquam, res habet. ut, si tibiae inflatae non referant sonum, abiciendas eas sibi tibicen putet, sic oratori populi aures tamquam tibiae sunt; eae si inflatum non recipiunt aut si auditor omnino tamquam equus non facit, agitandi finis faciendus est.

Come se un flauto, soffiandovi dentro, non desse suono, il flautista penserebbe di doverlo buttare via, così per l’oratore le orecchie del pubblico sono come un flauto; se non ricevono il soffio, o se l’uditorio, come un cavallo, è riottoso, bisogna porre fine agli sforzi.

L’avvio del periodo, piuttosto colloquiale, «le cose stanno così», prepara con un effetto in crescendo, a suo modo musicale, alla bellezza delle immagini selezionate. La prima delle due raffronta le orecchie del pubblico ad una tibia: come un flauto che non restituisce il suono desiderato viene messo da parte dal flautista, così se le orecchie non ricevono il soffio o recalitrano (tamquam equus non facit), bisognerà che l’oratore ponga fine agli sforzi.

Anche altrove, in de orat. 2.338, il flauto è protagonista di una similitudine analoga. Li si afferma che, come un flautista non può suonare senza il proprio

33 «It seems reasonable to believe that this is the Latin for the ‘refusal’ of a refractory horse»: così Douglas 1966, 142.
34 Sulla sfida complessa che questo passo mette in atto, cf. Culpepper Stroup 2010, 130: «If we read this against the social and literary background of Brutus, we see that it is neither making vague references to a fickle audience nor – as Brutus would appear to claim – giving up the ghost. He is challenging his dependence on the forensic audience and promoting – both in his words and through the display of his dialogue – the possibility of breaking free from this dependence. Like the tibicen with a broken flute or the equestrian with an unruly horse, Cicero knows that he must find a new mechanism for the display of his craft. He must create for himself an audience that will be responsive, predictable, and sympathetic to his literary and social needs». Sull’aspetto musicale della performance oratoria e del personaggio di Cicerone in particolare cf. Pieper/Jansen/van der Velden (p. 313–337) in questo volume.
strumento, così un oratore non potrà essere eloquente senza la corona della moltitudine (*habet enim multitudo vim quandam talem, ut, quem ad modum tibicen sine tibiis canere, sic orator nisi multitudine audiente eloquens esse non possit*). Che è quanto Bruto ha appena finito di dire. Insomma, Cicerone si autocita, ma nel passaggio dal *De oratore* al *Brutus* non si compie una mera ripresa della similitudine, quanto una sorta di ragionato ampliamento.\(^{35}\) Se infatti si conferma, il che era precisato nel *De oratore*, che l’oratore ha bisogno della *corona* di *cives* come il *tibicen* di una *tibia* per produrre il suono, Cicerone aggiunge che il rapporto tra «attore» e «strumento» è doppia condizionante: il secondo – la *tibia/corona* – determina ed influenza la condotta del primo – *tibicen/orator*. L’oratore non ha solo bisogno del suo strumento, ma esso è in fondo il *metronomo* su cui misurarne l’efficacia. Se dunque lo strumento non risponde come si aspetta che accada, al musicista tocherà – si passi il ricorso insistito alla metafora musicale – cambiare aria musicale.

La tensione argumentativa è come spezzata da questa serie fluida di immagini e metafore che non solo arricchiscono l’esposizione ma, anche, la strutturano. L’esempio desunto dalla prassi musicale è parte di un ragionamento esteso che certo ha a che fare con tutta una trama di segni che coinvolgono, da un lato, l’aneddoto relativo al flautista Antigenida, dall’altro, il destinatario ultimo, le insistemmente evocate *populi aures*, una sorta di convitato di pietra. Ciò avviene anche quando questa complessa partitura testimonia una verità scomoda e cioè che in talune circostanze il popolo sceglie l’oratore peggiore; ma questo accade – aggiunge Cicerone come a correggere il tiro – nell’eventualità in cui esso non abbia la possibilità di sentire di meglio: *Hoc tamen interest, quod vulgus interdum non probandum oratorem probat, sed probat sine comparatione; cum a mediocri aut etiam a malo delectatur, eo est contentus; esse melius sentit, illud quod est, quaecumque est, probat. Tenet enim auris vel mediocris orator, sit modo aliquid in eo* (*Brut.* 193).

D’altra parte, anche quando il discorso si accresce di tono e sembra scegliere la strada dell’approfondimento tecnico, come avviene per il celebre *affaire* della Causa Curiana (*Brut.* 194–198),\(^{36}\) dove si contrapponsero, intorno ad una que-

---

36 Per Dugan 2012, 120, la trattazione della causa Curiana offre come una lente attraverso cui leggere l’intero trattato: «in this legal case we find several vital themes of the dialogue as a whole played out in miniature». 
stione ereditaria, Crasso e Scevola, le conclusioni sono pressoché le stesse (Brut. 198):

Hic ille de populo iudex, qui separatim alterum admiratus esset, idem auditó altero iudici- cium suum contemneret; at vero intellegens et doctus audiens Scaevolam sentiret esse quoddam utherius dicendi genus et ornatus. Ab utroque autem causa perorata si quaere-
retur uther praestaret orator, numquam profecto sapientis iudicium a iudicio volgi dispre-
paret.

A questo punto il nostro critico preso dal popolo, che dopo avere ascoltato il primo av-
vocato da solo, lo avesse ammirato, avrebbe ripudiato il proprio giudizio dopo avere
ascoltato l’altro; ma il competente e l’intenditore, ascoltando Scevola, si sarebbe reso con-
to che vi è un genere di eloquenza più ricco e più adorno. Ma se, una volta perorata la causa
da parte di ambedue, si fosse chiesto quale fosse l’oratore migliore, mai certamente il
giudizio del competente sarebbe stato diverso da quello del volgo.

La vittoria di Crasso al processo curiano contro Scevola, preparatissimo e pro-
babilmente nel giusto, serve a Cicerone a portare a compimento il ragionamento, ri-
bilantando il giudizio dell’esperto quando si tratterà di operare una valutazione
tra due oratori che incontrano entrambi il favore popolare (Brut. 199: Praestat etiam illo doctus auditor indocto, quod saepe, cum oratores duo aut plures populi iudicio probantur, quod dicendi genus optumum sit intellegit). L’esito della ri-
flessione è ancora una volta nel solco di quanto fin qui sostenuto, mostrando peraltro il medesimo piglio argumentativo (Brut. 199):

Nam illud quod populo non probatur, ne intellegenti quidem auditóri probari potest. Ut
enim ex nervorum sono in fidibus quam scìenter ei pulsi sint intellegi solet, sic ex ani-
morum motu cernitur quid tractandis his perficiat oratōr.

Ciò che non incontra l’approvazione del popolo, non può incontrare neppure quella
dell’ascoltatore competente. Come infatti dal suono delle corde della cetrara si suole rico-
noscere con quanto abilità sono state toccate, così dai movimenti degli animi si vedono i
risultati che l’oratore sa ottenere nel trattarli.

Ancora una similitudine musicale, ma con uno scarto significativo, dalla tibia
alle fides, da uno strumento a fiato ad uno a corda. Come il suono prodotto dalle
corde pizzicate manifesta la bravura del musicista, così l’effetto prodotto

37 L’ampia digressione ciceroniana ha fornito innumerevoli spunti di riflessione agli studiosi di
diritto soprattutto in materia di volontà del testatore. Per una considerazione delle questioni
rettiche connesse ad una maggiore attenzione allo spirito della legge piuttosto che alla sua
interpretazione letterale cf. Vaughn 1985. Per Dugan 2012, infine, la discussione della Causa
Curiana offre in piccolo un saggio delle tecniche compositive dell’opera.
sull’animo degli ascoltatori costituirà la prova di ciò che l’oratore è in grado di realizzare per ottenerlo.\(^{38}\)

Da quest’ultima affermazione, che porta a conclusione il ragionamento fin qui tenuto, vien fuori una pagina giustamente famosa nella quale, forse con una punta di malinconia per una antica consuetudine forense, ormai solo da rimpiangere, Cicerone ricorda come dev’essere il foro quando in azione è un vero principe del foro (Brut. 200):

Itaque intellegens dicendi existumator non adsidens et adtente audiens sed uno aspectu et praetriens de oratore saepe iudicat. Videt oscitantem iudicem, loquentem cum altero, non numquam etiam circulantem, mittentem ad horas, quasesitorem ut dimittat rogantem: intlegit oratorem in ea causa non adesse qui possit animis iudicum admoveere orationem tamquam fidibus manum. Idem si praetriens aspexerit erectos intuentis iudices, ut aut doceri de re idque etiam volet probare videantur, aut ut avem cantu aliquo sic illos viderit oratione quasi suspensos teneri aut, id quod maxume opus est, misericordia odio motu animi aliquo perturbationes esse vehementius: ea si praetriensi, ut dixi, aspexerit, si nihil audiverit, tamen oratorem versari in illo iudicio et opus oratorium fieri aut perfectum iam esse profecto intellet.

Perciò un critico competente dell’eloquenza sa spesso giudicar ed iudicatore anche senza soffermarsi ad ascoltare con attenzione, ma con una sola occhiata gettata là di passaggio. Vede il giudice che sbadiglia, che parla con un altro, che talora forma capannelli, che manda acchiappare l’ora, che prega il presidente di rinviare la seduta: comprende che in quel processo non vi è un oratore che sappia toccare col suo discorso – come la cetra con la mano – gli animi dei giudici. Se invece, passando, noterà che i giudici sono protesi ad ascoltare, così da apparire lasciarsi informare sui fatti e manifestare anche col volto la loro approvazione, o lì vedrà quasi tenuti sospesi dal discorso come un uccello da un canto, oppure, e questa è la cosa essenziale, lì vedrà in preda al più grande turbamento, per compassion, per avversione; e per qualche altro moto dell’animo; se passando, come ho detto, vedrà ciò, anche senza nulla ascoltare, tuttavia comprenderà senz’altro che in quel processo è di scena un vero oratore, e che si sta compiendo, o è già del tutto compiuta quella che è la vera opera di un oratore.

La descrizione è certamente tra le più intense del Brutus e forse dell’intera produzione retorica ciceroniana. L’ecphrasis coglie in atto l’azione dell’oratore,

---

38 In virtù del criterio enunciato, Cicerone non avrà esitazione a giudicare lo stile del cugino Gaio Visellio Varrone, la cui eloquenza risultava poco gradita presso il popolo. Cicerone dice in prima battuta che il proprio giudizio è in disaccordo con quello del popolo, ma poi non può fare a meno di osservare che l’eloquenza di costui era precipitosa e resa oscura dalla sua stessa rapidità: Erat etiam vir doctus in primis C. Visellius Varro consobrinus meus [...]; in quo fatoer volgi iudicium a iudicio meo dissensisse. nam populo non erat satis vendibilis: praeceps quaedam et cum idcirco obscura, quia peracuta, tum rapida et celeritate caecata oratio; sed neque verbis aptiorem cito alium dixerim neque sententis creбриorem (Brut. 264).
attraverso l’osservazione dei risultati prodotti. L’*enargheia* con cui è costruita la rende a suo modo un caso esemplare della capacità ciceroniana di mettere in movimento immagini, altrimenti sbiadite, animandole e facendole parlare. Ciò che Cicerone rievoca non è una scena identificabile, non corrisponde ad un evento preciso; al contrario, egli ricostruisce dall’interno ciò che si svela alla vista di chi, anche solo per un momento, si trovasse ad osservare un oratore in azione. Una sola, rapida occhiata basterebbe infatti a distinguere il competente dall’incapace, misurando gli effetti che l’oratore è in grado di sortire su giudici e assemblea. Un giudice che sbadiglia, assorto nella conversazione con qualcuno o che chiede l’ora è il segno della palese inefficacia degli sforzi dell’oratore di turno. Se invece il giudice in questione fosse *erectus e intuens*, manifestasse col volto la propria attenzione, sospeso dal discorso come un uccello dal canto con cui l’uccellatore tenterà di trararlo nella rete, o trascinato dal più grande turbamento, allora comprenderà che in quel processo c’è un oratore vero e che lì si compie un *opus oratorium*, la fatica vera e propria di un oratore, quella che altrove, in *de orat.* 2.72, viene definita «di gran lunga la più gravosa tra le attività umane» (*de humanis operibus longe maximum*).

## 5 Conclusione

La pagina ciceroniana, resa ancora più affascinante per il modo «smorzato» di presentarla (si tratterebbe infatti di un quadretto colto dalla quotidianità dell’esercizio della giustizia), è al contrario uno dei punti di forza dell’opera. Essa è infatti, in ultima analisi, un elemento centrale della strategia di *self-fashioning* che domina nel trattato. Cicerone pensa a se stesso, ai momenti di gloriosa discesa nell’arena del foro da indiscusso matatore. In questo senso potrebbe essere considerata il doppio di tante altre analoghe descrizioni di scene più o meno simili che compaiono ad esempio nel *De oratore*. Questa del *Brutus* ha però almeno due caratteri di eccezionalità: l’uno risiede nella oramai prolunga e forse definitiva assenza dal foro, una lontananza percepita non solo come individuale ma anche, per così dire, collettiva e sociale; Cicerone avverte la perdita di una condizione che coinvolge la propria persona al pari della società tutta. E per questo tanto più dolorosa. A fronte di tale tono, che piaga alla nostalgia, in questo ritratto di sé, ancora una volta filtrato come più volte av-

---

39 Sul carattere della rappresentazione cf. Jahn-Kroll 1964, 136: «was jetzt angeführt wird, zeugt von praktischem Blick und Erfahrung auf dem Forum, nicht von wissenschaftlich ausgebildetem Urteil, und auch einer *de populo* konnte sehr wohl diese Beobachtung machen».

viene nel corso del dialogo, va colta la volontà di una reazione forte, certamente polemica, contro una nuova generazione di oratori, assai lontani dalle esperienze ciceroniane e che soprattutto rifiutavano il ruolo strategico che Cicerone rivendicava per le emozioni ed il coinvolgimento *totale* dell’auditorio.

### 6 Appendice. Nuove frontiere per la questione del consenso popolare

La complessa e variegata stagione del ciceronianismo\(^1\) induce a segnalare un paio di possibili percorsi di approfondimento in relazione alla rivendicata importanza per l’oratore del criterio del giudizio popolare. Qui di seguito proverò a fornirne un paio di esempi, molto differenti per tempo e finalità.

Un caso noto è rappresentato dal quarto libro del *De doctrina Christiana*, dedicato da Agostino al *proferre*, argomento per forza di cose particolarmente caro all’oratore ecclesiastico.\(^2\) Dopo aver in principio affermato che ip recetti della retorica sono necessari ad offrire in forma presentabile la dottrina cristiana, Agostino precisa a più riprese con immagini emotivi palesemente ciceroniani che il ricorso all’eloquenza non deve mai esser separato dalla guida esercitata dalla *sapientia*.\(^3\) Se l’utilizzo di Cicerone appare ricorrente ed esplicito in più punti\(^4\) come, ad esempio, in relazione ai tre *officia oratoris* (*doctr. Christ*. 4.27–33),\(^5\) appare significativo il trattamento dedicato al tema del saper parlare a tutti, quello che, a proposito di Cicerone, impone, secondo la definizione di Schenkeveld, «the total verdict»:\(^6\) per Agostino, probabilmente memore delle

---

1. Su cui, per uno sguardo d’insieme e ulteriore bibliografia, rinvio ad Altman 2015.
2. Per una visione d’insieme dei temi e della successione degli argomenti cf. Simonetti 1994, XIV-XVII.
5. Quanto al *delectare* è interessante osservare con Pieri 2018, 35, come Agostino realizzi uno spostamento «da fine a mezzo al servizio degli altri due *officia*», sicché la *delectatio* potrà essere utile a trascinare qualsiasi tipo di uditorio.
pagine ciceroniane, i *boni doctores* dovranno fare in modo di evitare ogni parola che risulti oscura o ambigua accordandosi al *vulgi mos*: solo così, infatti, si potrà fare in modo di esser compresi da tutti, parlando non alla maniera delle persone colte, ma degli *indocti* (*doctr. Christ. 4.10.24: Non sit dicatur ut a doctis, sed potius ut ab indoctis dici solet*). Un modo, sia pur scorciato in altra prospettiva, di rinnovare il tema, sviluppato in queste pagine, della centralità del giudizio popolare, a proposito del quale vale in fondo quanto già affermato da Antonio in *de orat. 2.159*, quando, in polemica con gli Stoici, rivendicava come criterio guida per la propria *oratio* che essa fosse accordata alle «orecchie della folla» (*haec enim nostra oratio multitudinis est auribus accommodanda, ad oblectandos animos, ad impellendos, ad ea probanda, quae non aurificis statera, sed populari quadam trutina examinantur*).⁴⁷

Se la pagina di Agostino offre un eccellente documento del permanere in età cristiana delle riflessioni ciceroniane in merito alla ricerca del consenso da parte dell’oratore, è poi forse interessante documentare come un riflesso di queste tematiche si situi molto oltre, nello spazio e nel tempo. Mi riferisco al ruolo che Cicerone ha notoriamente giocato nella formazione della classe politica americana nel diciannovesimo secolo,⁴⁸ con un dibattito assai vivo circa le potenzialità che il modello di eloquenza da lui rappresentato poteva aggiungere. È singolare come due Presidenti degli Stati Uniti, in particolare il secondo ed il terzo, abbiano rappresentato posizioni molto diverse in merito.⁴⁹

Thomas Jefferson, terzo Presidente, vice-presidente di John Adams, ebbe un atteggiamento piuttosto ostile dinnanzi al dilagare del modello retorico incarnato da Cicerone. A suo giudizio, le caratteristiche fondamentali dell’Atticismo – e cioè la *brevitas* e la centralità degli elementi razionali a scapito di quelli emozionali e patetici – dovevano essere alla base dell’oratoria repubblicana americana.

Così, ad esempio, egli si esprime in una lettera a David Harding del 1824, in cui, con un patente caso di rimozione, Cicerone non è mai nominato mentre, benché si parli di eloquenza, gli si preferiscono in omi di storici, quali Livio, Sallustio, Tacito:⁵⁰

The art of reasoning becomes of first importance. In this line antiquity has left us the finest models for imitation, and he who studies and imitates them most nearly will nearest

---

⁴⁷ Su cui Moretti 1995, 117; Fantham 2004, 161 e adesso Li Causi et al. 2015, 491.
⁴⁹ Il che s’inserisce nel più ampio campo d’indagine delle alterne fortune ciceroniane nel diciannovesimo secolo, documentate da Cole 2011.
⁵⁰ Desumo la citazione da Richard 2015, cui rinvio per un più esaustivo commento.
approach the perfection of the art. Among these I should consider the speeches of Livy, Sallust, and Tacitus as preeminent specimens of logic, taste, and that sententious brevity which using not a word to spare, leaves not a moment for inattention to the hearer. Amplification is the vice of modern oratory. It is an insult to an assembly of reasonable men, disgusting and revolting instead of persuading. Speeches measured by the hour die with the hour [...]. In a republican nation whose citizens are to be led by reason and persuasion and not by force, the art of reasoning becomes of first importance.

Lo screditemanto delle modalità persuasive teorizzate e perseguita da Cicerone è, però, solo una delle facce con cui si presenta l’eloquenza ciceroniana agli occhi della politica americana del primo Ottocento. Pressoché negli stessi anni, John Adams, Presidente negli anni della vicepresidenza di Jefferson, esprimeva idee diametralmente opposte.⁵¹

Mostrando il proprio entusiasmo per la professione prescelta di avvocato, già nel 1758, appena ventitreenne, affermava: «A field in which Demosthenes, Cicero, and others of immortal Fame have exulted before me!»⁵² e poi, parlando del piacere provato leggendo le orazioni ciceroniane, nel dicembre dello stesso anno aggiungeva:⁵³

The sweetness and grandeur of his sound, and the harmony of his numbers give pleasure enough to reward the reading if one understood none of his meaning. Besides, I find it a noble exercise. *It exercises my lungs, raises my spirits, opens my pores, quickens the circulation, and so contributes much to health.*

Un invito a leggere (e rileggere) Cicerone, di cui far tesoro.

---

⁵² Butterfield 1966, 65.
⁵³ Butterfield 1961, 63.
Alejandro Díaz Fernández

A Ciceronian exemplum: Cicero’s Self-Portrait as Provincial Governor through his Letters

No one can deny that Cicero is one of the most important sources – if not the most important one – for studying Republican Rome: his many treatises, speeches and letters are key documents for knowing the Republic and, most especially, the last decades of the period.¹ Cicero was in fact one of the most relevant political actors of the last generation of the Republic (only eclipsed in the historical tradition by Caesar and Pompey), which adds even more value to his testimony. Moreover, Cicero displayed a keen interest in topics that did not always attract the attention of Greek and Latin historians, such as law, the Roman institutions and – as is the case for the present paper – the provincial administration. Whereas the sources that deal with the period before Cicero rarely pay attention to the provinces – except when they narrate seditions and wars, Cicero provides us with an abundance of comments and testimonies about the working of Roman provincial system. Because of this wealth of information, the orator has become an indispensable source for the study of the Roman provinces during the Republic.² Any study that touches upon provincial admin-

Note: The present chapter has been prepared within the Research Project “Funciones y vínculos de las élites municipales de la Bética. Marco jurídico, estudio documental y recuperación contextual del patrimonio epigráfico. II” (PGC2018-093507-B-100), the “Red de Investigación de Excelencia Libera Res Publica: red de estudios sobre la República romana” (HAR2017-90703-REDT), funded by the Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación (Gobierno de España), and the “Grupo de Estudios Historiográficos” (HUM-394), funded by the Junta de Andalucía. I want to sincerely thank Francisco Pina Polo and the reviewers of this volume for their helpful comments, as well as the editors of this book for their kindness and patience. All mistakes are, of course, of my responsibility. All dates are BC.

1 Lintott 2008; on the historical value of Cicero’s writings, cf. particularly 3–14. An accurate overview in Bispham 2006, 42: “until his death in 43 we see late republican history through Cicero’s eyes: through his huge output of forensic and political speeches, treatises on rhetoric, ethics, natural philosophy, and political theory, and an enormous body of private correspondence. This contemporary material, above all the letters, makes possible a study of politics and society which is simply not possible for any other period. Cicero was often an eyewitness, and what he did not see, he subjected to the analysis of a powerful mind, albeit one often clouded by vanity”.

istration during the Republic cannot but come under Cicero’s influence in one way or another.

A good deal of this information comes from his judicial speeches and ample correspondence, especially those letters that he wrote to his friends and associates when he was sent to Cilicia as proconsul in May of 51, in compliance with the terms stipulated by the lex Pompeia of 52. These letters, sent to Atticus as well as other individuals who formed part of the orator’s personal and political circle (compiled in the Epistulae ad familiares), shed light on aspects of provincial administration that, in some cases, are completely unattested outside of Cicero, such as (to give just one example) how a governor and his quaestor had to hand over their account books (rationes) at the close of their command under the provisions of the lex Iulia. But besides such nuggets of information, Cicero’s letters from Cilicia provide us with a detailed portrait of the role that he played as provincial governor. In fact, we can say that thanks to his letters, Cicero’s proconsulship in Cilicia is the provincial command about which we are best informed for the entire Republican period. Consequently, his governorship has become the archetype to which scholars turn when studying Roman provincial administration. Moreover, Cicero represents the antithesis of the bad governor that can be glimpsed, for instance, in his well-known Verrinae: if C. Verres’ tenure in Sicily is often touted as the epitome of corruption and abuse in the Roman provinces, Cicero has come to embody the figure of the exemplary commander who used his virtues and abilities to successfully fulfill his duties. Beyond his

---


5 Cic. Att. 6.7.2; fam. 2.17.2–4; 5.20.2 (perhaps the lex Iulia de pecuniis repetundis cited in Rab. Post. 8; 12; Vat. 29; Sest. 135); cf. Fallu 1973, 209–217; Berendonner 2014, 183–187; Pina Polo/Díaz Fernández 2019, 171–172.


well-known oratorical prowess and his incomparable contribution to Latin literature, Cicero is also remembered as the paradigm of the good governor thanks to the evidence provided in his own correspondence.

That said, it would be remiss to accept Cicero’s account of his own governorship without a grain of salt, since it is a biased – and in some aspects even stereotyped – depiction of his role as Cilicia’s governor. In his letters, Cicero shows himself as he wanted to be seen (and remembered), which means that the portrait that emerges from these letters was carefully crafted to cast a favorable light on the orator’s conduct. As is well known, Cicero also lent great importance to his reputation (existimatio) and was fully aware of the important influence that the command of a province could have on a Roman politician’s image.⁸

In one of the letters that he sent to his brother Quintus during the latter’s proconsulship in Asia,⁹ the orator recalls the dolor he felt upon hearing of the existimatio that C. Vergilius and C. Octavius then enjoyed as the governors of Sicily and Macedonia in contrast with the embarrassing news that was circulating in Rome about Quintus’ command in Asia.¹⁰ As we shall see, Cicero was well aware that he had to look after his own existimatio during his command in Cilicia; indeed, many of his letters shows his desire to cement his good reputation in the province, a desire that explains his bold effort not only to highlight the
fama achieved in his province but also to put forth an exemplary portrait of his command in his letters.¹¹

Even if the majority of these letters are private documents, we cannot overlook the fact that their recipients were people of influence in Rome's political circles (many of them were senators).¹² The efforts invested in constructing a favorable view of his tenure as Cilicia's governor, then, cannot be interpreted as mere vanity – though Cicero cannot be freed of that charge either. Instead, we should be cognizant of the political motivations behind such a portrait. Furthermore, we cannot dismiss the possibility that Cicero's letters circulated within certain political circles and hence received a broader, secondary audience.¹³ When Cicero reminds Quintus of the need to cultivate a good reputation as governor, the orator harshly criticizes his brother for his indiligentia when it comes to his epistolary habits, since many of these letters had cast an unfavorable light on his actions in Asia. Cicero even goes so far as to insist that Quintus destroy letters whose content could one day compromise his public standing.¹⁴

¹¹ Cicero's existimatio, in Att. 5.11.5; 6.1.21; fam. 15.10.2; 15.13.2 (cum et tua summa amplitudo et dignitas et meas magnus honos magnaque existimatio postulare videatur); on his fama, Att. 5.10.2; 5.19.2; 5.20.6; 6.1.8. Cicero also shows his worrying for his laus as governor: cf. fam. 2.12.3 (spero me integritatis laudem consecutum: non erat minor ex contemnenda quam est ex conservata provincia); 15.4.11; Att. 5.10.2; 5.14.2; 6.3.3. See Hellegouarc'h 1972, 362–369; Rosillo López 2017, 6–12.

¹² Such as M. Caelius Rufus (tr. pl. 52 and aed. cur. 50) in Cic. fam. 2.8–15; Ap. Claudius Pulcher (cos. 54), cf. fam. 3.8–13; M. Porcius Cato (pr. 54), fam. 15.3–4; 15.6; M. Claudius Marcellus (cos. 51), fam. 15.9; C. Claudius Marcellus (cos. 50), fam. 15.7–8; 15.10–11; L. Aemilius Paulus (cos. 50), fam. 15.12–13; C. Cassius Longinus (q. 55?), fam. 15.14; C. Scribonius Curio (q. 55?), fam. 2.7. Wistrand 1979, 10–22. Most probably, Cicero wrote more letters of the same tenor during his proconsulship in Cilicia; in fam. 15.14.5, the orator requests C. Cassius Longinus to prevent the prorogation of his command, as he had already asked the latter in litterae superiores that are not preserved.

¹³ See Steel 2001, 192: “[Cicero’s treatises and letters], just as much as the speeches, were written with specifics audiences in mind, and the treatises, at least, were designed to be disseminated openly”; 201–202; cf. Carcopino 1951, 10–14; Correa 2012, 49–52; 57–59. Cicero shows indeed his concern about the potential dissemination of some of his letters; cf. Att. 1.9.1; 2.20.3; 3.12.2; 4.15.3; 4.17.1; Q. fr. 3.1.21.

¹⁴ Cic. Q. fr. 1.2.8–9: In litteris mittendis (saepe ad te scripsi) nimmium te exorabili praebuisti. Tolle omnis, si potes, iniquas, tolle inusitatas, tolle contrarias [...] vide per homines amantis tui, quod est facile, ut haec genera tollantur epistularum: primum iniquarum, deinde contrariarum, tum absurde et inusitate scripturarum, postremo in aliquem contumeliosarum. Atque ego haec tam esse quam audio non puto; et si sunt occupationibus tuis minus animadversa, nunc perspice et purga. (‘In sending out official letters – I have often written to you about this – you have been too ready to accommodate. Destroy, if you can, any that are inequitable or contrary to usage or contradictory [...] Do see to it through friendly agents – it is easy enough – that the following
The advice that Cicero gives his brother demonstrates how letters of this sort were not merely private documents; instead, they could acquire a level of notoriety in certain circles. All of this goes to show that Cicero was himself aware that whatever information he sent back to his circle of friends and associates in his letters could end up playing a decisive role in shaping opinion back in Rome about his governorship and could influence decisions in the senate concerning issues such as the possible extension of his *imperium*. As a matter of fact, there are many occasions in which the orator made use of his letters to request his provincial command not be extended.\(^{15}\) More than instruments of private communication, correspondence served as a political tool and, quite possibly, as a means of self-fashioning. In this way, Cicero not only used his letters as a way to keep up with the political happenings in Rome,\(^ {16}\) but also as an opportunity to craft his own self-portrait as a governor and to use his inner circle (particularly M. Porcius Cato, M. Caelius Rufus and T. Pomponius Atticus) to project that image within the ruling aristocracy.

Taking all of this into account, we ought to ask ourselves, firstly, whether the self-portrait that Cicero broadcasts in his letters faithfully matches the reality on the ground during his governorship in Cilicia. Was Cicero really the exemplary governor that his letters suggest? The question is not easy to answer, since practically everything that we know about his tenure in Cilicia comes either directly or indirectly from his own account. In short, we do not possess an alternative source of information that would allow us to verify the validity of his claims.\(^{17}\)

Not even Plutarch’s biography really helps on this point, since the few lines that the Greek author dedicates to Cicero’s time in Cilicia are based on Cicero’s own account.\(^ {18}\) Despite this difficulty, reading between the lines of several Ciceronian letters does suggest that his actions in Cilicia were not always as praiseworthy as he would have us believe. Some letters inform us, for example, about

---

\(^{15}\) Cic. *Att.* 5.1.1; 5.2.1–3; 5.9.2; 5.11.1; 5.11.5; 5.13.3; 5.14.1; 5.15.1–3; 5.17.5; 5.18.1; 5.20.7; 6.2.6; *fam.* 2.7.4; 2.8.3; 2.10.4.3; 3.8.9; 3.10.3; 15.9.2; 15.12.2; 15.13.3; 15.14.5; cf. 8.10.5; see Hall 2009, 42–43.

\(^{16}\) See Cic. *Att.* 5.10.4; 5.13.3; 5.14.3; *fam.* 2.8.1; 2.10.4; 3.8.9–10; cf. 8.1.1; see Rosillo López 2017, 9–12.

\(^{17}\) Broughton 1952, 243; 251–252; Díaz Fernández 2015, 472–473. Besides the literary sources, we have numismatic evidence of Cicero’s proconsulship, but the coins provide nothing relevant to our purpose; cf. Stumpf 1991, 54–55.

\(^{18}\) Plut. *Cic.* 36.1–7; cf. also *vir. ill.* 81.3 (praetor *Ciliciam latrociniis liberavit*); see Carcopino 1951, 119–120.
the tensions that arose between Cicero and his quaestor, L. Mescinius Rufus, over certain sums of money that did not add up in the accounts that both were supposed to submit at the end of their time at the helm of Cilicia’s administration.¹

Secondly, we must also ask ourselves to what extent the exemplary portrait that Cicero paints can be seen as a reflection of what the Roman administration at that time strove to be. Does his portrait really coincide with an ideal or with some of the governmental guidelines recognized and taken up by the Roman senators? Recently, Kit Morrell has suggested that we ought to interpret Cicero’s efforts in Cilicia in light of the guidelines put into place by Pompey and, especially, M. Porcius Cato with the intention of creating an alternative model of governing a province that would be a far cry from the despotic habits that had traditionally dominated the Roman administration and that had led to so many problems for the stability of the imperium.² According to Morrell, the ultimate aim of Pompey, Cato and their associates was to promote a new paradigm of administration based on methods that were both more tolerant of and less aggressive toward the provincials. These measures would have improved the efficiency of Roman taxation in the provinces, at the same time avoiding revolts and other undesirable situations, such as those that occurred in Asia during Mithridates’ invasion.²¹

---

¹ Cic. fam. 5.20.1–9; Fallu 1973, 217–229; Cuomo 2011, 196–198; Muñiz Coello 1998, 198–213; Pina Polo/Díaz Fernández 2019, 171–174; cf. Carcopino 1951, 123–125. Cicero was also involved in private business during his tenure in Cilicia; Cic. fam. 2.11.2 (but see Att. 5.21.5; 6.1.21; Plut. Cic. 36.5); 8.2.2; 8.4.5; 8.8.10; 8.9.3; 8.11.4; Att. 5.18.4; 5.21.10–13; 6.1.3–7; 6.2.7–8; 6.3.5–7; see especially Rauh 1986, 21–30 (cf. 23: “Like so many others, Cicero as governor appears to have helped his friends to help their friends, at least within the limits of decency. On the whole this appears to have been one of the basic ways in which amicitia functioned at Rome. Consequently, one might almost feel inclined to accept Cicero’s repeated claims to an exemplary proconsulship, were it not for one startling event about which we are only slightly informed [namely, P. Valerius’ affair]”); Magie 1950, 393–396; Muñiz Coello 1998, 221–241; Campanile 2001, 263–272. In Att. 6.4.1, Cicero even shows himself disturbed by the troublesome situation of his province, which was threatened by the war, the brigandage and administrative difficulties (Tarsum veni Non. Iun. Ibi me multa moverunt: magnum in Syria bellum, magna in Cilicia latrocinia, mihi difficilis ratio administrandi, quod paucos dies habebam reliquos annui muneres, illud autem difficilimum, relinquendus erat ex senatus consulto qui praesesset); also fam. 2.9.1 (latrocinia).

² Morrell 2017, 238–243; 250–252.

²¹ Morrell 2017, 65–72; 106–116; 187–191; 204–268. See Morrell’s conclusions in 269–275; cf. 270, with regards to the measures promoted by Pompey and Cato in 52–50: “Rome and the provinces were treated as a unit, with benefits for both. Moreover, legislative change was
Nevertheless, it remains a matter of debate whether the exemplary self-portrait that Cicero paints in his letters should be linked to the Catonian political project. As we have noted, Cicero’s letters are far from offering any transparent record of his political career; instead, the image that he projects in his correspondence is carefully crafted in accordance with a series of personal attitudes and values, which, even though they were shared by some of his peers from the senate, fundamentally reflect Cicero’s own circumstances and personal interests.\textsuperscript{22} We cannot overlook the fact that Cicero was a novus homo, which means that his need to cultivate his public image and his existimatio was all the more pressing in a society like Rome’s, where personal prestige was undeniably of paramount importance.\textsuperscript{23} If we uncritically accept Cicero’s self-portrait, we run the risk of analyzing his role as proconsul in Cilicia – not to mention the entire system of provincial administration – through what we could call a ‘Ciceronian mirror’; that is, we would accept a model of provincial administration that reflects an idealized image, based on a series of stereotypical virtues, rather than the actual standards that ruled provincial commands in the late Republic.

1 How to shape a self-portrait: Cicero imperator

Leaving aside his experience as a quaestor in Sicily, it is clear that Cicero was barely trained in provincial administration when he assumed the command of Cilicia, since he had previously turned down provincial posts and disdained anything that would take him away from Rome.\textsuperscript{24} Nevertheless, due to his long ca-

\textsuperscript{22} See Carcopino 1951, 120: “Cicero calculated that no one else would be as well qualified as he to sing his praises, and he filled his letters from Cilicia with the tale of his popularity and of his dazzling virtues”; also Steel 2001, 198: “The letters to Atticus from Cilicia form, in effect, a self-conscious description of the wise man as governor, and presumably Atticus was to do his bit in Rome in spreading this picture”; Cristofori 2000, 69: “Cicerone in effetti aveva il controllo diretto di uno dei mezzi per diffondere la propria fama di buon governatore a Roma, attraverso i suoi contatti epistolari con l’élite culturale e politica della capitale”; Correa 2012, 49 – 52.

\textsuperscript{23} Wiseman 1971,100 – 107; n. 446; Dugan 2005, 1 – 15; van der Blom 2010, 41 – 59; Tempest 2011, 152 – 154; also 59 – 69; cf. Steel 2001, 192 – 202. See Cic. Verr. 2.5.180 – 181; leg. agr. 2.3; Pis. 3; Mur. 17.

\textsuperscript{24} See Cic. Planc. 66; cf. Pis. 5; Phil. 11.23; Mur. 42; fam. 5.2.3; 15.4.13; Att. 2.1.3; also, leg. agr. 1.26; Plut. Cic. 12.4; Dio Cass. 37.33.3 – 4. Allen 1952; Brennan 2000, 401 – 402. Cicero’s quaestorship (75) as quaestor Lilybitanus in Sicily, in Cic. Div. Caec. 2; Planc. 64 – 65; fam. 13.38; Plut.
career as a central player in Rome’s judicial sphere he was very familiar with the
details of provincial administration and was well aware of the displeasure that
the despotic behavior of a governor could provoke among the provincial popu-
lation. Cicero also knew of the pressure that the Roman authorities put on the
provincials, who were not only exhausted by taxes and all kinds of outrages,
but were also generally fed up with an administration unconcerned about
their needs. This is precisely the picture that Cicero draws in his letters when
describing the situation in which he found Cilicia upon his predecessor Ap. Clau-
dius Pulcher’s departure. A good instance of this is to be found in a letter sent
to Atticus dated to 14 August 51 (just after Cicero took up his post), in which the
orator describes Cilicia as a desolate and ruined province (Att. 5.16.2: Maxima ex-
spectatione in perditam et plane eversam in perpetuum provinciam nos venisse
scito prid. Kal. Sext.), whose inhabitants complained about the exorbitant
taxes they were unable to pay and the heart-rending abuses that they had to en-
dure (Audívimus nihil aliquid nisi imperata ἐπικεφάλα solvere non posse, ὄνας om-
nium venditas, civitatum gemitus, ploratus, monstra quaedam non hominis sed
ferae nescio cuius immans). In this case Cicero does not pin the blame for
this situation on anyone specifically, though elsewhere he does put responsibil-
ity for the distressing situation squarely on Appius’ shoulders. Cicero draws a
stark contrast between Appius’ mismanagement and his own admirable work,
thanks to which Cilicia was able to recover from the pitiable condition in
which the orator had found it (Att. 6.1.2).
Quid enim potest esse tam dissimile quam illo [sc. Appio] imperante exhaustam esse sumptibus et iacturis provinciam, nobis eam obtinentibus nummum nullum esse erogatum nec privatim nec publice? Quid dicam de illius praefectis, comitibus, legatis etiam? De rapinis, de libidinibus, de contumelis? Nunc autem domus mehercule nulla tanto consilio aut tanta disciplina gubernatur aut tam modesta est quam nostra tota provincia.

In fact could any two systems differ more widely? When he was governor the province was drained dry with charges and disbursements, while since I took over not a sixpence has been paid out either privately or publicly. Need I speak of his Prefects and staff, his legates too? The robberies, the outrages, the indignities? Whereas now I really don’t think you could point to a private household so wisely and strictly run or so well behaved as my entire province.

Beyond any abuses that Appius may have actually committed in Cilicia, it is clear that Cicero’s critiques against his predecessor are intended to propagate a good image of his governorship by contrast with Appius’ blamed deeds. In the letter just quoted, Cicero recognizes that Appius’ friends had reproached him with seeking to win a good reputation in the province with the sole aim of discrediting his predecessor (Att. 6.1.2: Haec non nulli amici Appi ridicule interpretantur, qui me idcirco putent bene audire uelle ut ille male audiat et recte facere non meae laudis sed illius contumeliae causa). However, it seems more accurate to say that Cicero was willing to win laus for himself, even if that implied exposing Appius to contumelia.


30 During the years 51 and 50, Appius was successively accused de repetundis, de vi, de maestate and de ambitu (Cic. fam. 8.6.1; 8.8.3; 3.11.1–3; 3.12.1; cf. vir ill. 82.4); see Alexander 1990, nn. 340 – 341; 344 – 345; Muñiz Coello 2003, 224–225.

31 ‘Certain friends of Appius put an absurd construction on all this, fancying that I am desirous of a good reputation in order to give him a bad one, and that I am an honest governor not to gain credit for myself but to cast inflexion on him’.

32 Cic. Att. 6.1.2; Morrell 2017, 251–252. See Mamoojee 1994, 34; Steel 2001, 198–200; Campanile 2001, 252–259; cf. 258: “il quadro di Appio che Cicero presenta potrebbe essere anche viziato dal desiderio di mettere in risalto l’equilibrio e l’umanità delle proprie decisioni, mentre la cupa caratterizzazione del predecessore fornita da Cicero tende a evocare un’immagine tirannica di Appio”. Muñiz Coello 1998, 241–249; Hall 2009, 139 – 153. Dugan 2005, 58–66 presents a similar interpretation of Cicero’s distorted portrayal of L. Calpurnius Piso, who is presented in In Pisonem as an inversion of the role played by the orator as a consul. Nevertheless, Cicero’s relationship with Appius evolved from the tension that his first letters from Cilicia show to the apparent cordiality in fam. 3.9.1, when Appius was already in Rome. In fam. 2.13.2, for instance, Cicero says that there were simply certain points of contrast between his method of administration in Cilicia and that of Appius; similar in fam. 3.8.7–8. Appius became indeed one of the senators to whom the orator pressured to prevent the prorogation of his command; fam. 3.8.9; 3.10.3; cf. 3.13.1.
Cicero’s self-portrait also contrasts with that of M. Calpurnius Bibulus (cos. 59), the proconsul sent to Syria to take charge of the province in the wake of the disaster at Carrhae and the death of M. Licinius Crassus in 53.\footnote{Cic. \textit{fam.} 15.3.2; Caes. \textit{BC} 3.31.3; Liv. \textit{Per.} 108; App. \textit{Syr.} 51; Dio Cass. 40.30.1; cf. Broughton 1952, 242; Díaz Fernández 2015, 486–487. See Morrell 2017, 194–200.} When Cicero reached the province on 31 July 51, the Parthians were still threatening Antiochia and there was a palpable sense of fear that Pacorus’ troops would reach Cilicia.\footnote{See Cic. \textit{Att.} 5.14.1; 5.16.4 5.18.1; 5.21.2; \textit{fam.} 15.1.1–2; 15.3.1; 15.4.3–7. Still in early year 50 the Romans feared that the Parthians attacked again; cf. \textit{Att.} 6.1.14 (\textit{Parthicum bellum inpendet}); 6.2.6; 6.3.2; 6.4.1; 6.6.3; cf. \textit{fam.} 2.11.1; 8.5.1; 8.10.1. Muñiz Coello 1998, 171–177; Morrell 2017, 177–193.} In view of the alarming news coming from Syria, Cicero moved two legions to Mons Amanus in order to impede a Parthian invasion. There he achieved certain and (in all likelihood) modest successes against populations from the surrounding area.\footnote{Cic. \textit{Att.} 5.20.1–5; \textit{fam.} 2.10.2–3; 15.4.2–10; cf. 3.8.10; 15.2.1–8; Plut. Cic. 36.4. Pina Polo 2005, 286–292; Muñiz Coello 2007, 218–224.} Luckily for Cicero (for it appears that he had no desire to directly face off against the Parthians), C. Cassius Longinus, Crassus’ quaestor, managed to push Pacorus’ troops away from Antiochia and Bibulus finally took up his command in Syria.\footnote{Dio Cass. 40.28.1–30.2; Cic. \textit{Att.} 5.20.3; 5.21.2; \textit{fam.} 2.10.2; 15.4.7; 15.14.2–3; Vell. 2.46.4; Just. 42.4.4–5; Oros. 6.13.5. Morrell 2017, 183–187.} Despite this, reproaches against Bibulus’ handling of the situation are far from scarce in Cicero’s letters. While Appius represents the abusive governor who had plundered his province, Bibulus seems to be the antithesis of Cicero’s determination and ability to fulfill his military duties.\footnote{Cicero’s attitude (cf. \textit{fam.} 15.2.1–5; 15.4.8–10) contrasts with Bibulus’ apparent negligence; \textit{Att.} 5.16.4; 5.18.1; 7.26–8; \textit{fam.} 2.17.6–7; 15.1.1; see, however, \textit{Att.} 6.5.3 (\textit{cum enim arderet Syria bello et Bibulus in tanto maerore suo maximam curam belli sustineret ad meque legati eius et quaestor et amici eius litteras mitterent ut subsidio venirem}); Dio Cass. 40.30.1–2. In \textit{Att.} 5.20.4, Cicero claims that Bibulus lost one of his \textit{cohors} with its \textit{primipilus} (\textit{ille cohortem primam totam perdidit centurionemque primi pil}), but M. Caelius Rufus nuances Cicero’s words in \textit{fam.} 8.6.4: \textit{Tamen, quoquo modo [sc. hic omnia iaceant] potuit, sine Parthis Bibulus in Amano nescio quid cohorticularum amisit.} Morrell 2017, 194–197.} In fact, Cicero denies that Bibulus deserved any merit for the Parthian retreat, as he makes it clear in a letter to Atticus in which the orator justifies his desire to celebrate a triumph because the senate had granted Bibulus an \textit{amplissima supplicatio} (\textit{Att.} 7.2.6):\footnote{Also \textit{Att.} 6.8.5; cf. Wistrand 1979, 37–40; Morrell 2017, 197–200.}
With regard to the Triumph, I was never in the least eager until Bibulus sent that quite shameless letter which resulted in a Supplication in the most handsome terms. If he had done what he claimed I should be delighted and wish him the honour. As it is, if Bibulus is honoured, who did not stir a foot outside the town gate so long as there was a Parthian this side Euphrates, while I, whose army was his army’s hope and stay, am not similarly honoured, why, we are humiliated—and I mean ‘we’, you as well as I. So I shall try all I know and I trust I shall succeed.

Despite his apparent disinterest in the military aspects of his command, Cicero knew that his reputation as a governor largely depended upon his ability to handle the Parthian matter and to maintain peace in his province. This explains why the orator went to such lengths in the letters to showcase his *diligentia* and military prowess, even going so far as to exaggerate his modest successes against the people from Mons Amanus.\(^3\) So much is seen in several letters, all of which touch upon a similar subject and were sent to Atticus, M. Caelius Rufus, Cato and, finally, the senate and Roman magistrates: there Cicero narrates in great detail the military actions that he undertook since his arrival in the province as well as his successes despite the lack of cooperation from Bibulus.\(^4\) Well aware of the importance of military prowess for constructing his self-portrait as governor (especially in a province like Cilicia),\(^5\) Cicero thought that he deserved a *supplicatio* and even a triumph. Accordingly, in spite of his initial disinterest, the orator pressures his friends and associates in many of his letters to intercede on his behalf in the senate in a bid to secure these honours for himself, since he knew that such distinctions would bolster his prestige and would even compensate for the

---

\(^3\) Cic. *fam.* 15.2.1–5; see 15.4.8–10. Also Cato underlines Cicero’s *diligentia* in *fam.* 15.5.1–3. Benferhat 2007, 28–32.

\(^4\) Cic. *Att.* 5.20.2–5; *fam.* 2.10.2–4; 15.4; 15.1–2; see especially on Bibulus *Att.* 5.20.4; *fam.* 15.1.1; cf. 2.17.6.

\(^5\) We must bear in mind that P. Servilius Vatia (cos. 79) held a triumph ca. 74 for his campaigns in Cilicia (Cic. *Pis.* 5; *Verr.* 2.1.57; 2.5.66; Val. Max. 8.5.6). When Cicero was still in Cilicia (51), the senate also granted the triumph to P. Cornelius Lentulus Spinther (cos. 57), who had been pro-consul in 57–54; cf. Cic. *Att.* 5.21.4. Also Ap. Claudius Pulcher requested a triumph for his work in Cilicia, but he gave up his *postulatio* when accused by P. Cornelius Dolabella *de maiestate* and *de ambitu*; Cic. *fam.* 3.9.2; 3.10.1; 8.6.1; Alexander 1990, nn. 344–345. Cicero’s friends apparently saw the opportunity that Cilicia offered the orator to achieve a triumph; cf. *Att.* 6.6.4; *fam.* 2.10.2.
damage done by his exile in the past, as he points out in a letter to Cato (fam. 15.4.13–14): \( ^{42} \)

Itaque et provinciam ornatam et spem non dubiam triumphi neglexi, sacerdotium denique, cum (quamadmodum te existimare arbitror) non difficillime consequi possem, non appetivi. Idem post inuriam acceptam (quam tu rei publicae calamitatem semper appellas, meam non modo non calamitatem sed etiam gloriam), studui quam ornantisissima senatus populi Romani de me iudicia intercedere. Itaque et augur postea fieri volui, quod antea neglecteram, et eum honorem qui a senatu tribui rebus bellicis solet, neglectum a me olim, nunc mihi expetendum puto. Huic meae voluntati, in qua inest aliqua vis desideri ad sanandum vulnus iniuriae, ut faveas adiutorque sis, quod paulo ante me negaram rogatum, vehementer te rogo.

So I shut my eyes to the lure of a province with all its official appanages, and, by so doing, to the certain hope of a triumph. And finally, as to the priesthood, although I might have obtained it without much difficulty (and that I believe is your opinion also), I never applied for it. And yet, for all that, after the injustice I had suffered – an injustice which you always refer to as a degradation of the State, though not only degradation, but even an honour, to myself – I was anxious that there should follow decisions of the Senate and Roman people regarding myself of the most distinguished character. And so I subsequently set my heart on what I had previously regarded with indifference – my election as augur; and furthermore, as to the honour usually conferred by the Senate for services in the field, though I never troubled about it in the old days, I now think I should make an effort to secure it. Mingled with this aspiration of mine is a sort of intense longing to heal the wound I suffered in the injustice done me; and I earnestly beg of you (as a moment ago I declared I never would) to give it your countenance and support. \( ^{43} \)

Nevertheless, Cicero places the most emphasis on the successes connected to his administration in his self-portrait as governor. In the letter quoted above, he affirms that he had achieved power and personal gains in the province due more to his aequitas and continentia than to the troops that he had at his disposal,

---

42 See Cic. Att. 6.6.4: Amicorum litterae me ad triumphum vocant, rem a nobis, ut ego arbitror, propter hanc παλιγγενεσιαν nostram non neglegendam; 6.4.2; 6.8.5; 7.1.7–8; 7.2.5–6; fam. 2.10.2; 2.15.2; 3.9.2–4; 8.11.1–2; 15.10.1–2; 15.13.2–3; 16.1.1; Carcopino 1951, 254–255; Wistrand 1979, 41–42; Mamoojee 1994, 34. In Mur. 22–24, for instance, Cicero underlines the preeminence of the dignitas rei militaris; cf. 24 (summa dignitas est in eis qui militari laude antecellunt). See, however, fam. 2.12.3, where Cicero seems to show certain disinterest towards the triumph (spem triumphi inicis: satis glorioso triumpharem, non essem quidem tam du in desiderio rerum mihi carissimarum); also, Verr. 2.5.1–24. As is well-known, Cato rejected to support a supplicatio for Cicero (but he later backed such an honour for his son-in-law M. Calpurnius Bibulus; Cic. Att. 7.2.7): fam. 15.5.1–3; also 8.11.2; Att. 7.1.7. See Wistrand 1979, 25–34; Morrell 2017, 252–261; Martelli 2017, 94–102; Drogula 2019, 248–252.

43 Latin text and English translation of Cicero’s letters to his friends: Glynn Williams 1960.
since his aim was to win the provincial population’s *amicitia, fidelitas* and *benevolentia* towards Rome (*fam.* 15.4.14):⁴⁴

Equidem etiam illud mihi animum advertisse videor (scis enim quam attente te audire soleam), te non tam res gestas quam mores *et* instituta atque vitam imperatorum spectare solere in habendis aut non habendis honoribus. quod si in mea causa considerabis, reperies me exercitiu imbecillo contra metum maximii belli firmissimum praesidium habuisse aequitatem et continentiam. His ego subsidios ea sum consecutus quae nullis legionibus consequi potuissem, ut <ex> alienissimis sociis amicissimos, ex infidelissimis firmissimos redderem animosque novarum rerum esperatione suspensos ad veteris imperi benevolentiam traducerem.

This too I seem to have noticed (and you know how attentively I listen to you), that in the award or non-award of honors, it is not the achievements themselves that it is your practice to keep before your eyes so much as the character, principles, and everyday life of the commanders. And if you consider my case in like manner, you will find that, weak as my army was, I found my strongest safeguard against the threat of a most serious war in my fair-dealing and moderation. With these forces to aid me, I succeeded, where no legions could have enabled me to succeed, in converting the most disaffected allies into the most devoted, the most disloyal into the most trustworthy, and in bringing back hearts that wavered in anticipation of a change of rule into a feeling of friendliness for the old régime (Trans. Glynn Williams 1960).

Cicero shapes his self-portrait as governor through a series of virtues that he habitually puts forth in his letters to throw into relief his flawless conduct and, above all else, his great consideration for the provincial population, whom he led out of the depressing situation that resulted from years of abuse and mismanagement on the part of Roman authorities. In addition to his *aequitas* and *continentia*, Cicero also parades his other virtues, such as *moderatio*, *mansuetudo*, *integritas* and *abstinentia*, underscoring that he had turned down all sorts of honors and had even avoided further expense for the local communities, including those that were recognized as legitimate under the *lex Iulia* (*Att.* 5.16.3).⁴⁵

---


⁴⁵ See Cic. *Att.* 5.10.2; 5.14.2; *fam.* 15.4.10. Cf Att. 5.9.1 (*modestia; abstinentia*); 5.15.2; 5.17.2 – 5 (*abstinentia*); 5.18.2 (*mansuetudo; abstinentia*); 5.20.6 (*continentia; integritas*); 5.21.5 – 11 (*abstinentia; iustitia; faciilitas*); 6.2.4 (*moderatio; continentia*); 6.2.8; *fam.* 2.12.3 (*integritas*); 15.1.3 (*mansuetudo; integritas; aequitas*); 15.3.2 (*mansuetudo; continentia*); 15.4.1 (*aequitas; continentia*). See Dubouloz 2014, 71 – 72; Morrell 2017, 240 – 241; more concretely on the *lex Iulia de pecuniis repetundis*, 133 – 140. Hellegouarc’h 1972, 258 – 271. Again, the contrast between Cicero’s *abstinentia* and Appius’ behavior is evident, since, as we have noted, the latter caused considerable expenses to the provincial population during his tenure in Cilicia; compare, for instance, Cic. *fam.* 3.8.2 – 3 (on the
Levantur tamen miserae civitates quod nullus fit sumptus in nos neque in legatos neque in quaestorem neque in quemquam. scito non modo nos faenum aut quod e lege Julia dari solet non accipere sed ne ligna quidem, nec praeter quattuor lectos et tectum quemquam accipere quicquam, multis locis ne tectum quidem et in tabernaculo manere plerumque. Itaque incredibilem in modum concursus fiunt ex agris, ex vicis, ex oppidis omnibus; et omnes meherecul etiam adventu nostro reviviscunt, iustitia, abstinentia, clementia tua Ciceronis cognita, quae opiniones omnium superavit.

However it is some relief to the wretched communities that no expense is incurred on my account or that of my Legates or my Quaestor or anyone whosoever. I may tell you that besides hay or what is customarily given under the lex Julia we even decline wood; and except for four couches and a roof no one takes anything – in many places not even a roof; they usually sleep under canvas. So the way the people flock in from every country district, village, and town is hardly to be believed. Upon my word the mere fact of my arrival brings them back to life, knowing as they do the justice, the abstinence, and the clemency of your friend Cicero, which has surpassed all expectations.

No less exemplary was his judicial activity, thanks to the combination of clemensia, facilitas and a moderate severitas, not to mention his meticulous edict in which he declared his respect for Greek laws and αὐτονομία. In this way, Cicero managed to set the province back on track and win the goodwill of the inhabitants towards Rome, as evidenced by the fact that they paid their taxes without any sort of coercive measure. Moreover, there are various letters in which the orator draws attention to the benefits of his management not only for the provincials (whom he freed from excessive taxes) but also the publicani, whom even managed to collect back taxes from the socii. The presence of negotiatores and legationes sent by the provincials to commend Appius at Rome; cf. 3.9.1; 3.10.6) with Att. 5.21.7; Cristofori 2000, 73–75.

46 See Cic. Att. 6.2.5 (iam cetera iuris dictio nec imperita et clemens cum admirabili facilitate. aditus autem ad me minime provinciales); 6.3.3 (decreto iusto et severo perpauci); cf. 5.16.3 (iustitia; clementia); 5.17.5 (iustitia); 5.21.5 (iustitia; facilitas; clementia). Hellegouarc’h 1972, 261–267; 281–285.


49 Cic. fam. 15.4.2: Quibus in oppidis cum magni conventus fuissent, multas civitates acerbissimis tributis et gravissimis usuris et falso aere alieno liberavi; Att. 5.16.2–3; 5.21.11; 6.2.4.

publicani in the provinces appears to have often been a source of trouble for Roman commanders, since it was difficult to satisfy their greed without angering the local population. And yet Cicero boasts in his letters that he managed to thread the needle, by keeping the tax collectors happy without hurting provincial communities, as he mentions in a letter to Atticus in which he lays out other accomplishments worthy of being recounted in books (Att. 6.3.3):\textsuperscript{51}

Reliqua plena adhuc et laudis et gratiae, digna iis libris quos dilaudas: conservatae civitates, cumulate publicanis satis factum; offensus contumelia nemo, decreto iusto et severo perpaucli, nec tamen quisquam ut queri audeat; res gestae dignae triumpho, de quo ipso nihil cupide agemus, sine tuo quidem consilio certe nihil.

The rest of my administration brings me so far abundance of praise and gratitude, befitting the volumes you eulogize so handsomely: communities saved from bankruptcy, tax farmers more than satisfied, nobody insulted, only a very few offended by the strict justice of a ruling (but none daring to complain), military achievements worthy of a Triumph. In that matter I shall do nothing savouring of undue eagerness, and certainly nothing without your advice.

Cicero goes even further and claims that his praiseworthy and exemplary behavior rubbed off on his subordinates and collaborators, such as the various legati, tribuni and praefecti, who followed his example and employed their diligentia to increase his gloria (Att. 5.17.2):\textsuperscript{52}

Nos tamen (etsi hoc te ex aliis audire malo) sic in provincia nos gerimus, quod ad abstinentiam attinet, ut nullo erruncius insumatur in quemquam. Id fit etiam et legatorum et tribunorum et praefectorum diligentia; nam omnes mirifice συμφιλοδοξοῦν gloriae meae.

However, my conduct in my province (though I’d sooner you heard of it from others) is such, so far as financial strictness goes, that not a penny piece is spent on anyone. This is partly due to the consciousness of my Legates and Tribunes and Prefects, who are all admirably ambitious for my credit.

We must remember that responsibility for any action carried out in a province by a member of the cohors always fell upon the imperator. This means that it was important to surround oneself with trustworthy individuals who would not cause any problems or inflict damage on the commander’s reputation.\textsuperscript{53} Cicero lays especial emphasis on this issue in one of the letters he sent to his brother Quintus when the latter was governor of Asia: the orator stresses how important

\textsuperscript{51} Also Cic. Att. 6.1.16; 6.2.5; fam. 2.13.3. Benferhat 2007, 34 – 35; Morrell 2017, 241 – 242.

\textsuperscript{52} See Cic. Att. 5.10.2; 5.11.5; 5.16.3; however, 5.14.2.

the behavior (and even the words) of collaborators and members of the *cohors* during a provincial command was, given the direct repercussions that any mistake could have on the governor’s own *existimatio* (*Q. fr. 1.1.10–12*):

His autem in rebus iam te usus ipse profecto erudivit nequaquam satis esse ipsum has te habere virtutes, sed esse circumspiciendum diligenter ut in hac custodia provinciae non te unum sed omnis ministros imperi tui sociis et civibus et rei publicae praestare videare [...] Quos vero aut ex domesticis convictionibus aut in necessariis apparitionibus tecum esse voluisti, qui quasi ex cohorte praetoris appellari solent, horum non modo facta sed etiam dicta omnia praestanda nobis sunt. Sed habes eos tecum quos possis recte facientis facile diligere, minus consulentis existimationi tuae facillime coercere.

However, your own experience has doubtless taught you that in these matters it is not enough for you to have such virtues yourself; you must look carefully around you, so that as guardian of your province you are seen to take responsibility to the provincials, the Romans, and the commonwealth not only for your individual self but for all your subordinate officials [...] What of those whom you have chosen to be with you from your household entourage or necessary staff – members of the governor’s cohort, as they are usually called? In their case we have to answer not only for everything they do but for everything they say. However, the people with you are people of whom you can easily be fond if they behave well and whom you can even more easily check if they don’t pay enough regard to your reputation.

This is not the only aspect of the letter to Quintus that parallels the self-portrait presented by Cicero in his letters from Cilicia. As is well known, the letter was sent on the occasion of the prorogation of Quintus’ command (at the end of 60 or early in 59) to advise the governor of Asia on how to behave in the province if he wanted to obtain the coveted *gloria* in the final year of his command.⁵⁴ Nevertheless, the letter constitutes more than a private admonition, since Cicero uses it as a pretext to compose a fully-fledged political essay about good governance, as he seems to admit in a passage with a certain rhetorical flare (*Q. fr. 1.1.18: Sed nescio quo pacto ad praecipiendi rationem delapsa est oratio mea, cum id mihi propositum initio non fisset*).⁵⁵ Indeed, Cicero alludes to the models of government laid out in works like Plato’s *Republic* o Xenophon’s *Cyropaedia*, which he defines as *effigies iusti imperi*.⁵⁶ Cicero, in short, uses the occasion given by

---

⁵⁴ *Cic. Q. fr. 1.1.3; 1.1.41–44.*


what is apparently a letter of advice to his brother to paint a picture of the ideal ruler as provincial governor.\textsuperscript{57}

2 How to portrait the ideal governor: Cicero’s letter to Quintus (\textit{Q. fr. 1.1})

As we have said, there are many parallels between the advices that the orator gives to Quintus in the letter and the qualities that Cicero would later ascribe to himself in his correspondence from Cilicia. Many of the virtues discussed above, such as \textit{moderatio}, \textit{integritas}, \textit{continentia}, \textit{aequitas}, \textit{clementia}, \textit{mansueto-udo} and \textit{abstinentia}, are equally stressed by Cicero in his letter to Quintus in order to compose the portrait of the exemplary governor.\textsuperscript{58} Nevertheless, it would be wrong to claim that the similarities are merely lexical. As he would later stress in his letters from Cilicia, Cicero lectures Quintus on the importance of avoiding any sort of behavior or expense that could affect the people of Asia (even during any trip); by doing so, he would certainly arouse the \textit{laetitia} of the provincial population.\textsuperscript{59} According to Cicero, Quintus had to preserve the provincials’ well-being, by freeing the Asian communities from abusive taxes, maintaining the proper functioning of local institutions and presiding over the justice with \textit{clementia}, \textit{mansuetoudo} and \textit{humanitas}; by these means Quintus helped many cities, like Samos and Halicarnassus, to recover from the ruin into which they had fallen (Cic. \textit{Q. fr. 1.1.25}).\textsuperscript{60}

Nullum aes alienum novum contrahi civitatibus, vetere autem magno et gravi multas abs te esse liberatas; urbis compluris dirutas ac paene desertas, in quibus unam Ioniae nobilississ-\textsuperscript{57}mam, alteram Cariae, Samum et Halicarnassum, per te esse recreatas; nullas esse in oppi-dis seditiones, nullas discordias; provideri abs te ut civitates optimatum consilii adminis-\textsuperscript{59}trentur; sublata Mysiae latrocinia, caedis multis locis repressas, pacem tota provincia


\textsuperscript{58} See, on \textit{moderatio}, Cic. \textit{Q. fr. 1.1.5} and 9; \textit{integritas} (1.1.8; 20; 37; 45); \textit{continentia} (1.1.8); \textit{aequi-tas} (1.1.9; 45); \textit{clementia} (1.1.25); \textit{mansueto-udo} (1.1.25); \textit{abstinentia} (1.1.32). Cicero also underlines virtues as \textit{severitas} (1.1.19–20; 45); \textit{diligentia} (1.1.4); \textit{temperantia} (1.1.9); \textit{humanitas} (1.1.25; 37–38); cf. Dubouloz 2014, 67–71.

\textsuperscript{59} Cic. \textit{Q. fr. 1.1.9}: \textit{Non itineribus tuis pertrereri homines, non sumptu exhauriri, non adventu com-moveri? Esse, quocumque veneris, et publice et privatim maximam laetitiam, cum urbs custodem, non tyrannum, domus hospitem, non expilatorem recepisse videatur?}

\textsuperscript{60} More concretely on the governor’s justice in Cicero’s letter, Meyer 2006, 167–171.
The communes, we are told, are contracting no new debts, and many have been relieved by you of a massive load of old obligations; you have restored a number of ruined and almost deserted cities, including Samos and Halicarnassus, one of the most famous city of Ionia, the other of Caria; the towns are free of rioting and faction; you take good care that the government of the communes is in the hands of their leading citizens; brigandage has been abolished in Mysia, homicides reduced in many areas, peace established throughout the province, banditry quelled not only on the highways and in the countryside but in greater quantity and on a larger scale in the towns and temples; calumny, that cruellest instrument of governor’s greed, has been banished, no longer to threaten the reputations, property, and tranquility of the rich; communal expenses and taxes are equitably borne by all who live within the communal boundaries. You yourself are very easy of access, ready to lend an ear to every grievance, and no man is so poor and forlorn but he is admitted to your house and bedchamber, to say nothing of the tribunal where you receive the public; your entire conduct as governor is free of all trace of harshness and cruelty, entirely pervaded by mercy, gentleness, and humanity.

As we have already seen, Cicero attributes to himself in his correspondence accomplishments similar to those underlined in the letter to his brother: the reduction of the tax burden on provincial communities, respecting for local law and autonoomia, the administration of justice with moderation and fairness or the recovery of many cities from the misery into which they had fallen. Cicero also warns Quintus about the important and difficult balancing act of keeping the publicani happy without overburdening the provincials, a task that required the very virtus divina that Quintus had apparently achieved in Asia (Q. fr. 1.1.33): Hic te ita versari ut et publicanis satis facias, praesertim publicis male redemptis, et socios perire non sinas divisae cuiusdam virtutis esse videtur, id est tuae.

We are therefore faced with nearly identical portraits, built around similar virtues and behaviors, that sketch the same paradigm of good governance. Cicero

61 Cic. Att. 5.16.2–3; 5.21.11; 6.2.4; fam. 15.4.2.
62 Cic. Att. 6.1.15; 6.2.4.
63 Cic. Att. 6.2.5; 6.3.3.
64 Cic. Att. 5.16.2–3; 6.1.2; 6.2.4.
paints an image of himself as Cilicia’s governor in accordance with the ideal that he had already presented nearly a decade before in his letter to Quintus, hence turning his own proconsulship into the embodiment of the virtues that characterized such a model. It is no coincidence that in a letter to L. Papirius Paetus Cicero says that during his governorship in Cilicia he meticulously lived up to the guidelines that Xenophon had laid out in the *Cyropaedia* and, therefore, also those that he had laid out for his brother. Moreover, Cicero depicts himself as an example of excellent conduct for his own associates and collaborators, as he makes clear to Atticus with some boasting (*Att. 5.11.5*).

Nos adhuc iter per Graeciam summa cum admiratione fecimus, nec mehercule habeo quod adhuc quem accusem meorum. videntur mihi nosse [nos] nostram causam et condicionem profectiosis suae; plane servium extimationi meae. Quod superest, si verum illud est, “οἵαπερ ἣ δέσπονα...”, certe permanebunt; nihil enim <a> me fieri ita videbunt ut sibi sit delinquendi locus.

So far my journey through Greece has been the admiration of the country, and I must say that I have no complaint to make so far of any of my part. I think they know my position amid the understanding on which they come. They are really jealous for my good name. As for the future, if there is anything in the old saying ‘like master...’ they will certainly keep it up, for they will see nothing in my behaviour to give them any pretext for delinquency.

As mentioned above, Kit Morrell has argued that Cicero’s ultimate goal was precisely to construct a new paradigm of governance that would break with the abusive habits for which Roman governors were held responsible in the past; in this view, Cicero’s actions fit into Cato’s political agenda and matched the spirit of the *lex Pompeia* that had been supposedly passed at his insistence in 52. According to Morrell’s analysis, Cato intended to transform radically the standards of governing that had previously applied to provincial command; more specifically, he sought to make the provincial administration much more restrained in its treatment of the local population in addition to running the provinces more smooth-

---

66 Mamoojee 1994, 34–35. When stressing his ability to satisfy the publicans’ interests without angering the provincials (*Cic. Att. 6.1.16; 6.2.5; 6.3.3; fam. 2.13.3*), Cicero implicitly assumes the *virtus divina* that he attributes to Quintus in *Q. fr. 1.1.33.*


69 Morrell 2017, 204–236; see also 200–203; cf. Dio Cass. 40.46.2–3; 40.56.1.
Put in this way, we cannot deny that the Catonian project jibes with what Cicero reports of his time in Cilicia. Morrell has also suggested that the virtue-language that Cicero employs in his letters is a direct reflection of the ethical standards developed by Cato, who in this case would not only have been Cicero’s inspiration but also the target audience of the orator’s self-portrait.\(^7\)

Nevertheless, the obvious parallels between Cicero’s depiction as proconsul and the model of good governance that he himself puts forth in his letter to Quintus would seem to undercut the idea that the ethos that Cicero projects during his tenure in Cilicia is based strictly on Cato’s political ideology. What the coincidences between the guidelines that characterized Cicero’s administration as well as that of other contemporary governors, such as Q. Minucius Thermus (more debatable is the role played by Bibulus),\(^7\) and the principles that Cato seems to have championed shows is that in late-Republican political circles there emerged a shared ideal of governance that was in large part based on Stoic-sounding virtues and which favored policies that, among other things, were more lenient towards the provincial population.\(^7\) When Cicero set out to write his letter to lecture Quintus on the values that ought to guide his command, it was upon these ideals that the orator constructed his characterization of the perfect governor – the same ones that Cato apparently championed when putting together his political agenda.

\(^7\) Morrell 2017, 249–268; cf. 250: “the immediate aim of Cato’s policy as what Cicero tells Cato he has done, and what Cato praises him for doing: that is, saving his province by fair administration”.

\(^7\) Morrell 2017, 238–243; more concretely, 239–240: “Cicero had obeyed Atticus’ exhortation by acting as Cato (rather than Atticus) would wish. Further, if ‘Momus’ is perchance Cato, that letter shows it was Cato’s standards that Atticus impressed upon Cicero. Virtue-language abounds in Cicero’s Cilician correspondence, particularly qualities of integrity, justice, and restraint, along with mildness and accessibility. These are the archetypal qualities of the good governor, and qualities essential to Cato’s policy”. Drogula 2019, 247–248; cf. Benferhat 2007, 39–41; Martelli 2017, 94–98. See Cic. fam. 15.4.1; 15.4.14; Att. 6.1.13.

\(^7\) Morrell 2017, 243–252. Q. Minucius Thermus governed Asia as propraetor in 51–50; Cic. fam. 2.18; 13.53–57; cf. 13.65.1 (\textit{tua cum summa integritate tum singulari humanitate et mansuetudine consecutus es ut libentissimis Graecis nutu quod velis consequare}). Brennan 2000, 569–570; Díaz Fernández 2015, 450–461; see Cristofori 2000, 61.

\(^7\) Mamoojee 1994, 35–36; Morrell 2017, 98–116; 252–267; see also Prost 2017, 156–162.
3 How to portrait the ideal governor: Diodorus’ παραδείγματα

Moreover, we must take into account that this ideal of provincial government was already embodied in the generation before Cicero and Cato in the figure of Q. Mucius Scaevola, who was the governor of Asia around 99. Even though he remained in his province for nine months only, Scaevola’s command appears to have left a profoundly positive mark on Asia thanks to his commendable administration, which was far from the arbitrariness and abuses for which Roman commanders were usually known (especially in a province as prosperous as Asia). Diodorus of Sicily recalls Scaevola’s exemplary government in a series of passages collected in the παραδείγματα of the Excerpta Constantiniana, which are possibly based on Posidonius: in these passages, we encounter a portrait that is remarkably reminiscent of that which Cicero provides in his correspondence from Cilicia as well as his letter to Quintus. Advised throughout his tenure by P. Rutilius Rufus, who had been chosen from among the governor’s most noble friends (ἐπιλεξάμενος τὸν ἄριστον τῶν φίλων), Scaevola displayed his λιτότης, ἀφέλεια and δικαιοσύνη, even personally assuming the costs associated with his command in Asia – not only his own, but also those of his retinue (Diod. Sic. 37.5.1):

Ἐκπεμφθεὶς γὰρ εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν στρατηγός, ἐπιλεξάμενος τὸν ἄριστον τῶν φίλων σύμβουλον Κόιντον Ῥοτίλιον μετ’ αὐτοῦ συνήδρευε βουλευόμενος καὶ πάντα διατάττων καὶ κρίνων τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἐπαρχίαν. καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν διατάν προρείνει ἐκ τῆς ἱδίας υὐσίας ποιέοντα τοῖς τε συνεκδήμοις καὶ αὐτῷ. Ἐτὸς λιτότητι καὶ ἀφέλεια χρώμενος καὶ ἀκεράϊ τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ τὴν ἐπαρχίαν ἀνέλαβεν ἐκ τῶν προγεγονότων ἀκληρημάτων.

When sent out to Asia as governor, he selected as his legate the noblest of his friends, Quintus Rutilius, and kept him at his side when taking counsel, issuing orders, and giving judgement about provincial matters. He resolved that all expenses for himself and his staff should come from his own purse. Furthermore, by his observance of frugality and simplic-
Furthermore, Scaevola lifted Asia out of the misery into which it had fallen at the abusive hands of the publicans and the conniving of previous governors; consequently, he quickly recuperated the provincials’ εὐνοία towards Rome (Diod. Sic. 37.5.4). Sic. 37.5.4: Καὶ τὰς συνήθεις τῶν στρατηγῶν καὶ συνεκδήμοις δαπάνας ἐκ τῆς ἰδιαὶς οὐσίας ποιούμενος ταχὺ τὰς εὐνοίας τῶν συμμαχοῦστων εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην ἀνεκτήσατο). The same uprightness that is seen in his face-off with the publicans can also be found in his proper and strict administration of justice (Diod. Sic. 37.5.2–3). Ταῖς μὲν δικαιοδοσίαις ἀδιαφθόροις καὶ ἀκριβεῖς χρησάμενος οὐ μόνον πάσης συκοφαντίας ἀπῆλλαξε τοὺς κατὰ τὴν ἐπαρχίαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ τῶν δημοσιων ἀνομήματα διωρθώσατο): he indeed reduced excessive taxes, handed out compensations to those who had been abused and severely condemned those who had taken advantage of the provincial population.80

As we can see, there are many aspects in this snapshot of Q. Mucius Scaevola that coincide with the image that Cicero projects in his letters: from virtues such as ἀφέλεια (“simplicity”) and δικαιοσύνη (comparable to Cicero’s iustitia) to the choice of personally paying for the costs associated with his command, the recovery of a province from financial ruin and the restoring of Rome’s good name among the local population (as Cicero makes in his correspondence from Cilicia).81 And yet Scaevola is not the only example of such virtues in Diodorus: the passages comprising the Excerpta Constantiniana also allude to the praiseworthy behavior of a certain L. Asullius in Sicily, who, like Scaevola, also chose as his trusted advisor and legate the most virtuous of his friends, C. Longus, as well as a reputable eques from Syracuse. With the help of these men, Asullius was an even-handed administrator of justice and was able to assist the most wretched of Sicilians, hence bringing back prosperity to the province which had previously found itself in a rather sorry state (Diod. Sic. 37.8.1–4).82

Λεύκιος Ἀσύλλιος, πατρὸς μὲν ὑπάρχων τεταμευκότος, ἐκπεμφθεὶς δὲ στρατηγὸς εἰς Σκελίαν, κατέλαβη τὴν ἐπαρχίαν διεφθαρμένην, ἀνεκτήσατο δὲ τὴν νήσου χρησάμενος τοῖς καλλίστοις ἐπιτηδεύσαν. παρασημοίως γὰρ τῷ Ἐκασύνῳ προσεχείρισα τὸν ἄριστον τῶν φίλων προεβεβήν τε καὶ σύμβουλον, δὲ ἦν Γαίος, ἐπικαλούμενος δὲ Δόγγος, ζηλωτής

81 See Cic. fam. 15.4.14: Ut <ex> alienissimis sociis amicissimos, ex infidelissimis firmissimos red-derem animosque novarum rerum expectatione suspensos ad veteris imperi benevolentiam tradu- cerem; cf. Cic. Att. 5.16.2–3; 6.1.2; 6.2.4.
Lucius Asyllius [sic], son of a man who had risen only to the rank of quaestor, on being sent out as governor of Sicily found the province ruined, but by the excellence of the measures he employed succeeded in restoring the island. Like Scaevola, he selected the finest of his friends as legate and adviser, a certain Gaius, surnamed Longus, an ardent partisan of the sober, old-fashioned way of life, and together with him a man named Publius, the most highly esteemed member of the equestrian order resident in Syracuse [...]. These then were the two men on whom Syllius [sic] relied, and having constructed adjoining houses to accommodate them, he kept them by him as he worked out the details of the administration of justice and devised means to further the rehabilitation of the province [...]. In general he devoted his entire term of office to redressing private and public wrongs, and thereby restored the island to its former state of generally acclaimed prosperity.

Given these parallels, it is tempting to conclude that Cicero based his portrait of the ideal governor on the archetype of good behavior embodied in figures from the previous generation like Scaevola or, at the very least, that Cicero attempted to live up to Scaevola’s virtuous behavior during his own proconsulship in Cilicia. In this sense, it is hardly a coincidence that the orator stresses that he had referred to Scaevola’s edictum Asiaticum when writing his own edict as Cilicia’s governor. Furthermore, in a passage dedicated to the praemia virtutis bequeathed by tradition, Valerius Maximus recalls that Scaevola administered his province so impeccably (Asiam tam sancte et tam fortiter obtinuit) that the senate decreed that his administration should be taken as an exemplum atque normam officii for all subsequent governors sent to Asia. In this way, by recalling Scaevola’s edict and stressing the same virtues and merits that had characterized his administration in Asia, Cicero not only associates himself with that standard of governance, but also reveals that he was living up to the rules that the senate had previously established for provincial commands.

---

84 Val. Max. 8.15.6.
4 Beyond the self-portrait

It is certainly meaningful that Cicero uses his correspondence to underscore that his actions as proconsul adhered to the standards of administration declared in Rome and, particularly, to the Republic’s interests. In his two letters sent to the Roman senate and magistrates, Cicero insistently stresses the appropriateness of his actions to his duties as governor and the public interests, thus showing his attentive diligentia. The reasons why Cicero was so interested in presenting to the Roman authorities the most favorable version of his provincial administration (especially when it comes to the Parthian matter) seem to be identical to the motives that drove him to put forth a exemplary image of his command in the letters to his friends. As we noted at the outset, even though Cicero’s letters were primarily private, this does not mean that some of them would not have been circulated in certain political circles or that, at the very least, their author hoped that they would reach a broader audience than the named recipient. As mentioned previously, in many letters Cicero pressures his associates to become his spokespeople before the senate, whether to argue against the undesired prorogation of his command or to underline the merits to grant him a supplicatio or triumphus. Admitting that many of the letters from Cilicia were meant to influence decisions that would be made in Rome, it is not possible to deny that Cicero’s tendency to paint himself as a paragon of virtue ought to be connected to political motives. Cicero wanted to promote and convey a good image of himself as governor to his circle back in Rome so that they in turn could peddle that portrait to others in the capital. He appears to say it in a letter to the consul L. Aemilius Paulus (cos. 50) in which, in addition to asking for the latter’s help in getting a supplicatio and not having his command extended, Cicero urges him to keep an eye out for his interests and existimatio (fam. 15.13.3).

---

86 Cic. fam. 15.2.1: Maxime convenire officio meo reique publicae conducere putavi parare ea quae ad exercitum quaeque ad rem militarem pertinere; 15.2.7; cf. 15.1.3–6. In fam. 15.4.10, Cicero claimed to have attacked Pindenissus ad existimationem imperio. He also shows his aim of giving up the command of Cilicia according to the senatus consultum; Att. 6.4.1; 6.5.3; 6.6.3; 7.3.1; fam. 2.13.3; 2.15.4; see also, with regards to Brutus’ affair, Att. 5.21.11–13; 6.2.7.
87 See Steel 2001, 201: “Atticus’ friendship and approval on their own were very valuable to Cicero; Cicero’s restraint becomes even more understandable if he was also hoping that Atticus would disseminate a favourable account of Cicero’s governorship”; cf. Cristofori 2000, 69.
88 A similar letter was sent to L. Aemilius Paulus’ colleague, C. Claudius Marcellus; cf. fam. 15.10.2: Qua re a te peto in maiores modum ut me per te quam ornatissimum velis esse meansque et in supplicatione decernenda et in ceteris rebus existimationem satis tibi esse commendatam putes; see also 15.7–8; 15.9.2; Martelli 2017, 102–106; Drogula 2019, 248–249.
Nunc, cum tua summa potestas summaque auctoritas notaque omnibus nostra necessitudo sit, vehementer te rogo ut et quam honorificentissime cures decernendum de meis rebus gestis et quam celerrime. Dignas res esse honore et gratulatione cognosces ex iis litteris quas ad te et collegam et senatum publice misi. Omnimque mearum reliquarum rerum maximeque exstimationis meae procurationem susceptam velim habeam, in primisque tibi curae sit, quod abs te superioribus quoque litteris petivi, ne mihi tempus prorogetur.

As it is, seeing that you possess the highest power and influence, and that our close connection is known to all men, I ask you in all earnestness to ensure that the decree concerning my achievements is couched in the most complimentary terms possible, yes, and as speedily as possible too. That those services are deserving of honor and congratulation you will discover from the dispatch I sent in my public capacity to yourself and your colleague and the Senate; and I should be glad if you would undertake to look after all my reputation, and particularly to see to it, as I asked you to do in a former letter also, that there is no extension of my term of office.

But what exactly was Cicero looking for? Was it his goal to align himself with the principles of Cato and other senators? Beyond his proverbial vanity, the reason behind such a painstaking self-portrait could quite well be found in Cicero’s personal circumstances and his standing in the political scene. As Cicero recognises in one of his letters to the senate, the fact of being sent to Cilicia constituted a serious blow to his political aspirations that he had to accept with a resigned verecundia.89 While the explanation for his disappointment is usually attributed to his well-known disdain for provincial issues (the same feeling that had previously led him to turn down provincial commands), perhaps there is more to the matter: whether Cicero felt disdain for such responsibilities or not, he knew that the command of a province was a potentially compromising task that would bring him under public scrutiny and, especially, under that of the senate (including his political enemies), even more because he had been sent to a province threatened by war.90 These circum-

89 Cic. fam. 15.1.4: Quod ego negotium non stultitia occaecatus sed verecundia deterritus non recusavi. Neque enim umquam ulla periculum tantum putavi quod subterfugere mallem quam vestrae auctoritati obtemperare; cf. fam. 2.12.2; 3.2.1; 15.12.2; Att. 5.10.3; 6.3.2. Campanile 2001, particularly 273–274; Muñiz Coello 2007, 212–216; Prost 2017, cxiv-cxvi.

90 As Cicero seems to point out in fam. 2.11.1: Mirum me desiderium tenet urbis, incredibile meorum atque in primis tui, satietas autem provinciae, vel quia videmur eam famam consecuti ut non tam accessio quaerenda quam fortuna metuenda sit vel quia totum negotium non est dignum viribus nostris, qui maiora onera in re publica sustinere et possim et soleam, vel quia beli magni timor impendet, quod videmur effugere si ad constitutam diem decedemus. M. Caelius Rufus (Cic. fam. 8.10.2), for instance, comments the reluctance of the consuls to assume the command of the Parthian war at the end of 51: Consules autem, quia verentur ne illud senatus consultum <non> fiat “ut paludati exeant” et contumeliose praeter eos ad alium res transferatur, omnino sen-
stances explain Cicero’s worry about the events in Syria and his repeated lamentations over the apparent dearth of troops (which smack of a justification for whatever could have happened if the Parthians had invaded Cilicia).  

Cicero’s concern was shared by M. Caelius Rufus, who also shows his fear about the impact of an eventual war on both the orator’s dignitas and the public opinion in Rome (fam. 8.10.1):  

Ego quidem praecipuum metum, quod ad te attinebat, habui, qui scirem quam paratus ab exercitu esses, ne quod hic tumultus dignitati tuae periculum adferret. Nam de vita, si paratior ab exercitu esses, timuissem; nunc haec exiguitas copiarum recessum, non dimicatio- nem mihi tuam praesagiebat. Hoc quo modo acciperent homines, quam probabilis neces- sitas futura esset, <verebar, et> vereor etiam nunc neque prius desinam formidare quam tetigisse t<e> Italiam audiero.

For my own part, being aware of your unpreparedness in the matter of your army, my special apprehension as regards yourself is that this sudden rising will imperil your prestige. For were you better prepared in respect of your army, I should fear for your life; as it is, the present numerical weakness of your forces fills me with foreboding, not of an engagement, but of a retreat, on your part. How the public would accept the latter decision, and how the necessity for it would be taken as a sufficient justification, as so that I have my misgivings even now, and shall never cease to have a feeling of dread, until I am told that you have landed in Italy.

Cicero knew that he could not commit any mistake during his tenure in Cilicia, since one misstep in his handling of the Parthian problem or an accusation (substantiated or not) of mismanagement or embezzlement (things which were quite common in Roman politics) could bring his career to an end.

---

atum haberi nolunt, usque eo ut parum diligentes in re publica videantur. Sed honeste sive negle- gentia sive inertia est sive ille quem proposui metus latet sub hac temperantiae existimatione, nolle proviniam.

91 Cic. Att. 5.15.1 (me nomen habere durum legionum exilium); 5.18.1; 6.4.1; 6.5.3; cf. fam. 3.3.1–2; 3.6.5; 8.5.1; 8.10.1; 15.3.2. Cicero depicts the situation as dramatic in fam. 15.1.4–6; see 15.1.5 (hoc autem tempore res sese sic habet ut, nisi exercitum tantum quantum ad maximum bellum mittere soletis mature in has provincias miseritis, summum periculum sit ne amittendae sint omnes eae provinciae quibus vectigalia populi Romani continentur); Lintott 2008, 260. Nevertheless, Plutarch (Cic. 36.1) says that Cicero had an army of twelve thousand ὀπλαρχα and twenty-six hundred ιππαι (that is, two legions; cf. Brunt 1971, 687–689), which was later doubled with Deiotarus’ troops (Cic. Att. 5.18.2; 5.20.9; 6.1.14; fam. 15.1.6; 15.4.7); cf. also fam. 15.4.3.

92 Also Cic. fam. 8.5.1 (nunc, si Parthus movet aliquid, scio non mediocrem fore contentionem. tuus porro exercitus vix unum saltum tueri potest. Hanc autem nemo ducit racionem, sed omnia desiderantur ab eo, tamquam nihil denegatum sit ei quo minus quam paratissimus esset, qui publico negotio praepositus est). See Rosillo López 2017, 11.
This seems to be the reason why Cicero is so insistent on the need of maintaining a balance between the provincial population’s wellbeing and the financial interests of the publicani, thus trying to prevent an accusation from either party (especially if we think of the influence that the publicani, as equites, had in the courts).

Most probably, Cicero was thinking of the case of P. Rutilius Rufus, who was unjustly condemned in a trial de repetundis for his role as legate in Asia, at behest of the publicani, who did not probably dare to do the same with Scaevola because of his prestige.

As a novus homo, Cicero was aware that he did not benefit from the same support or status that had helped Scaevola after his command and tended to protect nobiles from Rome’s leading families, should they have to face a potentially compromising situation (as Marius claims in his famous speech in Sallust). In addition, Cicero’s exile was not far from memory and his political rivals would be glad to find any opportunity to rid themselves of him. In this context, Cicero not only had to oversee a flawless provincial administration, but also make an unambiguous display of his commendable behavior in the court of public opinion.

Cicero, in short, not only had to be a good governor, but he had also to appear so. This explains why he painted an exemplary portrait of his command and transmitted that image to those who could speak on his behalf in Rome. In line with what he had told his brother years before, this process obviously would have involved downplaying and sweeping under the rug any aspect of his administration that could come back to bite him.

Without denying the accomplishments that Cicero could have achieved during his command in Cilicia or the possible ideas that he shared with senators like Cato, we ought to conclude that his self-depiction as governor is essentially based on the desire to project a series of archetypal behaviors and virtues that not only had been

---


94 Cic. fam. 1.9.26; de orat. 1.129; Font. 38; Pis. 95; Liv. Per. 70; Val. Max. 2.10.2; 6.4.4; Vell. 2.13.2; Dio Cass. 28 fr. 973; cf. Alexander 1990, n. 94. See Cic. Planc. 33; Schol. Bob. 158 St. Kallet-Marx 1995, 145–146; 1990, 137–138; on the political implications of P. Rutilius Rufus’ trial, Ferriès and Delrieux 2011, 228–230; Prost 2017, 164.


96 Cic. Q. fr. 1.2.8–9; Muñiz Coello 1998, 227. See Rauh 1986, 19–20: “Except for the case of his financial arrangements, we see little evidence that Cicero was directly involved in business per se [...]. To be sure, Cicero’s language was veiled in these instances. As to the significance of this little doubt should exist, for as Cicero repeatedly inform us, his correspondence usually stood at risk of being read by outside parties, especially when his letters were borne by someone other than an intimate, as was often the case”.
part of Roman political discourse since at least the time of Scaevola’s tenure in Asia, but that Cicero himself had stressed when advising Quintus on how a governor ought to administer his province.\footnote{Benferhat 2007, 41–42; van der Blom 2010, 241; Dubouloz 2014, 65–75; cf. Prost 2017, 166–167. Some features of this exemplary portrait are also reflected in Cicero’s self-depiction as quaestor in \textit{Planc. 64}: \textit{Sed tamen non vereor ne quis audeat dicere ullius in Sicilia quaesturam aut clariorem aut gratiorem fuisse. Vere me hercule hoc dicam: sic tum existimabam, nihil homines aliud Romae nisi de quaesturam mea loqui. Frumenti in summa caritate maximum numerum miseram; negotiatoribus comis, mercatoribus iustus, mancipibus liberalis, sociis abstinent, omnibus eram visus in omni officio diligentissimus; excogitati quidam erant a Siculis honores in me inauditi; also Plut. \textit{Cic. 6.i}: Υστερον δὲ τῆς ἐπιμελείας καὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ πραότητος αὐτοῦ πείραν λαμβάνοντες, ὡς οὖν ἡ τῶν πώποθ’ ἡγεμόνων ἐτίμησαν.}} The use of this model in the last decades of the Republic shows that indeed there was a current of opinion in Roman politics that championed a more favorable treatment of provincial populations; in Cicero’s case, however, the reason for assuming this paradigm of governance should be chalked up to motivations of political nature rather than to his own ethical principles or the supposed influence of legislative initiatives.
Cicerone esule: dall’autorappresentazione all’esemplarità letteraria (da Livio a Petrarca e Ortensio Lando)

1 Introduzione

Un letterato come Cicerone, anche se considera l’esilio soprattutto una sconfitta politica e aspira al ritorno, sceglie di raccontarsi con i toni e il pathos che caratterizzano i personaggi di esuli della tragedia greca, come dimostreremo nel corso della nostra analisi. Attraverso le lettere scritte durante il suo non lungo peregrinare, rivolgendosi a Attico e ai suoi familiari, Cicerone dimostra di non cercare consolazione negli studi e nella filosofia, anzi sottolinea la sua nostalgia e il suo dolore, enfatizza, drammatizzandola, la sua perdita d’identità personale. Cicerone in esilio è il politico che guarda al suo passato esperienziale e cerca di ricostruire il suo futuro, eroicizza il suo sacrificio personale in nome della patria: poi nelle orazioni post reditum continua a promuovere il suo ritratto patetico, affermando di non temere i giudizi sulla sua debolezza, di cui anzi si vanta in quanto segno di umanità. L’esilio costituisce un tema centrale nella biografia ciceroniana sia dal punto di vista del self-portraying¹ sia per la sua ricaduta nella lunga storia della ricezione della figura dell’Arpinate; Cicerone esule non diviene comunque un significativo esempio paradigmatico di esilio filosofico, ma rimane al margine di questa tipologia. Poche, ma emblematiche tappe di questo complesso percorso saranno prese in esame, e mi soffermerò solo su alcuni autori e testi che, a mio parere, ben caratterizzano quest’aspetto della fortuna ciceroniana:² il Camillo di Tito Livio, l’orazione spuria Pridie quam in exilium iret, le attestazioni dell’esilio in un ammiratore dell’Arpinate come Francesco Petrarca e infine i paradossali dialoghi Cicero relegatus et Cicero revocatus di Ortensio Lando.


2 Cicerone si racconta

Cominciamo dal self-portraying e da un brano fondamentale per documentare la consapevolezza ciceroniana del proprio ruolo politico; scrive Cicerone in Verr. 5.35 ricordando la questura a Lilibeo: Sic obtinui quaesturam in Sicilia provincia ut omnium oculos in me unum coniectos esse arbitrer, ut me quaesturamque meam quasi in aliquo terrarum orbis theatru versari existimarem, «ricoprii la carica di questore nella provincia di Sicilia in modo tale da pensare che gli occhi di tutti fossero rivolti su me solo, tanto da ritenere che io, con la mia carica di questore, agissi, per così dire, nel teatro del mondo».3

L’ampio scenario, che solo l’impegno pubblico sembra poter conferire all’azione del singolo, si presenta già qui come elemento determinante per le scelte ciceroniane:4 la vita politica e più in generale l’agire umano si dispiegano in un palcoscenico universale, terrarum orbis theatrum, un’immagine fortemente evocativa che, non casualmente, si leggerà in seguito solo in Curzio Rufo 9.6.21, che l’attribuisce ad Alessandro Magno. Cicerone fa emergere già nelle Verrine una forte autocoscienza del suo obiettivo costante in politica, la costruzione, anche attraverso la produzione letteraria, di un’immagine pubblica in grado di orientare e condizionare l’immaginario collettivo. Illuminante a questo proposito anche un aneddoto della Pro Plancio 66,5 dove, ancora in riferimento al suo operato di questore a Lilibeo,6 leggiamo che in un frequentato luogo di villeggiatura come Pozzuoli si rende conto che nessuno si congratula con lui per il suo operato siciliano, ma anzi gli chiedono come vanno le cose a Roma, e con un tratto di realistica autoironia trae da questo smacco al suo orgoglio un utile

3 Traduzione Bellardi 1975; quando non altrimenti specificato le traduzioni sono mie.
4 Molto diversa l’amarà constatazione di off. 3.3: Ita qui in maxima celebritate atque in oculis cívium quondam vixerimus, nunc fugientes conspectum sceleratorum, quibus omnìa redundant, abdīmus nos quantum licet et saepe soli sumus, «io che un tempo ho passato la vita in mezzo alla gente, sotto gli occhi dei concittadini, fuggendo ora la vista di scellerati, che pullulano ovunque, per quanto mi è possibile, vivo appartato e spesso sono solo».
5 Cic. Planc. 66: Nam postea quam sensi populi Romani auris hebetiores, oculos autem esse acri atque acutos, destiti quid de me audituri essent homines cogitare; feci ut postea cotidie præsentem me viderent, habitavi in oculis, pressi forum; neminem a congressu meo neque ianitor meus neque sommus absterruit, «infatti dopo che mi resi conto che le orecchie del popolo Romano erano piuttosto deboli, mentre invece gli occhi erano acuti, cessai di darmi pensiero su quello che gli uomini avrebbero sentito dire di me; mi prodigai perché in seguito ogni giorno mi vedessero presente, mi piazzai davanti ai loro occhi, presidiav i il foro; né il mio portiere né il sonno hanno mai impedito ad alcuno di incontrarsi con me». Il passo è giustamente valorizzato da Kurczyk 2006, 257–258.
insegnamento per il suo futuro politico: l’immagine più emblematica a commento della vicenda è *habitavi in oculis*, manifesto esplicito del suo presenzialismo programmatico, poi censurato dal moralismo di un biografo non certo ostile come Plutarco, che così conclude lo stesso aneddoto (6.5): «Eccessivo compiacimento al sentirsi lodare e inclinazione spiccatamente per la gloria non lo abbandonarono mai, e in più occasioni lo distolsero dai suoi giusti propositi». Quest’aneddoto autobiografico è molto significativo per noi perché, anche se descrive una situazione antecedente al momento di massima esaltazione del proprio operato, cioè il consolato del 63, appare in un’orazione del 54, quindi non molto dopo il rientro dall’esilio: Plancio, difeso dall’accusa di brogli elettorali, era stato uno dei pochi ad aiutarlo effettivamente⁷ e quindi il ricordo si carica, a mio parere, anche delle consapevolezze acquisite nell’anno e mezzo della sua forzata lontananza dalla patria.

3 L’esilio come tragedia

Il presenzialismo come strategia politica connota fin dall’inizio la carriera ciceroniana e sembra marcare la distanza dall’atteggiamento consono ad un *sapiens*, come conferma Plutarco, che ci offre un ritratto emblematico, quanto impietoso, del suo atteggiamento durante il forzato allontanamento dalla patria, forse anche per conformarlo al ritratto parallelo di Demostene, che non sopportò l’esilio con fermezza e che «piangeva ogni volta che guardava verso l’Attica» (26.5). Leggiamo in Plutarco a proposito di Cicerone esule (32.5): «Per quanto molte persone andassero a trovarlo con benevolenza e le città greche facessero a gara per inviargli ambascieri, trascorse la maggior parte del tempo scoraggiato e sofferente (ἀθυμων καὶ περίλυπος), guardando con nostalgia verso l’Italia come un innamorato infelice (ῳσπερ οἱ δυσέρωτες); divenne per la sventurato, umile e completamente prostrato, al punto che si fece travolgere dalla disgrazia

---

⁷ Come si legge all’inizio dell’orazione, Cicerone non solo esalta Plancio come uomo integerrimo, ma ritiene che le accuse contro di lui siano in parte da imputarsi alla sua stessa figura: cf. almeno 3: *Cuius ego salutem non secus ac meam tueri debeo, sed etiam pro me ipso, de quo accusatores plura paene quam de re reoque dixerunt*, «la cui salvezza devo difendere proprio come la mia, ma anche in difesa della mia persona sulla quale gli accusatori hanno parlato più a lungo, quasi, che sulla causa e sull’accusato». Su Plancio durante l’esilio, cf. Cic. *Att.* 3.14.2; 22.1 (commento in Degl’Innocenti Pierini 2003², 140).
più di quanto ci si sarebbe aspettato da un uomo vissuto con una formazione culturale come la sua».

Col paragone con i δυσέρωτες, Plutarco stigmatizza la passione insana di Cicerone per la patria (non a caso l’aggettivo si legge per l’amore di Fedra in Eur. Hipp. 193), una valenza sentimentale che caratterizza effettivamente l’approccio verso la propria vicenda biografica e più in generale anche il suo semplice allontanarsi da Roma, tanto che anche in seguito, in procinto di partire per la Cilicia da Atene, scrive ad Attico (5.11.1): «non si può esprimere a parole quanto sia bruciante la mia nostalgia per la mia città» (*non dici potest quam flagrem desiderio urbis*). Anche Cassio Dione dedica ampio spazio alle vicende dell’esilio (38.18–29) inventandosi la fiction dialogica con un filosofo non altrimenti noto, Filisco, che contrappone le sue tesi stoicheggianti al sentimen
talismo ciceroniano; nello sceneggiato gioco delle parti Cicerone, rappresentato come addolorato, lamentoso e offuscato da una mente non più lucida, viene accusato di aver dimenticato tutta la sua paideia filosofica e persino le sue capacità dialettiche e forensi (38.18.1): «Cicerone, non provi vergogna a proferire lamenti e a comportarti come una donna? Mai mi sarei aspettato che tu ti si saresti mostrato così debole, tu che sei dotato di una cultura profonda e varia, tu che sei stato il difensore di molti».

Questo Cicerone innamorato della sua città, e che non si vergogna ad ammetterlo esplicitamente, non ha certo goduto il favore delle generazioni successive, come dimostreremo poi con qualche esempio: infatti, mentre nel V libro delle Tusculanae disputationes e nei Paradoxa Stoicorum discute autorevolmente con convinzione dell’esilio come un adiaphoron alla maniera degli stoici, nella sua vicenda personale dimostra un atteggiamento suscettibile di critiche, del quale del resto fu lui stesso ben consapevole. In un passo importante della De domo 97–98 sintetizza apologeticamente in un clamoroso diritto al dolor il

8 Lo sguardo nostalgico dell’esule è un motivo topico, che arriva fino al Foscolo, il quale si ispira proprio all’esilio ciceroniano nelle fonti greche sopra citate: cf. Degl’Innocenti Pierini 1992, 147–149. Interessante anche lo sguardo nostalgico di Pompeo in Lucan. 3A–7: *Solum ab Hesperia non flexit lumina terra / Magnus, dum patris portus, dum litora numquam / ad visus reditura suos tectumque cacumen / nubibus et dubios cerin vanescere montis* (ringrazio Giuseppe La Bua della segnalazione).

9 Sull’amor di patria ciceroniano, utili analisi in Bonjour 1975, in particolare 150–156.


11 Rimando a Degl’Innocenti Pierini 2000.

12 Cf. in particolare dom. 97: *Accepi, pontifices, magnum atque incredibilem dolorem: non nemo, neque istam mihi adscisco sapientiam quam non nulli in me requirebant, qui me animo nimis fracto esse atque adflicto loquebantur. An ego poteram, cum a tot rerum tanta varietate divellerer, quas idcirco praetereo quod ne nunc quidem sine fletu commemorare possum, iniftiari me esse
suo comportamento, affermazione che implica una diffusa conoscenza delle sue reazioni emotive, documentate nell’epistolario esiliaco. Le lettere scritte nel suo viaggio verso l’esilio e nel suo breve soggiorno sul suolo greco costituiscono la sofferta testimonianza di una sconfitta politica, ma documentano già un’abile creazione di una nuova immagine pubblica, sono l’espressione di un disagio privato ed esistenziale, ma allo stesso tempo tessono la trama di un dialogo con Roma per richiamare su di sé l’attenzione e la compartecipazione affettiva di quei boni, che avevano costituito la base del consenso nella sua vittoria contro Catilina.

Nelle pieghe più profonde di questa corrispondenza si individua il disegno di un’autorappresentazione, continuata e consolidata poi dalle orazioni pronunciate al suo ritorno: Cicerone, infatti, non racconta cronachisticamente la tragedia dell’esilio, ma descrive in filigrana il suo esilio come una tragedia, proponendosi come protagonista di un dramma che viene presentato come eccezionale soprattutto attraverso il ricorso implicito alla propria cultura letteraria. In assenza dell’uso sapiente ed esibito delle citazioni poetiche, così frequenti nelle sue opere e anche nelle lettere di altri periodi, si impone nel carteggio esiliaco una caratterizzazione patetica sottile, che invita ad essere decrittata col filtro dei paradigmi tragici e che implica il concetto dell’autorappresentazione, del self-portraying. Lo testimonia con chiarezza l’insistenza sull’eccezionale unicità della sua condizione, come quando scrive al fratello Quinto (1.3.5) e afferma perentoriamente che «non esiste saggezza od ottrina filosofica, che abbia tanta forza da far sopportare un dolore così grande»¹³ (Neque enim tantum virium habet ulla aut prudentia¹⁴ aut doctrina ut tantum dolorem possit sustinere) oppure rivolgendosi ad Attico in 3.7.2 sostiene che nessuno mai è stato colpito da disgrazia così grande e che per nessuno mai la morte è stata più desiderabile (hoc adfirmo, neminem umquam tanta calamitate esse addictum, nemini mortem magis optandum fuisset), come ribadisce più ampiamente in Att. 3.15.2:


¹³ Qui e in seguito le traduzioni delle epistole dall’esilio sono di Degl’Innocenti Pierini 2003². ¹⁴ Per la presenza della filosofia nelle lettere abbiamo ora l’importante studio di McConnell 2014: non si occupa di questo passo, ma interessante per il rifiuto della filosofia è quanto leggiamo a proposito di Att. 9.10.2 (v. 64 – 71).
Hoc confirmo, neque tantis bonis esse privatum quemquam neque in tantas miserias incidisse. Dies autem non modo non levat luctum hunc sed etiam auget. Nam ceteri dolores mitigan tur vetustate, hic non potest non et sensu praesentis miseriae et recordatione praeteritae vitae cottidie augeri.

Lo affermo con forza, nessuno è stato mai privato di tanti beni né è mai precipitato in un tal cumulo di infelicità. Il tempo poi non solo non mitiga quest'afflizione, ma anzi la accresce. Sono dolori di altra natura ad essere attenuati dal passar del tempo, sofferenze come queste non possono che accrescersi di giorno in giorno, sia nella percezione dell'infelicità presente sia nel ricordo della vita passata.

Mentre in altri periodi offre agli altri i più comuni motivi consolatori, ora li rifiuta per sé, invitando Attico ad astenersi dalle consuete forme di partecipazione (3.15.7: communiter consolari desine) e sottolineando spesso che la sua condizione è del tutto eccezionale ed unica, come era del resto quella da cui egli si è trovato a precipitare verso l'esilio.¹⁵

L'atteggiamento di rifiuto degli exempla consolatori¹⁶ testimonia la consapevole riaffermazione dell'eccezionalità, quasi eroica, della propria vicenda e si configura come una sorta di mythologische Selbtheroisierung, che per certi versi prelude all'atteggiamento di Ovidio esule.¹⁷ Con un'espressione icastica come Viximus, floruimus, «ho vissuto pienamente, sono stato in auge» di fam. 14.4.5, rivolgendosi alla moglie e ai figli, enfatizza la dolorosa consapevolezza di un passato irrecuperabile, trovando un'eco solo in Ovidio, quando lamenterà il repentinó mutare della sua fortuna con analoga metafora in trist. 5.8.19, Nos quoque floruimus, sed flos erat ille caducus, «anch'io fui in fiore, ma quel fiore era caduco». La dolorosa consapevolezza del cambiamento del proprio destino, uno dei procedimenti più comuni per suscitare la compartecipazione emotiva anche in ambito tragico, configura la sofferta reazione dell'esule in una drammatica lettera al fratello (1.3.1):

Mi frater, mi frater, mi frater, tune id veritus es, ne ego iracundia aliqua adductus pueros ad te sine litteris miserim? Aut etiam ne te videre noluerim? Ego tibi irascerer? Tibi ego possem

¹⁵ L'immagine della caduta sottintende il ricordo della difficile ascesa compiuta dall'homo novus per raggiungere la vetta del consolato: Att. 3.13.2; 15.2: In tantas miseriae incidisse; 15.7: Me certe ad exitium praecipitantem retinuiisses.
¹⁶ Anche nelle due orazioni di ringraziamento dopo il ritorno tende a sottolineare la sua distanza dal comportamento di personaggi, pur eccezionali, come il conterraneo Mario: p. red. in sen. 37–38; p. red. ad Quir. 20.
irasci? Scilicet, tu enim me affixisti; tue nim me afflixisti; tua me inimici, tua me invidia, ac non ego te misere perdidi. [...] Ego te videre noluerim? Immo vero me a te videri nolui; non enim vidisses fratrem tuum, non eum quem reliqueras, non eum quem noras, non eum quem flens flentem, prosequentem profiscens dimiseras, ne vestigium quidem eius nec simulacrum sed quandam effigiem spirantis mortui.

Fratello, fratello mio, fratello mio caro, proprio tu hai temuto che io, spinta da qualche motivo di risentimento, abbia mandato da te degli schiavi senza lettere o che addirittura non ti abbia voluto vedere? Io avrei dovuto adirarmi con te? Io potrei risentirmi nei tuoi confronti? Certo, non c’è dubbio, sei stato tu a ridurmi così, i tuoi nemici e la tua impopolarità mi hanno rovinato, non sono io che ho trascinato te nella mia disgrazia. [...] Io non avrei voluto vederti? Al contrario, non ho voluto che tu mi vedessi; non avresti infatti veduto tuo fratello, almeno non quello che avevi lasciato, non quello che conoscevi, che tu piangendo avevi salutato anch’egli in lacrime, che ti aveva accompagnato mentre partivi, non una traccia di quello, né un’ombra, ma, per così dire, l’immagine di un morto vivente.

Il pathos è reso con mezzi stilistici poco consueti per il registro stilistico epistolare, come la triplicazione iniziale quasi nello stile solenne della preghiera, la serie di domande retoriche caratterizzate da ironia drammatica, la triplice anfora di non eum, con la disposizione chiastica di espressioni poliptotiche e/o allitteranti. Infine l’ossimoro conclusivo spirans mortua, hapax in tutta la latinità, in un contesto già stilisticamente sostenuto implica il recupero di un modello letterario sotteso: è infatti calco di un nesso presentato in Ant. 1167 ἐμψυχον νεκρόν lo riferisce a Creonte, un «morto vivente» ormai privo di ogni felicità.¹⁸

Molti sono i passi e i riferimenti implicitamente allusivi a personaggi e testi tragici greci e latini, che si possono individuare nelle epistle dell’esilio: in particolare sembrano emergere in filigrana le figure di Aiace, Polinice e Telefo. Come l’Aiace dell’Armorum iudicium pacuviano, 40 R.³: men servasse, ut essent qui me perderent! «proprio io che li ho salvati perché ci fosse chi mi mandasse in rovina» – un verso tramandato da Svetonio Caes. 84 come cantato in miserationem et invidiam caedis eius per la morte di Cesare – Cicerone si rimprovera in fam. 14.2.2 di aver provocato la disgrazia propria e dei suoi cari con un comportamento non all’altezza della situazione, affermando idque fieri mea culpa, qui ceteros servavi ut nos periremus! «io che ho salvato gli altri per poi perire io stesso», con la stessa marcata opposizione servare/perdere/perire.

Telefo, un re esule e ramingo, ma fiero, costituisce una tipologia drammatica paradigmatica già per Aristotele (poet. 53a), poi portata sulla scena romana da Ennio e Accio:¹⁹ è figura mitica evocata da Cicerone attraverso una probabile allusione a famosi versi acciani, 619 – 620 R.³: Nam si a me regnum Fortuna atque opes / eripere quivit, at virtutem nec quit, «se la sorte mi ha potuto togliere il regno e i miei beni, non ha potuto privarmi della mia virtù», in due passi delle lettere dall’esilio, dove Cicerone manifesta l’orgoglio di mantenere intatta la sua integrità morale secondo un cliché anche di tradizione cinico-stoica (Att. 3.5: Inimici mei mea mihi, non me ipsum ademerunt, «i miei nemici mi privarono dei beni che possedevo, non della mia identità»; fam. 14.4.5: Virtus nostra nos afflixit, «è stata la mia integrità morale a provocare la mia disgrazia»). La presenza in filigrana del mito di Telefo è confermata al ritorno dall’esilio nelle due orezioni post reditum, dove in estrema e implicita sintesi, paragona al suo il destino dell’eroe, che, ferito da Achille, solo da lui poteva essere sanato con la ruggine della sua lancia²⁰ secondo il risponso dell’oracolo: p. red. in sen. 9: Nec enim eguissem medicina consulari, nisi consulari vulnere concidissem, «infatti non avrei avuto bisogno della cura di un console, se non fossi caduto per la ferita di un console» e p. red. ad Quir. 15: An ego [...] dubitarem, quin is [scil. Lentulus] me confectum consularibus vulneribus consulari medicina ad salutem reduceret?,²¹ «E forse che [...] avrei potuto dubitare che lui, Lentulo, con una cura da console, avrebbe guarito me, stremato per ferite inferte da consoli?».

Quanto a Polinice, che nella letteratura greca sull’esilio viene evocato quale esempio di un attaccamento irrazionale alla propria terra, fosse anche solo quella in cui vorrebbe essere sepoltola, nelle Phoenissae euripidee chiede alla madre e alla sorella (1447–1449) di avere della terra paterna di avere almeno quanto basta al suo corpo, anche se ha distrutto la sua casa, versi che sono citati già nell’opera sull’esilio di Telete (exil. 30.2–10 Hense). Il concetto, pur nella diversità delle situazioni, trova piena corrispondenza in Att. 3.19.3: Te oro et obsecro, T. Pomponi [...] mihique ex agro tuo tantum adsignes quantum meo corpore occupari potest, «Ti prego e ti scongiuro, o Tito Pomponio [...] dei tuoi possesi riservami quel tanto che possa contenere il mio corpo»: un confronto

¹⁹ Non si occupa di Cicerone il saggio di Fantham 2009 dedicato a Telefo.
significativo, a mio parere, anche se passato inosservato, e che mi sembra possa costituire un’importante spia di come Cicerone proietti le sue vicende personali su uno sfondo tragico e come anche lui, al pari dell’eroe greco, trovi nella speranza l’unica motivazione, vagamente consolatoria, cui aggrapparsi: un tema riconosciuto presente già in Euripide, come dimostra Phoen. 396 αi δ’ ἐλπίδες βόσκουσι φυγάδας, ώς λόγος «le speranze nutrono gli esuli, come si suol dire».

L’esilio quindi appare anche enfatizzato nelle sue conseguenze – dopo tutto Cicerone si trovava o in Grecia o in Epiro – per autorappresentarsi con tinte drammatiche e con il ricorso ad un pathos emotivo molto lontano dalla sapientia, che poi sarà recuperato nell’immaginario descrittivo delle orazioni post reditum. La città e soprattutto la propria casa in fiamme sotto il dominio eversivo di Clodio sono addirittura paragonate a Troia e al palazzo di Priamo per mezzo di ben studiate citazioni tragiche, come in Sest. 121, evocando haec omnia vidi inflammari dall’Andromacha enniana 86 R³; in dom. 97–98, difendendo il suo comportamento in esilio (haec omnia subire conservandorum civium causa, «subire tutto questo per la salvezza dei concittadini»), paragona il suo destino a quello di chi si trova a fare i conti con una capta urbs, con la conquista della propria città e deve affrontare le conseguenze da solo (ea quae capta urbe accident victis stante urbe unum perpeti, «patire da solo, nonostante la propria città fosse incolume, la sorte dei vinti dopo la conquista di una città»). Quest’ultima affermazione ci porta anche a ricordare che Cicerone nelle orazioni post reditum ama vestire i panni del capro espiatorio, evocando le modalità eroiche tipiche della devotio romana, in cui uno solo (unus pro multis) si sacrifica per il bene di tutta la comunità, un tema dell’epica e anche della tragedia, come sembrerebbe dimostrare un titolo come quello della pretesta acciana Decius (sive Aeneadae).²³

²³ I passi sono davvero numerosissimi, cito solo i più rilevanti: p. red. ad Quir. 1: In me uno potius quam in optimo quoque et universa civitate deficeret; dom. 30: Si utile rei publicae fuit haurire me unum pro omnibus illam indignissimam calamitatem, etiam hoc utile est...; 145: Si in illo paene fato rei publicae obieci meum caput pro vestris caerimoniiis atque templis perditissimorum civium furori atque ferro... meque atque meum caput ea condicione devovi; har. 47: Haerent ea tela in re publica quae, quam diu haerebant in uno me; Pison. 9: Alios ego vidi ventos, alias prospexi animo procellas, aliis impedentibus tempestatibus non cessi sed bis unum me pro omnium salute obtuli. Sulla devotio nelle post reditum, cf. Dyck 2004.
4 L’esilio di Cicerone dopo Cicerone: qualche sondaggio in età imperiale

Ma questo tormentato periodo vissuto da Cicerone da politico impossibilitato ad agire per il bene della patria e non da sapiens, come è poi citato, giudicato, rivissuto nella lunga storia della ricezione ciceroniana? Come è evidente, non potrò che proporre alcuni testi esemplificativi, cercando di portare un contributo ad un campo di studi molto ben sondato anche negli ultimi anni. Se l’Invectiva in Ciceronem pseudosallustiana (5.1) sintetizza la vicenda dell’esilio nella pregnante derisione dei pedes fugaces, facendo di Cicerone una sorta di schiavo fuggitivo in un catalogo di offese tutte feroci, interessante si presenta la posizione di un autore come Tito Livio, che, come sappiamo da Quint. inst. 10.1.39, ma soprattutto da Seneca padre (suas. 6.17; 22), fu un estimatore di Cicerone, anche se ne raccontò la morte, come l’elemento di maggior valore nella sua vita (suas. 6.22: Omnum adversorum nihil ut viro dignum erat tulit praeter mortem, «tranne la morte, non sopportò nessuna avversità come erede degno di un vero uomo»). Ma soprattutto un’indiretta presenza ciceroniana in un testo liviano molto ideologizzato ci permette, mi pare, di trarre significative valutazioni anche relativamente al self-portraying epistolare ciceroniano durante l’esilio: come ha dimostrato recentemente Gaertner, Livio si ispira a Cicerone nel famoso discorso di Furio Camillo nel libro V (quasi una vera e propria oratio post reditum), pronunciato quando, al ritorno in patria dall’esilio, decide di dimenticare i torti subiti e richiama i Romani all’unità per combattere i Galli. In particolare ci interessa una breve sezione precedente la peroratio finale (5.54.2–3):

Adeo nihil tenet solum patriae nec haec terra quam matrem appellamus, sed in superficie tignisque caritas nobis patriae pendet? Equidem – fatebor vobis, etsi minus injuriae vestrae quam meae calamitatis meminisse iuvat – cum abessem, quotienscumque patria in mentem veniret, haec omnia occurrebant, colles campique et Tiberis et adsueta oculis regio et hoc caelum sub quo natus educatusque essem; quae vos, Quirites, nunc moveant potius caritate sua ut maneatis in sede vestra quam postea, cum reliqueritis eam, macerent desiderio.

24 Cf. almeno van der Blom 2010; Keeline 2018; La Bua 2019.
25 Non possediamo il testo delle storie liviane sulla vicenda ciceroniana e la periodìa 103 molto succinta è fuorviante, dato che erroneamente parla di Cicerone come in exilium missus.
26 Gaertner 2008; influssi ciceroniani già segnalava, con un certo scetticismo, Ogilvie 1965, ad loc.
27 Accetto qui il testo trádito difeso da Ogilvie 1965, nel suo commento ad loc.
Così poco siamo legati al suolo della patria e a questa terra, che chiamiamo madre, e l’amor di patria per noi è attaccato ai pavimenti e ai soffitti? In realtà vi confesserò, per quanto non mi piaccia ricordare le mie sventure, e tanto meno i vostri torti verso di me, quando ero lontano, ogniqualvolta mi assaliva il ricordo della patria, mi tornavano davanti agli occhi tutte queste cose, i colli e le pianure e il Tevere, e il paesaggio familiare ai miei occhi, e questo cielo sotto il quale sono nato e cresciuto. Queste cose, o Quiriti, col vostro affetto ora vi inducano a rimanere nella vostra sede piuttosto che più tardi, quando la avrete abbandonata, vi macerino col rimpianto.\footnote{Traduzione di Perelli 1974.}

Ci sono in Livio molti sottili, ma emblematici riferimenti tematici e lessicali a Cicerone:\footnote{Rimando alla dettagliata e documentata analisi di Gaertner 2008, 42–48, che per primo, mi pare, sottolinea la presenza nel testo liviano dell’orazione p. red. ad Quir.} per noi è importante ricordare soprattutto la complessiva dipendenza da p. red. ad Quir. 4, dove l’oratore, rivolgendosi ai Romani, non esita a proclamare tutto il suo amore per la patria, designato in entrambi i testi con caritas.\footnote{Cf. Cic. p. red. ad Quir. 4: Ipsa autem patria, di immortales, dixi vix potest, quid caritatis, quid voluptatis habeat; quae species Italiae, quae celebritas oppidorum, quae forma regionum, qui agrì, quae fruges, quae pulchritudo urbis, quae humanitas civium, quae rei publicae dignitas, quae vestra maiestas! quibus ego omnibus antea rebus sic fruebar, ut nemo magis. Sui passi delle due orazioni a confronto si sofferma Raccanelli 2012: per questo passo, cf. in particolare 33–34. Sul concetto della caritas patriae, cf. Bonjour 1975, 62–64; un’importante definizione in rapporto a amor si legge in Cic. part. 56, mentre notevole è la sublimazione del concetto in off. 1.57.} Il tema dell’amore incondizionato per la propria città, della struggente nostalgia per tutto ciò che lo sguardo della mente abbraccia del proprio suolo natio, è motivo sentimentale, che, come abbiamo rilevato, è proprio dell’esilio ciceroniano, come conferma anche Plutarco.\footnote{Il motivo è invece assente nella vita plurarchea di Camillo come sottolinea giustamente Gaertner 2008, 42.} Inoltre, a mio parere, si può individuare nel Camillo liviano anche un più importante elemento, il definire l’esilio calamitas, termine afflittivo peculiare di Cicerone esule: infatti non leggiamo mai exilium in riferimento alla sua situazione personale, ma, nell’epistolario in particolare, sono presenti locuzioni ora altamente patetiche ed evocatrici, come calamitas, aerumna o pernicies,\footnote{Aerumna ricorre per es. in Att. 3.11.2; 14.1: dom. 134; p. red. in sen. 34; Sest 49; pernicies ricorre in Att. 3.4; 10.2; Pis. 19; 74; Sest. 25; 42; 53. Per un’esemplificazione, cf. Robinson (A.) 1994, 475–478; Garceau 2005, 162–164.} ora circonlocuzioni più neutre, e non giuridiche. Calamitas è senz’altro il termine più usato,\footnote{Att. 3.7.2; 84; 10.2, in un contesto marcatino da ironia tragica, dove novum calamitatis genus sottolinea il mancato incontro col fratello; 14.2; 25.1; fam. 14.3.1: Ego autem hoc miserior sum quam tu, quae es miserrima, quod ipsa calamitas communis est utriusque nostrum, sed culpa mea} non solo nelle
lettere, ma anche più volte nelle orazioni post reditum. Un’altra movenza retorica che il Camillo di Livio utilizza, a mio parere, su suggestione ciceroniana è l’incidentale fatebor vobis, una confessione che vuole essere sincera e antieroa, e che per questo mi sembra allusivamente evocare il passo di dom. 97–98, più volte citato, quando Cicerone rivendica il suo diritto al dolor.

La presenza così esibita di accenti ciceronianianelle parole che Livio fa pronunciare a Camillo porta Gaertner a parlare dell’esilio di Camillo come un modello per lui, ma non mi pare di poter condividere completamente quest’ipotesi, perché l’esempio di Camillo si legge in testi ciceronianiani nei quali ricorre insieme ad altri personaggi greci e latini, come in rep. 1.5–6 e dom. 85–86, e non ha quindi un ruolo prioritario. È vero che ci sono alcuni motivi comuni come l’ingratitudine dei concittadini, l’antagonismo verso la plebs e i tribuni, la lotta per preservare i valori etici e religiosi del passato, ma mancano collegamenti testuali precisi. Inoltre, a mio parere, Cicerone non poteva indicare come modello quello che la tradizione storica definiva un secondo Romolo, il rifondatore della città, perché, come è ben noto, era lui a voler essere definito tale, come si evince chiaramente dal famoso verso O fortunatam natam me consule Romam (cons. 17 Traglia) e questo sembra implicitamente oscurare il ricordo del vero rifondatore di Roma dopo l’incendio gallico, cioè Furio Camillo pater patriae. Se l’esempio di Camillo non servi al self-portraying ciceroniano, Livio tenne sicuramente presente Cicerone per plasmarmene il discorso al rientro dall’esilio e, dati i precisi riferimenti tematici ed espressivi, mi sembra un elemento importante da sottolineare, perché avvalora ulteriormente l’autenticità


34 Basti citare Att. 3.8.4: Incrèdibili et singulari calamitate adflictus sum, dove l’eccezionalità della situazione appare stigmatizzata dalla coppia di aggettivi, che tornerà in riferimento alla propria esperienza personale anche in de orat. 3.13: Quae nosmet ipsi ob amorem in rem publicam incredibilem et singularem pertulimus ac sensimus.

35 Cf. Cic. p. red. ad Quir. 6; 9; p. red. in sen. 20; 24; dom. 30; 65, per honestissimam calamitatem; 72; Sest. 32; cf. anche la spuria exil. 14. Calamitas si legge anche in Vell. 2.45.2 in riferimento esplicito all’esilio ciceroniano: Ita vir optime meritus de re publica conservatae patriae pretium calamitatem exilii tulit.


37 Liv. 5.49.7: Dictator recuperata ex hostibus patria triumphans in urbem redit, interque iocos militares quos inconditos iactunt, Romulus ac parens patriae conditorque alter urbis haud vanis laudibus appellabatur.
dell’orazione *Post reditum ad Quirites* in passato sospettata di essere un prodotto di scuola.

A proposito del tema dell’autenticità, uno dei testi che testimoniano un vivo interesse per l’esilio di Cicerone è l’*Oratio pridie quam in exilium iret*, che non a caso apre la serie delle orazioni *post reditum* anche nel più antico manoscritto del IX secolo: la tradizione sembra quindi confermare quello che potrei definire uno studiato *Prequel* per coprire uno spazio vuoto in quella sorta di *fiction* biografica, che talvolta la scuola di retorica imperiale costruisce sulla figura di Cicerone. Mi sembra un evidente tentativo di conferire dignità pubblica alla decisione dell’allontanamento da Roma, della quale poi si pentirà lo stesso Cicerone nelle sue lettere (come per es. in *Att.* 3.8.4) e che suscitò una spietata condanna in testi come l’*Invectiva in Ciceronem*. La *Pridie* è senza dubbio un falso, perché quel giorno prima della partenza era impossibile che Cicerone potesse pronunciare un discorso pubblico di questo tenore, rivolgendosi unitamente a tutti i Romani, popolo, cavalieri, e anche senatori: come ha ben dimostrato Gamberale, si tratta di un prodotto di scuola di difficile datazione, perché continuamente tramato di recuperi ciceroniani, ma che presenta comunque non pochi indizi linguistici e sintattici, che presupppongono una data vicina al IV secolo. In considerazione solo del suo contenuto apologetico, potrebbe costituire anche un prodotto di scuola del I secolo nella misura in cui appare un tentativo di difendere Cicerone dalle accuse di viltà ed incoerenza, che il suo comportamento suscitò subito. Non è difficile immaginare che temi simili fossero comuni nella scuola e le suasorie relative a Cicerone, che leggiamo in Seneca retore, danno largo spazio anche alla fantasia biografica, come in particolare la VII *Deliberat Cicero an scripta sua conburat, promittente Antonio incolumitatem si fecisset*.

Un altro elemento importante da ricordare è che la scuola di retorica rappresenta anche la prima testimonianza dell’uso dell’epistolario come elemento utile a difendere o a colpire Cicerone, come farà poi anche Seneca filosofo nelle sue opere. Infatti tanto è apologetica la *Pridie* che arriva a cambiare di segno persino il sentimentale rimpianto della patria espresso da Cicerone nelle lettere: in particolare, come nota Keeline, quello che leggiamo in una brevissima missiva ad Attico inviata nell’imminenza del rientro *Att.* 3.26.1 (*potius vita quam patria carebo*, «rinuncerò alla vita piuttosto che alla patria»), invece, *omnium*.

---

38 Si tratta di un manoscritto originario di Tours, conservato a Parigi (BNF, *lat. 7794*), su cui cf. La Bua 2019, 76; 82–83.
40 Cf. in particolare Degl’Innocenti Pierini 2018,19–21.
41 Keeline 2018, 170.
salutis causa, diviene nell’orazione spuria (exil. 20) multoque potius ipse patria liberisque meis carebo, quam propter unum me vos de fortunis vestris reique publicae dimicetis, «mi priverò della patria e dei miei figli piuttosto che fare scontrare voi per la sorte vostra e dello stato a causa di me solo». Aggiungerei anche che Cicerone incarna qui il ruolo di protagonista di un’eroica devotio, è unus pro multis, come si raffigura al rientro dall’esilio mentre lotta e combatte tra i flutti tempestosi della politica romana nell’in Pisonem 9, quando si descrive pronto anche al sacrificio estremo nell’affrontare i suoi nemici. In questo senso credo che, pur nella diversità della formulazione, anche il concetto espresso in exil. 6: non citatur reus audaciae, virtutis reus citatur, «non è ritenuto reo di una trasgressione, ma di virtù» rimandi anch’esso al tenore di una lettera dall’esilio scritta alla moglie, dove leggiamo non vitium nostrum sed virtus nostra nos afflixit, «è stata la mia integrità morale a provocare la mia disgrazia, non certo una mia colpa» (fam. 14.4.5), affermazione che isolata costituirrebbe un paradosso degno di uno stoico.

5 Cicerone esule in Petrarca e Ortensio Lando: qualche nota di lettura

Come è facile intuire, non mi sarà possibile che trattare molto brevemente della ricezione della figura di Cicerone esule, ammesso che si possano considerare rilevanti le tracce che ho individuato in una ricerca che, è appena il caso di ricordarlo, implicherebbe letture per una vita e non solo per una breve relazione.

5a Petrarca

Scrive Luca Marcozzi in un bell’articolo sull’esilio in Petrarca poeta:

A differenza del padre Pettracco e dei suoi coetanei (Dante, Cavalcanti, Cino), a differenza dei poeti fuoriusciti della generazione ancora precedente a questa, come Guittone, Francesco Petrarca non fu mai condannato o sbandito, né ha mai davvero provato quanto potesse saper di sale il pane altrui: tuttavia, nel modellare parte della propria esperienza poetica, soprattutto volgare, sugli esempi forniti dalla tradizione lirica precedente, ha trattato il tema letterario dell’esilio come una pietra angolare della costruzione della pro-

---

42 Cf. i passi citati supra, n. 23.
43 Marcozzi 2011, 71.
pria mitografia e dell’autobiografia ideale che ha dispensato ai lettori, contemporanei e posteri.

Nonostante questa riconosciuta importanza del tema, Francesco Petrarca, per quanto ho potuto vedere, tra i molteplici aspetti della personalità di Cicerone da lui molto amata,⁴⁴ riserva al motivo dell’esilio ciceroniano uno spazio marginale, ma non per questo, come mi auguro di dimostrare, meno degno di interesse. E del resto non potrebbe essere altrimenti, per un motivo ideologico, che si fa biografico, come si evince da quanto afferma in fam. 1.1.22, _ego in exilio genitus, in exilio natus sum_. In Petrarca l’esilio,⁴⁵ che assume spesso la valenza cristiana della lontananza dell’uomo dal cielo da cui proviene e a cui aspira a tornare, è comunque trattato e discusso anche secondo le modalità tradizionali con cui si affrontano i colpi di fortuna e le avversità, che vanno superate con una forza d’animo vicina a quella codificata dallo stoicismo: i testi latini di riferimento si possono individuare nelle ciceroniane _Tusculanae_, nella _Consolatio ad Helviam_ senecana, ma anche nel trattatello, da lui ancora attribuito a Seneca, _De remediis fortuitorum_, tutte opere che potremmo porre sotto l’egida tematica di un verso tragico proverbiale, _Patria est ubicumque est bene_, la patria è dovunque si stia bene o si agisca bene.⁴⁶ Basterà solo riferirsi a quanto si legge nel cap. 67 del secondo libro del _De remediis utriusque fortune_, dove si sviluppa un articolato ragionamento relativo all’esilio, e dove, tra gli esempi romani di esilio ingiusto e di spontaneo allontanamento, si citano prima Scipione, poi Camillo, Rutilio, Metello e Marcello, mentre solo un breve cenno viene riservato in conclusione a Cicerone, con evidente forzatura del dato biografico, dato che si dice che si consolava, _non exilii modo sed carceris dulce solatium_, sia con _l’operum splendor_ che con _literarum copia_, cosa che, come abbiamo prima rilevato, non corrisponde affatto al racconto biografico che si ricava dalle lettere.

Per una valutazione dell’esilio ciceroniano in Petrarca, bisogna tenere conto pregiudizialmente come la scoperta nel maggio del 1345 nella Biblioteca capitolare di Verona di un codice dell’_Epistolario_, contenente le lettere _ad Atticum, ad Brutum e ad Quintum fratrem_, seppure salutata con grande gioia, nello stesso

---


tempo costituisca un’incrinatura nell’immagine complessiva della figura ciceroniana, prima idealizzata, svelandone debolezze e soprattutto incoerenze.⁴⁷ Per valutare il dicotomico atteggiamento petrarchesco, emblematica è la posizione espressa nella famosa lettera che Petrarca scrive a Cicerone, fam. 24.3.1–7 (basterà citarne l’inizio e la fine):


1 Francesco saluta il suo Cicerone. Trovate, dopo molte e lunghe ricerche, le tue lettere là dove meno credevi, le ho lette avidamente. E ti ho inteso di molte cose, molte deplorare, su molte cambiare parere, o Marco Tullio; e se da un pezzo sapevo qual precettore tu fossi agli altri, ora finalmente ho compreso qual tu sia davanti a te stesso. […] 7 Ah, quanto meglio sarebbe stato, soprattutto per un filosofo, invecchiare tranquillamente in campagna, «meditando», come tu stesso scrivi in un certo luogo, «sulla vita eterna, non su questa terrena così breve», non aver avuto l’onore dei fasci, non aver aspirato a nessun trionfo, non aver messo su superbia per alcun Catilina! Ma ormai ogni rimprovero è vano. Addio in eterno, o mio Cicerone.⁴⁸

Questo suggestivo dialogo con un personaggio del passato, sempre presente nei suoi studi,⁴⁹ il Petrarca lo elabora non solo nella lettera a lui rivolta, ma anche in altre epistole, dove manifesta la sua ammirazione per il grande letterato, ma non può tacere della delusione per le incoerenze dell’uomo Cicerone, conseguenza della scoperta dell’Epistolario: lo si evince chiaramente da fam. 24.2.4 a Enrico Pulice, lettera che accompagna le epistole conclusive dirette ai grandi del passato, Antiquis illustrioribus:

4 Sed quoniam in rebus mortalium nichil constat esse perfectum, nullusque hominum est in quo non aliquid quod merito carpi queat, modestus etiam reprehensor inveniat, contigit

---

⁴⁷ Petrarca afferma esplicitamente che, prima di scoprire il codice delle lettere, è dall’opera di Seneca che aveva appreso dell’esistenza dell’epistolario di Cicerone: fam. 3.18.5: Et de Ciceronis epystolis Senece primusquam oculos meis credidi.
⁴⁸ Qui, e in seguito, le traduzioni delle Familiares sono di Enrico Bianchi (in Rossi/Bosco1975).
Nonostante che Petrarca fosse in possesso di codici sia della *Post reditum in senatu* sia anche molto probabilmente dell’apologetica *Pridie*, che anche lui sembra ritenesse spuria, non le cita mai e ben poco si occupa esplicitamente di Cicerone esule, tanto che nelle sue lettere troviamo solo tre menzioni. In *fam. 2.3.9*, la famosa *consolatoria super exilio ad Severum Apenninicolam*, nonostante la tematica specifica, leggiamo solo uno stringato giudizio sui diciotto mesi di esilio definiti «pochi giorni», anche se inseriti in un contesto complessivo chiaramente elogiativo ed evocativo del sentimento di nostalgia della città: *Ciceronem ab exilio Roma revocavit; diebus paucis egregii civis presentia carere potuit*, «Roma richiamò Cicerone dall’esilio; poté privarsi della presenza di un concittadino illustre solo per pochi giorni». Altrettanto rapido il giudizio che leggiamo nella *Senile 11.12.11* a Urbano V, dove Cicerone appare in un elenco di uomini antichi esiliati o condannati a morte, perché odiati a causa della loro virtù:

Omitto autem antiquiora illa, Socratem, Theramenem, Anaxagoram, Ciceronem, Senecam, Rutilium ac Metellum quos quid aliud quam virtutis odium in exilium et in mortem egit?

Tralascio poi quegli esempi più antichi, Socrate, Teramene, Anassagora, Cicerone, Seneca, Rutilio e Metello; che altro se non l’odio verso la loro virtù li portò alla esilio e alla morte?

Il tema dell’*odium virtutis*, molto elogiativo per la figura dell’Arpinate anche per l’avvicinamento a figure come Socrate e Seneca, può corrispondere nel pensiero ciceroniano a quel tema dell’invidia, da lui più volte chiamato in causa per dare una spiegazione al suo esilio anche in relazione al mancato aiuto di falsi amici,

---

51 Come mi comunica per litteras Monica Berté, Cicerone in questo caso, oltre a essere un esempio, è anche fonte per Socrate e Teramene (*Tusc. 1.96 – 97*). Devo alla cortesia e alla competenza della Berté, che sta ultimando la pubblicazione del *corpus* delle *Senili*, l’indicazione del passo.
52 Cf. per es. *Att. 1.19.6* e soprattutto *Verr. 2.5.181*: *Videmus quanta sit in invidia quantoque in odio apud quosdam nobilis homines novorum hominum virtus et industria.*
gelosi dell’ascesa di un homo novus, come si legge nelle lettere e anche nella Pridie.

Anche in fam. 11.5.6 il nome di Cicerone è inserito in un elenco di personaggi come Rutilio Rufo, Metello Numidico e Camillo richiamati in patria dopo un ingiusto allontanamento: questa lettera è una vera e propria gratiarum actio nei confronti dei Fiorentini per avergli restituito, anzi donato di nuovo, i suoi possedimenti in campagna, un luogo che il poeta definisce (§ 12) «l’antico nido\(^5\) dove è stato volare stanco dei lunghi viaggi» (Nunc vobis auctoribus primeus michi tandem nidus panditur, quo revolare queam longis iam fessus erroribus). Anche qui breve è il riferimento ciceroniano, ma comunque ha carattere esemplare: 6 Revocavit ab exilio Ciceronem suum Roma, revocavit et Rutilium et Metellum, sed ab eo exilio quod ipsa mandaverat, «Roma richiamò dall’esilio il suo Cicerone, richiamò Rutilio e Metello, ma da quell’esilio ch’essa stessa aveva loro imposto». Interessante è l’intero contesto non solo perché si evince una notevole partecipazione personale, ma anche perché, nello scrivere una lettera di ringraziamento, Petrarca si ispira proprio a orazioni ciceroniane, come l’in Pisonem (1.1 al § 11) e soprattutto la Pro Marcello (con due citazioni esplicite, 1.3 al § 4; 11.33 al § 13).

Quest’elemento dell’affettività e della sensibilità di Petrarca lettore di Cicerone ci porta a citare un importante, e ben consapevole, riuso letterario della più patetica delle epistole dall’esilio sulla quale ci siamo soffermati prima, la 1.3 rivolta al fratello Quinto, caratterizzata dall’incipit con la triplice, eccezionale, invocazione mi frater. Questa lettera viene esplicitamente evocata in fam. 8.7\(^5\) per scrivere all’amico fraterno, il suo Socrate, Ludovico di Beringen, con un moto dell’anima che si origina dal cordoglio per le vittime della pestilenza del 1348; il Petrarca cita Cicerone\(^5\) e immediatamente dopo Troia devastata, citando Virgilio

---

53 Può essere un ricordo ciceroniano, che parla di nidulus per bocca di Crasso in de orat. 1.196 un passo importante perché riferito a Ulisse (cf. Bonjour 1975, 304–308): Ac si nos, id quod maxime debet, nostra patria delectat, cuuis rei tanta est vis ac tanta natura, ut Ithacam illam in asperrimis saxulis tamquam nidulum adfixam sapientissimus vir immortalitati anteponeret, quo amore tandem inflammatis esse debemus in eius modi patriam, qua in omnibus terris domus est virtutis, imperi, dignitatis?


Aen. 2.688 – 689, e sviluppando successivamente un ampio lamento sull’intera condizione umana (fam. 8.7.2–9):

1 Mi frater, mi frater, mi frater – novum epystole principium, imo antiquum, et ante mille fere quadrингentos annos a Marco Tullio usurpatum; heu michi, frater amantissime, quid dicam? Unde ordiar? Quonam vertar? Undique dolor, terror undique. In me uno videas quod de tanta urbe apud Virgilium legisti, nam «crudelis ubique / Luctus, ubique pavor et plurima mortis imago».

1 O fratello, fratello, fratello mio – nuovo cominciamento di lettera, o piuttosto antico, ché Cicerone l’usò quasi mille e quattrocento anni fa –; ahimè, fratello dilettò, che dirò? donde comincerò? da qual parte mi volgerò? dappertutto è dolore, dappertutto spavento. Puoi vedere in me quel che di una grande città disse Virgilio: «Lutto crudel per ogni dove, e angoscia / e numerose immagini di morte».

Testimonianza molto emblematica di come anche il dettato testuale delle lettere ciceroniane venga ad assumere per Petrarca una profonda risonanza non solo letteraria e, pur nella conclamata distanza dei secoli, testimoni il bisogno di ricorrere a parole antiche e già dette per descrivere l’angoscioso dolore di un presente, che costituisce col suo calvario il vero esilio per un cristiano: infatti nella stessa lettera al § 2 Petrarca si descrive come *hanc erumnosam et infelicem vitam proiectus*, un esule cristiano la cui intera travagliata esistenza terrena aspira a tornare in un cielo di beatitudine.

5b Cicerone e l’esilio paradossale di Ortensio Lando

Vorrei concludere con un breve *flash* su un autore interessante per il mio tema, anche se non molto noto, Ortensio Lando, attivo nel XVI secolo, della cui vita non molto sappiamo; la sua opera più nota in volgare *I Paradossi* presenta un intero capitolo dedicato alla critica della figura di Cicerone. Lando è intellettuale, che si caratterizza per il suo girovagare in Europa e per il suo stile incisivo e stravagante sia in latino che in volgare. L’opera che mi interessa qui analizzare è un doppio


57 Basti citare il titolo del *Paradosso* XXX: «Che M. Tullio sia non sol ignorante de filosofia, ma di retorica, di cosmografia e dell’istoria». Per un’analisi cf. almeno Figorilli 2008b, nell’ambito più generale della letteratura sul paradosso, su cui cf. anche Figorilli 2008a.
dialogo in latino, *Cicero relegatus et Cicero revocatus*, pubblicato senza indicazione
d’autore nel 1534 a Lione per i tipi di Sébastien Gryphe, col sottotitolo anche di
*Dialogi festivissimi*,\(^{58}\) quindi un’opera che utilizza la vicenda biografica ciceroniana
per inserirsi nell’ampia trama di discussioni e polemiche suscitate in Europa dalla
pubblicazione del *Ciceronianus* di Erasmo nel 1528. L’appellativo di *festivissimi*
chiarisce già ai lettori il carattere dell’operazione culturale landiana tutta svolta nel
segnì di un’esibita e paradossale «ritrattazione palinodica».\(^{59}\) Il *Cicero relegatus* si
presenta come un dialogo ampio, complesso, ricco di numerose e variamente dotti
interlocutori,\(^{60}\) nel quale assistiamo anche al singolare e paradossale sdoppiarsi
della figura autoriale: il ciceroniano Ortensio Lando, che introduce il dialogo, e poi
Geremia Lando, l’eremita agostiniano, che si presenta invece come un accanito
denigratore dello scrittore latino. Questo sdoppiamento intende suggerire e pro-
vocare l’impressione del carattere fittizio e sterile delle dispute sulla figura di
Cicerone, ed infatti Erasmo, autorevole lettore dell’opera, sosterrà in una lettera del
21 maggio 1535 che Cicerone *odiassimine laceratur, frigide defenditur*.

Tutta la trattazione è molto suggestiva, ma noi ci limiteremo a mettere in luce
alcuni snodi importanti per il nostro tema, cui del resto si intitolano esplicitamente
i due dialoghi. Infatti nel primo dialogo il dibattito, quasi una sorta di processo a
Cicerone, si conclude con l’invito rivolto dalla convincente arringa di uno degli
interlocutori, Bassiano Lando, a punire Cicerone e le sue opere con l’esilio, perché
si afferma che (§ 88) *Et ut Romani illum exilio mulctarunt, ne ad illius vitia conivere
viderentur, nos erimus segniore?*, «E saremo più indolenti dei romani che lo pu-
nirono con l’esilio per non dare l’impressione di avallare i suoi vizi?», un’evidente
forzatura della vicenda che implica il successivo contrappasso letterario. Infatti,
con il consenso di tutti, viene scelto come luogo di relegazione la Scizia in base ad
un decreto secondo il quale, se qualcuno avesse mai pensato di richiamarlo, sa-
rebbe stato colpito dalla stessa pena (§§ 92–93), un testo scritto in uno stile solenne
che suggerìa la conclusione del primo dialogo.\(^{61}\)

\(^{58}\) Un’edizione italiana a cura di Elisa Tinelli è uscita a Bari nel 2017, ed è qui utilizzata anche
per la traduzione.

\(^{59}\) Così la definisce Figorilli 2008b, 38.

\(^{60}\) Per un dettagliato esame del dialogo e l’elenco documentato dei partecipanti, cf. Tinelli 2017,
in particolare 8–17; 115–120. Sul tema dell’esilio in Lando e altri umanisti un quadro d’insieme

\(^{61}\) *Tandem summo animorum consensu in Scythiam relegatus est factumque decretum, ut si quis
unquam vel de revocando illum ab exilio cogitasset, pari plectentur poena. DECRETUM: M. TULLI
CICERONIS OB EIU SPESIMA FLAGITIA ET ANIMADVERTENDA FACINORALIBERALIJMQUE
DISCIPLINARUM IMPERITIAM PERPETUO MULCTAMUS EXILIO, SIMILI POENA ILLOS OMNES
QUI VEL UNUM VERBUM DE EO REVOCANDO FECERINT AUT ILLIUS SCRIPTA LEGERINT.*
Il carattere paradossale dell’opera è evidente, così come è molto chiaro l’intento satirico anche nello scegliere come meta dell’esilio letterario, nel quale Cicerone e le sue opere devono essere confinati, la Scizia, cioè il luogo di un autentico e pesante esilio, quello che patì Ovidio. Tra l’altro nel secondo dialogo palinodico si legge (§ 144) che i barbari non volevano far tornare Cicerone, perché li aveva affascinati con la sua eloquenza, come racconta di aver fatto Ovidio con la sua poesia (Pont. 2.7.32). Per stigmatizzare il comportamento di Cicerone nel primo dialogo si utilizzarono molti luoghi comuni, in particolare l’avidità di gloria (§§ 17–20), l’incostanza (§§ 23–24), ispirandoli ai toni denigratori e alle parole offensive usate dall’Arpinate stesso nei confronti dei suoi nemici⁶², oppure avvicinandosi anche all’Inventiva in Ciceronem (cf. per es. §§ 38–39 e soprattutto 88, natus abdomini et ventri); non manca l’accusa di debolezza, che trova nel momento dell’esilio una riprova come dimostra l’adattamento (§ 62) di un famoso passo di una lettera dall’esilio (Att. 3.7.1: Odi enim celebritatem, fugio homines, lucem aspicere vix possum, «infatti non sopporto la folla, rifuggo dagli uomini, a malapena posso guardare la luce») infrazionato a passi epistolari di altri periodi, tutti caratterizzati dal tono lamentoso della conquestio. Il secondo dialogo landiano, più breve, fa poi rientrare a pieno titolo l’Arpinate nella respublica litterarum, e utilizza con abile intarsio (§ 145: Tantam in urbe nostra laetitiam excitavit ut urbis quoque moenia intrantid vivere viderentur, «il suo ritorno suscitò una così grande gioia nella nostra città che pure le mura cittadine parevano sorridere a lui che entrava») un brano autobiografico dell’In Pisonem 52 (etiam moenia ipsa viderentur et tecta urbis ac templal aetari, «persino le mura, le case e i templi di Roma sembravano rallegrarsi»), dove l’Arpinate descrive il suo ritorno dall’esilio con Roma personificata, quasi sradicata dalle sue fondamenta, che avanzava per abbracciare il suo conservator.⁶³ Il Cicero revocatus si conclude bruscamente, quasi a sorpresa con un autore che lascia di punto in bianco i suoi interlocutori senza più preoccuparsi delle loro ulteriori dispute, lasciandone intuire, mi pare, sia la futile sterilità sia anche il loro molto probabile perpetuarsi, come possiamo sicuramente testimoniare noi lettori moderni.⁶⁴

⁶² Citò un solo esempio: Lando, per bocca di Gaudenzio Merula, uno dei dialoganti, applica a Cicerone stesso, definito omnium scelerum maculis notatissimum (27), la pesante qualifica che l’oratore aveva riferito a Pisone in dom. 23: Homini taeterrimo, crudelissimo, fallacissimo, omnium scelerum libidinumque maculis notatissimo, L. Pisoni.

⁶³ Sul passo ciceroniano mi soffermi in Degl’Innocenti Pierini 2007, 204–206.

1 Introduction: Was Cicero a *Vir Bonus*?

Midway through *Institutio* 12.1, Quintilian confronts a problem that threatens to wreck his enterprise of educating “the good man skilled in speaking” (*vir bonus dicendi peritus*).¹ How can Cicero, whom Quintilian has treated as the font of oratorical wisdom and Roman oratory’s most outstanding exponent, calling him “the name not of a man but of eloquence itself” (*10.1.112*),² be considered an orator under Quintilian’s definition if Cicero was not a *vir bonus*? Read quickly, Quintilian’s judgment seems equivocal.³ He praises Cicero’s meritorious conduct but concedes that he may lack “consummate virtue” (*12.1.18: summa virtus*). He claims that Cicero occupies the “peak” (*fastigium*) of eloquence but admits that his oratorical exuberance could have used even more tempering (*12.1.20*). Quintilian’s final judgment, that Cicero can be called a perfect orator in a casual sense but that he ultimately fell short of perfect excellence (*12.1.19 – 20*), seems to subordinate his enthusiasm for Cicero to the purity of the ideal orator he is seeking.⁴ Upon closer examination, however, this passage proves to be a rich locus for exploring Quintilian’s wider commitments and observing how he maintains balance when these seem to conflict with one another.⁵ Quintilian performs this balancing act in 12.1 as a rhetorical exercise that pays homage to Cicero while demonstrating a key lesson of Book 12: how to plead a difficult case

---

¹ Quintilian credits Cato the Elder with this definition, as does Seneca the Elder in the prologue to his *Controversiae* (1.9). Cf. also Cic. *de orat.* 2.85: *Tantum ego in excellenti oratore, et eodem viro bono, pono esse ornamenti universae civitati.* Latin text is from Wilkins’ 1892 edition of *De Oratore.*

² See La Bua 2019, 3; 100 and Gowing 2013, 249.

³ For instance, Austin 1948 remarks in his note on Quint. 12.1.14: “Q. hedges uncomfortably”.

⁴ Likewise, Cicero says that the consummate orator he is seeking is not identifiable with any particular individual but is primarily an ideal (Cic. *orat.* 7). Layers of Ciceronian false modesty may of course be present (cf. Cic. *Brut.* 296 and *orat.* 100 – 102), but Quintilian can and does claim he is following Ciceronian precedent in continuing the search for the perfect orator (see Quint. 12.1.19 – 20, discussed in section 6 below: *Eum quaeram oratorem quem et ille quaerebat*).

⁵ As Quintilian states in 3.1.22, he draws from a variety of sources without rigidly adhering to any single *secta*.
while maintaining one’s own moral integrity and working towards a good outcome.\(^6\)

When read within the context of *Institutio* 12, it becomes clear that the main motivation fueling Quintilian’s complex defense of Cicero is his desire to protect his moral definition of the orator from invalidation. In order to preserve the integrity of his own work, he must establish the goodness of Cicero, his main inspiration. Quintilian responds to the accusations of Cicero’s detractors in order to resolve the conflict of Cicero’s imperfections with his basic moral goodness and thus confirm his usefulness for Quintilian’s educational project. He does this by admitting select weaknesses while insisting on Cicero’s fundamental goodness, which is supported, of course, by his outstanding eloquence.\(^7\)

In order to show this, I first identify the specific objections to Cicero’s goodness that appear to be at issue and trace how Quintilian responds to each of them. Next, I explain the structure of *Institutio* 12.1.14–22 as a defense that features Quintilian as Cicero’s advocate, mustering proof and conciliating his audience in the service of his cause. I then situate the passage within Book 12 as part of a larger argument supporting Quintilian’s ideal of the orator as a *vir bonus dicendi peritus*. I argue that this passage serves as a “teaching example” of how to go about the difficult defense that the *vir bonus* may have to undertake in the service of his client or of the common good.\(^8\) Finally, I locate Cicero within Quintilian’s expansion of the Ciceronian quest for the perfect orator through a reading of the prologue of *Institutio* 12.

## 2 Quintilian’s Defense I: Cicero’s Good Intentions

Criticisms of both Cicero’s and Demosthenes’ characters are mounted in 12.1.14 as part of a larger objection to the moral ideal of the orator. Quintilian refers

---

\(^6\) Cf. Gunderson 2009 for the *Institutio* as “a rhetorical performance” (109) that “exemplifies its own theory of rhetoric” (113). Dozier 2014 further develops the *Institutio*’s “rhetorical dimension” (71) through an analysis of 12.8.

\(^7\) La Bua notes how “Pollio and Livy, finally, judge Cicero by balancing his virtues against his vices” (110). By contrast, I think Quintilian judges Cicero by claiming that his virtue, albeit imperfect, is more fundamental to his character than are his faults.

\(^8\) Gunderson 2009, Taoka 2011, and Dozier 2014 offer parallel arguments and observations (focusing on 6. pr.; 10.1.125–131; and 12.8, respectively) about the ways in which Quintilian performs the principles he teaches in the *Institutio*. 
to the cluster of complaints as a conspiracy (*quasi conspiratione quadam*).⁹ “Was not Demosthenes then an orator? But we have learned that he was a bad man. Was not Cicero an orator? But many people have censured his character also” (*atqui huius quoque mores multi reprenderunt*).¹⁰

Who are the *multi*, and what *mores* do they disapprove of in Cicero? Many scholars have discussed Cicero’s critics, especially those in the declamatory tradition, in the intervening century and a half between his death and Quintilian’s writing.¹¹ The pseudopigraphal invective of Sallust against Cicero and the vituperation of Asinius Pollio, partially preserved in the Elder Seneca’s sixth *suasoria*, represent some of the most bitter attacks on Cicero, while Seneca the Younger emphasizes Cicero’s moral weakness (though he praises his oratorical prowess).¹² The pseudo-Sallustian invective accuses Cicero of being, among other things, fickle (5: *homo levissimus*); cruel and violent in his actions during the Catilinarian conspiracy (5–6); lacking in *fides* (7); and afflicted by a “disease of the mind” (1: *morbus animi*).¹³ Pollio complains of Cicero’s lack of moderation in favorable circumstances and his lack of courage in adverse ones.¹⁴ Likewise, Seneca the Younger famously characterizes Cicero in *De Brevitate Vitae* as tossed about on the waves of his fortunes and misfortunes, carried away by excessive self-praise in good times and excessive despair in bad ones, unable to preserve equanimity and to be called a *sapiens*.¹⁵

Picking up on these earlier criticisms of Cicero, three main moral objections seem to underlie Quintilian’s defense in 12.1.14–22: cowardice, inordinate boasting, and blameworthy actions undertaken in a political context. The last category is not as explicit in the passage I am examining here, but Cicero’s execution of

---

⁹ I will discuss the significance of this comparison in section 6 below.

¹⁰ Quint. 12.1.14: *Orator ergo Demosthenes non fuit? atqui malum virum accepimus. Non Cicero? atqui huius mores multi reprenderunt*. All English translations are my own, unless otherwise noted. The Latin text of the *Institutio oratoria* is from Russell’s 2001 Loeb, which largely reproduces Winterbottom’s 1970 OCT with some emendations.

¹¹ See Chapter 3 of La Bua 2019 (esp. 100–112) and Chapter 4 of Keeline 2018 (esp. 147–177) for discussions of the main declamatory sources of criticism of Cicero in the early imperial period.


¹³ Fulkerson 2013 explains Cicero’s supposed *levitas* as a consequence of his precarious political situation as a *novus homo* and emphasizes that Cicero at least considered himself to possess *constantia* in his devotion to the *res publica* despite fluctuating circumstances. See especially 247; 250; 253; 260–261. On pseudo-Sallust’s accusations, see also Keeline 2018, 155–158.


the Catilinarian conspirators and his unabashed deception of the judges in speeches like Pro Cluentio and Pro Milone\textsuperscript{16} are events that could trigger complaint, or at least cast a shadow on his character. Examining each area of criticism and Quintilian’s response to it shows that Quintilian is not intransigent in defending his hero; rather, he seeks to subordinate a concession of Cicero’s weaknesses to a favorable judgment of his good intentions.

Quintilian’s first concern is to sketch an outline of Cicero’s admirable political deeds in order to demonstrate the fundamental goodness of his personal character and public actions. Importantly, Quintilian does not say that Cicero was “the best citizen”\textsuperscript{17}, but rather that he did not lack “the will of a very fine citizen” (12.1.16: civis optimi voluntatem). This allows Quintilian room to claim a basic and stable goodness for Cicero without having to prove the absolute perfection of every one of his deeds. Quintilian’s account reads as follows (12.1.16–17):

\begin{quote}
Nec M. Tullio defuisse video in ulla parte civis optimi voluntatem. Testimonio est actus nobilissime consulatus, integerrime provincia administrata et repudiatus vigintiviratus, et civilibus bellis, quae in aetatem eius gravissima inciderunt, neque spe neque metu declinatus animus quo minus optimis se paribus, id est ret publicae, iungeret. Parum fortis videtur quibusdam, quibus optime respondit ipse non se timidum in susciendis sed in providenis periculis: quod probavit morte quoque ipsa, quam praestantissimo suscepit animo.
\end{quote}

I do not see that Cicero in any way lacked the will of a very fine citizen. As evidence, his consulship was conducted most nobly, his province was administered with utmost integrity and he refused a place on the Land Commission,\textsuperscript{18} and in the civil wars, which fell as very weighty burdens on his time, his spirit did not swerve from joining the best party (namely, the republic) because of hope of gain or fear of loss. He seems insufficiently strong to some people, to whom he himself gave the best response: that he was timid not in accepting dangers but in foreseeing them; and he proved this fact also by his very death, which he met with outstanding strength of spirit.

The abundant superlatives in this passage contrast Cicero’s virtues with the grave dangers that he faced (civis optimi, nobilissime, integerrime, gravissima, optimis partibus, optime respondit, praestantissimo animo). These strong affirmations of Cicero’s nobility drown out words that suggest he was lacking in something (defuisse, parum). But what does Quintilian mean when he says that he

---

\textsuperscript{16} Quintilian discusses the Pro Milone in many passages; see especially 4.2.57–59 for praise of Cicero’s artful deception in this speech. For deception in the Pro Cluentio see especially 2.17.21, discussed below.

\textsuperscript{17} Cf. Gowing 2013, 246.

\textsuperscript{18} See Rising 2015 for a summary of historical information and scholarly debate on Cicero’s rejection of Caesar’s offer of a place on the ‘Board of Twenty’ in 59 BC.
thinks Cicero had “the will (voluntas) of a very fine citizen”? The moral defense of Cicero is laid out in terms of choices that Cicero made, choices in which he embraced and refused the proper things. Cicero knew both how to choose or accept arduous goods and how to decline attractive evils. On the one hand, he joined the noble defenders of the republic and accepted his own death in an impressive manner. On the other, he refused a place on Caesar’s Campanian land commission (repudiatus vigintiviratus). His espousal of the nobler side in the civil war involved hardening his mind against the distracting lures of spes and metus. Alongside his adherence to the res publica, his resistance to spes and metus counteracts charges of levitas and mental unsteadiness. Quintilian’s brief and selective biography of Cicero thus portrays him equipped with the voluntas of an exemplary citizen, embracing noble and difficult things while refusing unjust or unworthy things. He can therefore be accounted a vir bonus, even if he did not attain consummate virtue (12.1.18: quod si defuit his viris summa virtus).

It is important to note what Quintilian passes over or minimizes in this passage. For instance, he does not overtly mention Cicero’s controversial actions during the Catilinarian conspiracy and its aftermath, which were subject to much criticism, though he elsewhere expresses his wholehearted approval of Cicero’s conduct in this matter (11.1.18). Here, he only implies his support by saying that Cicero’s consulship was conducted nobly (nobilissime). Nor does Quintilian mention Cicero’s self-satisfied deception of the judges in Pro Cluentio, which he defends in 2.17.21 and will defend again, more implicitly, in 12.1.33–45 as he argues for the upright orator’s prerogative to deceive the judges. Quintilian is playing a careful game in 12.1.14–22. While acknowledging and confronting key criticisms leveled against Cicero, he wants to make sure that Cicero ultimately appears in a favorable light. This involves being selective about what material to present, what to leave out, and which arguments to employ in order to optimize his portrayal of Cicero.

19 I think “intention” would be an equally acceptable translation for voluntas here.
20 See La Bua 2019, 107.
21 See 11.1.18, discussed in section 3 below.
22 I discuss this prerogative at greater length in section 5 below. Quint. 2.17 is trying to prove that rhetoric is truly an art and that it does not acquiesce to false opinions, which would imply that it does not have true perception, a Stoic idea (Russell 2001 ad loc.). Quintilian says that rhetoric may present false things in the guise of truth but without its practitioner being himself deceived, as Cicero employed falsehoods in defending Cluentius without himself being mistaken about the truth (Quint. 2.17.21: Nec Cicero, cum se tenebras offudisse iudicibus in causa Cluenti gloriatus est, nihil ipse vidit).
3 Quintilian’s Defense II: Cicero’s Courage and Self-Confidence

Quintilian’s response to allegations of Cicero’s cowardice is a good example of this careful game. To some critics, Cicero seems lacking in strength (*parum fortis*) and, implicitly, fearful (*timidum*, 12.1.17). As Giuseppe La Bua has pointed out, Seneca had criticized Cicero’s “psychological instability” in *De Brevitate Vitae* 5.1–2, arguing that no *sapiens* would ever call himself *semiliberus* under constraint from external circumstances. Quintilian himself has devoted significant energy in 12.1 to the evils of a *mala mens*, whose doubts and anxieties prevent it from focusing on the arts necessary for oratorical excellence. As later parts of *Institutio* 12 demonstrate, fearfulness is incompatible with the *ethos* of the morally good orator, who needs to purge away cowardly sensations in order to persuade effectively (12.2.3) and keep his mind steady to engage in oratorical combat (12.5.2–4). In our passage, however, Quintilian emphasizes actions that show Cicero’s courage, particularly his death (12.1.17, *quam praestansissimo suscepsit animo*) to suggest that Cicero’s actions were courageous at a fundamental level. He may have oscillated and worried ahead of time, but at the decisive moment of his assassination, he bore the ultimate terror courageously. Cicero also appears in 12.7.4 among the list of leading citizens whose prosecution of wicked men demonstrates their possession of a certain basic courage and confidence (*fiducia bonae mentis*). The attribution of *fiducia bonae mentis* to Cicero may seem at odds with Quintilian’s totalizing language in 12.1.4–6 about how the mind must be completely free of vice in order to study and how virtue and

---

23 Russell *ad loc.* points out for comparison Cicero’s letter to Toranius (*Cic. Fam.* 246/6.21), in which he says that Domitius and Lentulus considered him *timidus* for anticipating what in fact came to pass.
24 La Bua 2019, 110.
25 Quint. 12.1.7: *Nihil est enim tam occupatum, tam multiforme, tot ac tam variis adfectibus concisum atque laceratum quam mala mens. Nam et cum insidiatur, spe curis labore distingitur, et, etiam cum sceleris compos fuit, sollicitudine, paenitentia, poenarum omnium expectatione tortetur. Quis inter haec litteris aut ulli bonae arti locus?*
26 Some moderate anxiety is permissible and even praiseworthy, as long as it does not keep the orator from doing what must be done (Quint. 12.5.4).
27 Livy and Pollio both offer positive assessments of Cicero’s courage at the moment of death (*Sen. suas*. 6.21–25).
vice cannot exist together within a single person. But Quintilian bridges this difficulty in 12.1.19 when he distinguishes between an approximate way of speaking about goodness and a strictly true one. The point is to portray Cicero as basically courageous and thus to minimize and override aspects of his character, life, and writings that could serve as evidence to the contrary.

Another area of criticism that Quintilian touches on is Cicero’s propensity for self-glorification. In our passage, Quintilian’s only explicit allusion to this fault is to call Cicero minime sui contemptor, “not at all one to despise himself” (12.1.20), but in 11.1.17–28 he provides a more extensive defense of Cicero on this front that is worth comparing with 12.1. After recommending quiet consciousness of one’s own strengths, Quintilian notes that many people have criticized Cicero for his excessive self-praise (11.1.17, reprehensus est in hac parte non mediocriter Cicero). As in Book 12, Quintilian lays out a standard of behavior (the vir bonus in 12, avoidance of self-praise in 11) and then feels the need to defend Cicero from charges of violating this principle. Quintilian’s defense in 11.1 follows the progression of status theory. He cannot deny that Cicero praised himself abundantly, so he attempts to justify it as follows. According to Quintilian, Cicero boasted more about his political deeds than about his oratory, the latter being a more tasteless offense (11.1.18); he had to boast about his political deeds in order to defend others or himself against the invidia that drove him into exile (11.1.18, also 11.1.23); even when he did boast about his eloquence, he did not do so immoderately (11.1.19–20); at any rate, the positive things he said about his own eloquence were true (11.1.21); if this is still a fault, it is a more excusable fault than false humility (11.1.21); Cicero shared praise of his suppression of the Catilinarian conspiracy (coniuratio) with the senate and the gods and was acting in self-defense (11.1.23); perhaps it is true that his poetry was over the top, but people have been unnecessarily nasty about it (quae non desierunt carpere ma-

28 See Kennedy 1969, 124 for Quintilian’s Stoicizing “polarization of good and bad” such that an individual cannot combine elements of both but is either “perfectly good or perfectly villainous”.

29 In a similar context in De Officiis, Cicero himself had cited the Stoic Panaetius in distinguishing between a colloquial register of speech and a more precise one useful in philosophical disputation (alia est illa, cum veritas ipsa timatur in disputatione, subtilitas, alia, cum ad opinionem communem omnis accommodatur oratio. Quam ob rem, ut volgus, ita nos hoc loco loquimur, ut alios fortis, alios viros bonos, alios prudentes esse dicamus). Latin text is from Miller’s 1913 Loeb edition.

30 See Dugan 2014 for a psychoanalytic reading of Cicero’s re-visitations of his own consulship. Allen 1954 argues that Cicero’s “vanity” was not in fact as unusual and offensive as modern readers might be led to believe by the criticisms of his enemies.

ligni) and sometimes he was just imitating Greek sources (11.1.24); fiducia in one’s own eloquentia is good, and no one can disapprove of Cicero for demonstrating this confidence in his Philippics (11.1.25–26).

What is the purpose of this elaborate defense, and what is its relevance to our passage in 12.1? In both defenses of Cicero, Quintilian is working hard to resolve apparent contradictions that he himself has stirred up. In 11.1.16, he has called bragging (iactatio) a vice (vitiosa) and insisted that it is self-defeating because it alienates the audience, regardless of their relation to the speaker (11.1.17: invident humiliores, rident superiores, improbant boni). Almost immediately, then, he has to reconcile this principle with the fact that Cicero often acted to the contrary. In both places Quintilian concedes Cicero’s weaknesses in a limited way while maintaining that his actions (albeit imperfect) were justified (in part by the true excellence of his oratory).

4 Quintilian’s Defense III: Cicero’s Style as a Substitute for Character

The final line of approach that Quintilian uses to support Cicero’s goodness in 12.1 is a subtle shift in the discussion from an assessment of Cicero’s character to an evaluation of his style.32 Quintilian freely intermingles moral and stylistic criticism throughout his work, most notably in his treatment of Seneca the Younger at the end of 10.1.33 In Cicero’s case, the apparent discrepancy between the moral evaluation with which the defense begins and the stylistic one with which it ends makes more sense when understood as an attempt to distract the reader from Cicero’s moral shortcomings.34 Quintilian’s sleight-of-hand treats Cicero’s stylistic excellence as a partial substitute for moral excellence, blending

---

32 The introduction of Jansen/Pieper/van der Velden (p. 313) in this volume discusses the distinct but related question of Cicero’s “textualized voice […] as a representation of Cicero himself, not only of his voice, but of the whole personality”.

33 The interconnectedness of morals and stylistics is a prominent theme in Latin prose literature, the locus classicus being Sen. ep.114.1, talis hominibus fuit oratio qualis vita. See Berti 2018 ad loc. for bibliography, including a list of relevant passages in Cicero, especially Tusc. 5.47. On the mutual influence of “literary and moral criticism” in Quintilian’s work cf. Winterbottom 1998, 327 and Dominik 1997. On Quintilian’s imitation of Sen. ep.114 in Quint. 10.1.125 – 131, cf. Taoka 2011.

34 In calling Quintilian’s shift of emphasis a distraction, I do not intend to suggest that Quintilian considers morality and stylistics to be two strictly separate fields. On the contrary, I think he would justify this section of his defense by appealing to their interrelation.
the two realms in order to advance a stronger image of Cicero's overall excellence and support his status as a vir bonus (12.1.20):

Quamquam enim stetisse ipsum in fastigio eloquentiae fateor, ac vix quid adici potuerit invenio, fortasse inventur quid adhuc abscisum putem fuisse (nam et fere sic docti iudicaverunt plurimum in eo virtutum, nonnulli fuisset vitiorum, et se ipse multa ex illa juvenili abundantia coercuisse testatur): tamen, quando nec sapientis sibi nomen minime sui contemptor adseruit et melius dicere certe data longiore vita et tempore ad componendum securiore potuisse, non maligne crediderim defuisse ei summam illam ad quem nemo proprius accessit.

For although I declare that Cicero stood upon the peak of eloquence, and that I can scarcely find anything able to be added [to his skill], I suppose perhaps I can find something still able to be snipped off (for the learned have usually judged that there was much excellence in him and minimal vice, and he himself attests that he curbed many things from his youthful abundance): nevertheless, since Cicero, not at all one to despise himself, did not affix to himself the name of sapiens, and since he certainly would have been able to speak better if he had been given a longer life and an era safer for composing, I would not be grudging to believe that he fell short of that height which no one has ever approached more closely.

In this passage Quintilian concedes small faults and then turns these faults entirely to Cicero’s advantage. The “minimal vice” (nonnihil vitiorum) that learned people have detected in Cicero’s style pales in comparison with his abundant excellences (plurimum virtutum). Furthermore, Cicero himself knew that he had a tendency towards overabundance and took steps to temper it, and if he had lived longer and in a more stable time he definitely (certe) would have written even better. It is true that Cicero was minime sui contemptor, but the fact that he never considered himself a sapiens and continued to look for the perfect orator without laying claim to the title shows considerable restraint, a moderation of character that corrects for his overabundance and his tendency to boast. Quintilian downplays Cicero’s imperfections and repackages them as advantages that qualify Cicero for oratorical preeminence under Quintilian’s moral definition.

5 Cicero, the Good Man, and the Guilty Man: Overlapping Defenses in 12.1

Quintilian’s defense of Cicero in 12.1, while sophisticated in itself, is embedded within a still larger defense: that of Quintilian’s definition of the orator as a vir bonus dicendi peritus. The defense of Cicero occurs within a series of four ob-
jections that Quintilian answers in order to assert the validity of his definition.\textsuperscript{35} After satisfying these objections, Quintilian considers his point as proven (i.e., that the orator is a \textit{vir bonus}) and begins the next phase of the discussion.\textsuperscript{36} The defense of Cicero’s goodness cannot be separated from the wider rhetorical purpose of 12.1 and is motivated by it to a large extent.

Yet another purpose of the defense of Cicero is to give Quintilian an opportunity to illustrate one of the main lessons he is trying to teach in the \textit{Institutio}’s final book: namely, that the good orator is justified in defending a guilty client and that making such a defense does not compromise his fitness to be called a \textit{vir bonus dicendi peritus}.\textsuperscript{37} Quintilian calls attention to his defense of Cicero \textit{qua} defense, and he does so within a section of the text that aims to convince readers of a controversial point: the justifiability of defending the guilty. Quintilian’s defense of Cicero can be read as a demonstration of how to perform such a difficult defense in practice.

Thus far in describing Quintilian’s rehabilitation of Cicero, I have been using “defense” in a casual sense, but the text provides several indications that Quintilian wishes to flag this passage as a defense in a more formal way. After noting the \textit{conspiratio} to discredit Cicero as a bad man (12.1.14), Quintilian foresees the hostility that may attend his answer and marks the importance of conciliating his audience (12.1.15: \textit{Magna responsi invidia subeunda est: mitigandae sunt aures}). “Softening ears” is something that the orator must do to overcome prejudice in his audience, particularly the judge (e.g., 4.3.10: \textit{His igitur velut fomentis, si quid erit asperum, praemolliemus, quo facilius aures iudicum quae post dicturi erimus admittant}).\textsuperscript{38} In 12.1, then, Quintilian is setting up a scenario with himself as the advocate, Cicero as the defendant, and his readers as the judges. He will answer the charges of the \textit{conspiratio} and defend Cicero in a way compatible with his promotion of the \textit{vir bonus dicendi peritus}.\textsuperscript{39} Quintilian first attributes to Cicero the \textit{voluntas} of a \textit{civis optimus}, already an important compromise insofar as he is proving that Cicero had good intentions, not that he was perfect

\textsuperscript{35} Quintilian envisions objections in Quint. 12.1.10; 12.1.14; 12.1.23; and 12.1.33 that he refutes severally.

\textsuperscript{36} Although the standard divisions of the text may differ from what Quintilian himself recognized, I think it is permissible to treat Quint. 12.1 as a unit based on the first sentence of 12.2, which takes for granted the point that 12.1 argued for (\textit{quando igitur orator est vir bonus}).

\textsuperscript{37} Cf. Quint. 12.1.44: \textit{Non enim hoc agimus, ut istud illi quem formamus viro saepe sit faciendum, sed ut, si talis coegerit ratio, sit tamen vera finitio oratorem esse virum bonum dicendi peritum.}

\textsuperscript{38} By mentioning the \textit{aures} he must soften, Quintilian is speaking metaphorically, unless we think he intends his work to be read aloud.

\textsuperscript{39} Of course, Demosthenes is also a defendant in this case, but I focus on Cicero because Quintilian defends him at greater length and with more at stake.
in every one of his actions. Then he offers as evidence (testimonium) Cicero’s noble deeds (his consulship, his provincial administration, his refusal to join Caesar’s land commission, etc.). Testimonium, of course, can have the technical meaning of “evidence” in the context of a trial (e.g., 5.7.1; 4; 5). Quintilian both displays Cicero’s actions as testimonia and uses Cicero himself as a witness in the portion of the defense dealing with style (12.1.20: et se ipse [sc. Cicero] multa ex illa iuvenili abundantia coercuissae testatur). The presentation of evidence following a bid for a receptive hearing signals that readers should attend to this passage as a working example of defense.

The importance of this passage within the larger arc of 12.1 becomes clearer as Quintilian examines the orator’s prerogative to defend the guilty for a good reason (12.1.33–45). This discussion requires, in the first place, a defense of his own moral uprightness. In 12.1.33 Quintilian confronts a line of thinking that tries to contrast rhetoric’s colores with the alliance of goodness and truth.

Videor mihi audire quosdam (neque enim deerunt umquam qui diserti esse quam boni malint) illa dicentes: “Quid ergo tantum est artis in eloquentia? Cur tu de coloribus et difficilitium causarum defensione, nonnihil etiam de confessione locutus es, nisi aliquando vis ac facultas dicendi expugnat ipsam veritatem? Bonus enim vir non agit nisi bonas causas, eas porro etiam sine doctrina satis per se tuetur veritas ipsa”.

I seem to hear certain people (for those who would prefer to be clever at speaking rather than good will never be lacking) saying things like this: “Why then is there so much artfulness in eloquence? Why did you speak about ‘colors’ and defense of difficult cases and even about confession, unless sometimes force and capability at speaking overcome truth itself? The good man does not plead any cases except good ones, and besides, the truth itself protects good cases even without learning”.

Quintilian’s own project and the integrity of the vir bonus it proposes are at risk from this objection, which he deals with at once: “When I respond to these people first about my own work, I will also meet the objection about the duty of the good man, if sometimes reason leads him to a defense of guilty people” (12.1.34). Multiple levels of defense are at work here. When Quintilian argues that the officium of the good man may involve occasionally defending a guilty person, he also has to defend his own ethos for supporting this position. In addition to praising the educational benefits of argument in utramque partem (12.1.34–35), Quintilian insists that the good orator with upright motives is sometimes entitled to distract the judge from the truth (12.1.36):

40 Quint. 12.1.34: Quibus ego, cum de meo primum opere respondero, etiam pro boni viri officio, si quando eum ad defensionem nocentium ratio duxerit, satisfaciam.
Verum et illud, quod prima propositione durum videtur, potest adferre atio, ut vir bonus in
defensione causae velit auferre aliquando iudici veritatem. Quod si quis a me proponi mir-
abitur (quamquam non est haec mea proprié sententia, sed eorum quos gravissimos sapi-
entiae magistros aetas vetus credidit), sic iudicet, pleraque esse quae non tam factis quam
causis eorum vel honesta fiant vel turpia.

But reason is also able to assert what at first proposition seems harsh, that a good man in
the defense of a cause may wish sometimes to mislead the judge. And if anyone marvels
that I am proposing this (although this opinion does not belong to me but to those
whom an earlier age believed to be teachers of wisdom), let that person judge that a
great many things become upright or shameful not so much because of the deeds them-
selves as because of their motives.

Shortly after mentioning the vir bonus’ right to mislead the judge (auferre aliquando
iudici veritatem), Quintilian casts the doubtful reader as iudex (si quis [...] mirabitur [...] sic iudicet), thus setting up a framework with himself as advo-
cate and vir bonus pleading a difficult case before the reader as iudex. This playful setup lets the reader observe Quintilian as he performs an upright defense of
a difficult case and illustrates the principle he is trying to teach. It also disposes
the reader-iudex to reach a favorable judgment of Quintilian’s position (i.e., that
it is permissible to defend the guilty in certain circumstances). Quintilian is not
trying to undermine the importance of truth altogether, but he does want to relax
the bond between truth and goodness in order to make room for the good that he
believes can accrue from defending the guilty, an enterprise that often demands
deception.

In 12.1.40–44, Quintilian lists a number of situations in which the vir bonus
would have a worthy reason to use rhetoric deceptively in order to ensure a just
outcome (e.g., defending a would-be tyrant-killer in the tyrant’s court). Two of
these situations are especially useful for framing Quintilian’s defense of Cicero
as a teaching example of a difficult defense. First, a guilty person who is accused
truthfully may become a good man in the future, and the orator will want to pre-
serve this potential by defending him.⁴¹ In 12.1.20 Quintilian had posited that if
Cicero had lived a longer life, he might have tempered his stylistic abundance
and advanced even further towards perfection (fortasse inventurus quid adhuc
abscisurum putem fuisse, melius dicere certe data longiore vita et tempore ad com-
ponendum secuiri potuisset). Cicero’s own diagnosis of his stylistic faults and
his actions in response to them show, according to Quintilian, that he is aware of

⁴¹ Quint. 12.1.42–43: Ad hoc nemo dubitabit quin, si nocentes mutari in bonam mentem aliquo
modo possint, sicut posse conceditur, salvos esse eos magis re publica sit quam puniri. Si liqueat
igitur oratori futurum bonum virum cui vera obicientur, non id agit ut salvus sit?
his tendencies towards excess and is willing to correct himself (*se ipse multa ex illa iuvenili abundantia coercuisse testatur*). Quintilian portrays Cicero as well-intentioned, theoretically capable of progress (even though he is dead), and thus worth rehabilitating.

Second, in 12.1.43 Quintilian mentions a situation in which a good man can support a bad man in order to secure the common good.

> Da nunc ut crimen manifesto prematur dux bonus et sine quo vincere hostem civitas non possit: nonne ei communis utilitas oratorem advocabit? Certe Fabricius Cornelium Rufinum, et alioqui malum civem et sibi inimicum, tamen, quia utilem sciebat ducem, immittente bello palam consulem suffragio suo fecit, atque id mirantibus quibusdam respondit, a cive se spoliari malle quam ab hoste venire. Ita hic si fuisse orator, non defendisset eundem Rufinum vel manifesti peculatus reum?

Grant now that a good leader is being pressured by a clearly true accusation, and that without him the city cannot conquer the enemy: will not the common utility summon the orator to his defense? Certainly Fabricius, although Cornelius Rufinus was otherwise a wicked citizen and a personal enemy to him, nevertheless, because he knew him to be a useful leader when war threatened, openly made him consul by his own vote, and to those wondering at his behavior he responded that he preferred to be despoiled by a fellow citizen than to be sold into slavery by the enemy. Therefore, if Fabricius had been an orator, would he not have defended that same Rufinus even if the latter were standing trial for obvious embezzlement?

Although Quintilian’s defense of Cicero is framed in much milder terms, the discussion of Fabricius and Rufinus is relevant to the situation Quintilian finds himself in. The point of the comparison is not to suggest that Quintilian thinks Cicero is actually a bad man but rather to highlight a common motivation between the defense of Cicero and the defense of Rufinus: namely, the preservation of the defendant’s usefulness for a larger good that meets a pressing need of society. In the case of Cicero, this larger good is his usefulness for Quintilian’s enterprise of educating the *vir bonus dicendi peritus*, an enterprise whose urgency arises (at least in part) from the depravity of informer culture under the Flavians.

By its placement in 12.1, Quintilian’s defense of Cicero anticipates and illustrates his theoretical approach to the question of whether the orator can defend a guilty client and still retain his moral status. A dizzying array of defenses atop defenses comes into view. Quintilian, styling himself a *vir bonus*, defends Cice-
ro’s (contested) status as a *vir bonus* in order to uphold his definition of the orator as a *vir bonus dicendi peritus*. Since the duties of this *vir bonus dicendi peritus* include defending the guilty in order to achieve a good outcome, Quintilian uses the defense of Cicero to demonstrate this challenging task for his readers.\(^\text{45}\)

### 6  Cicero, Quintilian, and the Quest for the Perfect Orator

As Quintilian defends Cicero, he posits a subtle but persistent identification between himself and Cicero that marks the uniqueness of his own authorial project within the tradition of Ciceronian reception.

In 12.10.12–13, championing Cicero’s rightful place as artistic paragon (*in omnibus quae in quoque laudantur eminentissimum*), Quintilian recalls the vehemence with which Cicero’s critics attacked him after his death. After his proscription and murder, a multitude of haters, enviers, and flatterers attacked the dead Cicero, who was no longer able to defend himself (*non responsurum invaserunt*).\(^\text{46}\) Quintilian, however, does offer a response to Cicero’s attackers: first, by allowing Cicero himself to respond (12.1.17: *quibus optime respondit ipse*) and second, by speaking on his behalf in all the various defenses and mini-defenses that arise in the *Institutio*. Quintilian even takes on Cicero’s *persona* for a brief moment. Recall that Quintilian had framed the problem of 12.1.14 as a *coniuratio* against his own moral vision of the orator (12.1.14: *Nunc de iis dicendum est quae mihi quas conuratio quadam vulgi reclamari videntur*). The use of *coniuratio* evokes one of the most outstanding events of Cicero’s career: Catiline’s conspiracy.\(^\text{47}\) While Catiline’s conspiracy had attempted to oust Cicero from

---

\(^\text{45}\) The complex circularity of these levels of defense serves, I think, to urge the reader to reread, wrestle, and play with the material (cf. Dozier 2014, 85–86, though I disagree with his dismissal of the *vir bonus dicendi peritus* as “a patently artificial ideal”, and Taoka 2011, 135).

\(^\text{46}\) Quint. 12.10.13: *Postea vero quam triumvirali proscriptione consumptus est, passim qui oderant, qui invidebant, qui aemulabantur, adulatores etiam praesentis potentiae non responsurum invaserunt.*

\(^\text{47}\) As Robert Kaster pointed out to me, Cicero himself is much more likely to use *coniuratio* rather than *coniuratio* to describe what English-speakers mean by “conspiracy”. When he uses *coniuratio*, it is sometimes in a positive sense (“harmony”, e.g., Cic. *dom. 28, Cat. 4.22*), sometimes in a negative sense (“conspiracy”, e.g., Cic. *Scaur. 20; 37 and Deiot. 11*). Similarly, Quintilian uses *coniuratio* to speak of the Catilinarian conspiracy in Quint. 11.1.18 and 11.1.23, but all four of his uses of *coniuratio* are negative and he treats it as a synonym for *coniuratio* (e.g., Quint. 12.7.2: *Quare neque sociorum querelas nec amici vel propinquii necem nec erupturas in rem publicam conspirationes inultas patietur orator*).
the consulship, the *conspiratio* in 12.1.14 tries to invalidate Quintilian’s definition of the orator by undermining Cicero’s moral integrity. By doing away with Quintilian’s chief exemplar, it is a double attack on Cicero and Quintilian. As he demolishes the objections of this *conspiratio*, Quintilian reenacts Cicero’s suppression of Catiline’s attempt to overthrow his consulship and preserves both Cicero’s authority and his own. Quintilian thus aims to satisfy critics of his definition, portray Cicero in a positive light, and establish himself in the Ciceronian role of suppressing a harmful conspiracy for a noble purpose.

Quintilian also seems keen to take on a Ciceronian role in the enterprise of writing rhetorical theory. In 12.1.18–19, Quintilian turns his admission that Cicero was not (technically speaking) a perfect orator into a proclamation of his faithfulness to Cicero and his extension of Cicero’s theoretical project.

Ego tamen secundum communem loquendi consuetudinem saepe dixi dicamque perfectum oratorem esse Ciceronom, ut amicos et bonos viros et prudentissimos dicimus vulgo, quorum nihil nisi perfecte sapienti datur: sed cum proprie et ad legem ipsam veritatis loquendi erit, eum quaeram oratorem quem et ille quaerabat.

Nevertheless, according to common usage in speaking, I have often said and will say again that Cicero is a perfect orator, in the same way that we commonly say that our friends are good men and exceedingly wise, titles which are not granted except to the perfectly wise man. But when it is necessary to speak properly and in accordance with the very law of truth, I will seek that orator whom even Cicero himself was seeking.

Quintilian here pledges to carry forward Cicero’s avowed aim of searching for the ideal orator. This stance enables him both to continue Cicero’s project and to transform it. Cicero’s perfect orator is supposed to be a Platonic ideal apprehensible by thought and mind. Quintilian, by contrast, insists that the perfect orator may someday exist and makes it his mission to help bring him into being. In this way, Quintilian at once affirms Cicero’s project, continuing his

---

48 Austin 1948 ad loc. links this passage with Cic. orat. 7: *Atque ego in summo oratore fingendo talem informabo qualis fortasse nemo fuit. Non enim quaero quis fuerit, sed quid sit illud, quo nihil esse possit praestantius, quod in perpetuitate dicendi non saepe atque haud scio an numquam, in aliqua autem parte eluceat aliquando, idem apud alios densius, apud alios fortasse rarius.* Latin text of the *Orator* is from A.S. Wilkins’ 1903 OCT.

49 Cf. Logie 2003, 368–373 for Quintilian’s belief that he is an original author in his own right.

50 Cic. orat. 8: *Quod neque oculis neque auribus neque ullo sensu percipi potest, cogitatione tantum et mente complectimur.*

51 See for instance Quint. 12.1.25 and 12.1.31: *Nam si natura non prohibet et esse virum bonum et esse dicendi peritum, cur non aliquid etiam unus utrumque consequi posset? Cur autem non se quisque speret fore illum aliquem?*
quest and transmitting Cicero's textual, personal, and philosophical legacy, and incorporates Cicero into an enterprise very much his own.\footnote{Cf. Dugan 2005, 332 (cited below) for Quintilian's transmission of the Ciceronian legacy. For a summary of the general scholarly sense that Quintilian lacked originality and a compelling argument in defense of Quintilian's "aspirations toward an originary and proprietary authorship", cf. Logie 2003, 371. Along these lines, Winterbottom 1964 writes that "it is clear that Quintilian realized that he was innovating" (90), while Kennedy 1969 downplays Quintilian's originality but still admits that "no Roman writer puts quite so much emphasis on the moral character of the orator" as Quintilian (123).}

It is in light of Quintilian's simultaneous identification with Cicero and self-differentiation from him that the prologue of Book 12 needs to be read. As Quintilian's young orator finishes his training in the schools of the rhetor and prepares to navigate for himself, Quintilian, claiming to feel overwhelmed by the immensity of the task he has undertaken, introduces an extended nautical image (12.3–4):

Nunc “caelum undique et undique pontus”. Unum modo in illa immensa vastitate cernere videmur M. Tullium, qui tamen ipse, quamvis tanta atque ita instructa nave hoc mare ingressus, contrahit vela inhibetque remos et de ipso demum genere dicendi quo sit usurus perfectus orator satis habet dicere. At nostra temeritas etiam mores ei conabitudinem dare et ad-signabit officia.

Now "sky on all sides and on all sides the swell". Only one person do I seem to pick out in that boundless waste, Marcus Tullius, and even he himself, although he has entered upon this sea with such a great and well-outfitted ship, draws in his sails and restrains his oars and considers it sufficient to discuss only that style of speaking which the perfect orator will use. But my own rashness will try to give the orator principles of character as well and will assign him duties.

Quintilian uses nautical imagery to illustrate his own authorial role vis-à-vis the accomplishments of other authors, and especially of Cicero.\footnote{Ibid. (Kennedy). Curtius 1953, 128–129 gives a neat (though not exhaustive) catalogue of nautical imagery that serves a programmatic purpose in Latin poetry and prose. In addition to Vergil, Horace, Ovid, Propertius, and Statius, he mentions Cic. \textit{Tusc}.4.5.9 and the Quintilian passage we are examining here (129). For the Greek roots of nautical imagery in lyric poetry (within a larger discussion of Horace), cf. Cucchiarelli 2015.} The vast expanse of sea represents the panorama of oratorical achievement open to the rhetorical theorist. Most writers of rhetorical manuals hug the shore (12.2) and in the more technical parts of his treatise Quintilian's was one more boat in their midst.\footnote{Quint. 12. \textit{pr}. 2–3.}

Numbers thin as the subject matter shifts to the \textit{ratio eloquendi} and Quintilian realizes that he is one of the first to venture so far from port. It is at this point...
that Quintilian envisions Cicero’s boat, stark against the watery waste. Cicero has
advanced far into open sea where no others have sailed before, and to a great
degree he has established the trajectory of the ideal-oratorical project. But Cicero
stops short (contrahit vela inhibetque remos), discussing only the style of the per-
fect orator (de ipso demum genere dicendi quo sit usurus perfectus orator).
Quintilian is the one who will press onwards, beyond Cicero, to outline the orator’s
moral characteristics and responsibilities. In this stretch of sea Quintilian has
no antecedens and must establish his own course (12.3).

This passage is emblematic both of Quintilian’s veneration for Cicero and of
his own authorial self-fashioning in the Ciceronian tradition. In both the defense
of Cicero in 12.1 and in the nautical prologue of Institutio 12, Cicero is part of a
project that is distinctively Quintilian’s: the making of the vir bonus dicendi per-
itus. At the same time, Quintilian’s project is uniquely shaped by Cicero’s con-
cerns and imprinted with his image. Sailing beyond Cicero on a course that Ci-
cero himself established is Quintilian’s way of signaling his authorial expansion
upon Cicero’s legacy. In so doing, he pays the ultimate tribute to the Ciceronian
legacy as a dynamic, ever-evolving enterprise, the paradox of which is that the
very act of surpassing Cicero is quintessentially Ciceronian.

---

55 Quintilian is referring to Cicero’s Orator, which emphasizes the genera dicendi that the ideal
orator will have mastered (e.g., 100–101).

56 As Dugan 2005 explains, Quintilian’s portrayal of Cicero as an oratorical exemplar “fulfills
the terms in which Cicero first conceived of his program of self-fashioning in the Pro Archia: an
image of himself that would abide within Roman cultural memory and transmit his legacy far
into posterity” (332).

SECTION II: Cicero’s Exemplarity
Giuseppe La Bua

_Homo novus_ and _nobilis_: Cicero and the formation of the ‘modern’ aristocracy

1 Introduction

Cicero’s _novitas_, “newness”, is well known to have had a significant influence on the creation of the portrait of the republican orator and statesman and its propagation throughout the centuries. Conscious of what being a _novus homo_ meant in the turbulent years of the late Republic, Cicero tried to overcome his lack of famous ancestors by devising a strategy of self-advertisement and political advancement based on the exercise of personal virtues. Modern scholarship has long investigated the dichotomy between _nobilis_ and _homo novus_, concentrating on Roman _nobilitas_, the class struggle and the role played by new men in Roman history and society.¹ The excellent book of Henriette van der Blom has shed light on Cicero’s discourse of _novitas_ and his exploitation of historical and personal _exempla_ to build up his public image of perfect orator and politician.² Less attention has been paid to the impact exercised by Cicero _homo novus_ on the birth and development of bourgeois values in later centuries.³ This paper revisits the role played by Cicero _homo novus_ in the creation of a new ideal of nobility and argues that the status of Cicero as new man and new _nobilis_ effected later reflections on human dignity and nobility throughout the Middle Ages and the Early Italian Renaissance. It starts by paying attention to Velleius Paterculus’ celebration of the _homines novi_ (2.126 – 130). As Velleius demonstrates, alongside Marius, the bearer and interpreter of the new ideology of leadership, as he displays himself in Sallust’s fictional speech delivered before the Roman people after his election to consulship (Sall. _Iug._ 85),⁴ Cicero was held as the most representative example of political and rhetorical excellence, making up for his lack of ancestors by personal merits. Then, it considers later receptions of Cicero’s newness and the political re-use of Cicero’s self-portrait as _homo novus_ over the centuries. To

¹ Wiseman 1971; Burckhardt 1990; see also Shackleton Bailey 1986; Günther 2006; van der Blom 2010. On Cicero’s self-portrait as _homo novus_ in his oratorical and rhetorical works, see Dugan 2005 (also Bishop 2019, 3 – 7). For the integration of men of municipal origins into the political system of the late Republic, see Santangelo 2019.
² Van der Blom 2010.
³ Van der Blom 2018 (on Cicero _homo novus_ in the early imperial period).
⁴ On Marius’ speech in Sallust, see Yakobson 2014.
later generations Cicero was a figure of politician immediately associated to the
notion of novitas and nobilitas attainable through moral virtues. Later biogra-
phers and intellectuals elaborated on the figure of Cicero, seen as the unsur-
passed model of political man acting for the conservation of the res publica
by virtus and ingenium. Cicero’s successful strategy for political and social ad-
vancement challenged the public perception of nobilitas. What is most impor-
tant, Cicero homo novus set up a model of credible politician, an exemplum to
be followed and imitated by others.

2 Velleius on Cicero as Icon of nobilitas

In the so-called “Tiberian narrative”, the presentation of Tiberius’ reign which
occupies a large portion of the second book of his compendium of Roman his-
tory, Velleius Paterculus pays tribute to the homines novi of the past offered as
exempla for new men longing for an active role in Roman political life (2.126–
130). In moralistic, Sallustian tones, Vellius expands on the nobilitas of homines
novi, “new men” attaining honors through virtus, and celebrates Sejanus, raised
to the rank of adiutor imperii, power assistant, as a paradigm of morality, a man
neutralizing his lack of noble origins by personal merits. Within a general inter-
pretation of human and Roman history in ethical terms, Vellius places emphasis
on the virtus of the novi cooperating with the princeps in consolidating imperial
power and points to the interrelationship between morality and politics as cru-
cial to peace and political stability. In reminding his readers of the traditional,
deep-rooted contest between patricians and new men in early and late Republic,
he also endorses the equation of “noble man” and “best man”, a trait regarded
as characteristic of the ideal statesman. Velleius’ passage reads as follows
(2.128.1–4):

In huius virtutum aestimatione iam pridem iudicia civitatis cum iudiciis principis certant;
neque novus hic mos senatus populeque Romani est putandi, quod optimum sit, esse no-
bilissimum. Nam et illi qui ante bellum Punicum abhinc annos trecentos Ti. Coruncanium,

5 Woodman 1977, 234.
6 For the portrait of Sejanus in Velleius, see Schmitzer 2000, 263–286.
7 Giazzi 2015 (on exemplarity and morality in Velleius’ historiography). For Velleius’ celebration
of Roman values (especially in the praise of Tiberius’ reign at 2.126.2–4), see Schmitzer 2011. A
good discussion of virtus in Velleius’ history is now in Balmaceda 2017, 129–156.
8 Woodman 1977, 256.
9 On this passage, see Woodman 1977, 255–262. For Velleius’ use of pragmatic explanations
based on historical exempla, see Marincola 2011, 131–132.

In the value set upon the character of this man, the judgment of the whole state has long vied with that of the emperor. Nor is it a new fashion on the part of the Senate and the Roman people to regard as most noble that which is best. For the Romans who, three centuries ago, in the days before the Punic war, raised Tiberius Coruncanius, a “new man”, to the first position in the state, not only bestowing on him all the other honours but the office of pontifex maximus as well; and those who elevated to consulships, censorships, and triumphs Spurius Carvilius, though born of equestrian rank, and soon afterwards Marcus Cato, though a new man and not a native of the city but from Tusculum, and Mummius, who triumphed over Achaia; and those who regarded Gaius Marius, though of obscure origin, as unquestionably the first man of the Roman name until his sixth consulship; and those who yielded such honours to Marcus Tullius that on his recommendation he could secure positions of importance almost for anyone he chose; and those who refused no honour to Asinius Pollio, honours which could only be earned, even by the noblest by sweat and toil – all these assuredly felt that the highest honours should be paid to the man of merit. It was but the natural following of precedent that impelled Caesar to put Sejanus to the test, and that Sejanus was induced to assist the emperor with his burdens, and that brought the Senate and the Roman people to the point where they were ready to summon for the preservation of its security the man whom they regarded as the most useful instrument.¹⁰

The praise of Sejanus – and his famous predecessors – stems from a moral re-visitiation of the notion of nobilitas. Velleius breaks with the obsolescent category of nobility as associated to ancestry or noble lineage. The “most noble” is “the best”, quod optimum sit, esse nobilissimum:¹¹ reformulating a key concept of Marius’ political manifesto, as it is illustrated in Sallust’s celebrated speech,¹² and

---

¹¹ On this sententia and a brief excursus on the contrast between “the traditional nobilitas of the nobiles, dependent upon genus, and the nobilitas of the novi homines, attainable through virtus”, see Woodman 1977, 256–58.
¹² Cf. Sal. Iug. 85.13: Quamquam ego naturam unam et communem omnium existimo, sed fortissimum quemquam generosissimum (“To be sure, I personally believe that all men have one and the same nature, but that the bravest is of the best stock”); cf. also 85.17: Quod si iure me des-
following a tradition which links novitas with virtus. Velleius demonstrates the vitality of a political system founded on the replication of the ancestral moral virtues and calls to mind new men of the past who have ascended the cursus honorum because of their moral and political virtues. Tiberius Coruncanius, Spurius Servilius, Cato, Mummius, Marius and, at the top of the list, the couple Cicero-Asinius Pollio, the first one eulogized as the politician acting on behalf of his fellow-citizens and clients, the second one exalted as a model of morality: all of them are presented as men achieving nobility by means of those virtues that render a Roman citizen a vir bonus, a true, good Roman citizen and, above all, a “true noble”.

Whatever the purpose of Velleius’ praise of the novi, what matters here is that the Roman historian shows interest in portraying the ideal statesman, legitimated to power by labor and industria, opersity and diligence, whose status of authority emanates from moral and intellectual qualities. For Velleius virtus is “something personal, not a prerogative or an attribute of a social class”. The Roman historian dreams of a restoration of the ancient customs and forms of the early Republic (2.89.3 prisca illa et antiqua rei publicae forma revocata).

In trying to harmonize the idealized morality of the ancestors with new forms of political behavior, Velleius gets rid of the stereotyped image of nobility as exclusive to high-born individuals and pushes forward a new, reinvigorated idea of aristocracy. Virtus is a unifying concept in Roman history; it connects the “imperial present with the republican past”. Models of political excellence, the “new men” play a key role in the creation of a political system in which the traditional antithesis between nobiles and homines novi is annihilated by virtus. Marius, the first, notable example of homo novus attaining consulship because of his merits,
Cicero and Asinius Pollio testify to the centrality of \textit{virtus} to the intellectual and moral formation of the individual.\textsuperscript{20}

It might be tempting to say that, by claiming superiority on moral grounds and providing examples of men compensating the disadvantages of \textit{novitas} by personal qualities, Velleius subscribes to a progressive, revolutionary ideology. Yet the historian does not aim to subvert ancient Republican institutions. He sees Roman history as a continuum and interprets the advent of the principate as the final point of a long historical process in which \textit{virtus} occupies a central place. For Velleius, the \textit{novi}, like Sejanus (and himself), may contribute to the realization of the ideal Roman state, intended as “a stage for \textit{virtus}”.\textsuperscript{21} Velleius’ archetypical new man acts for the safety of Roman citizens and the restoration of the ancient Roman values. He ennobles his \textit{novitas} because of his personal \textit{virtues}. From this perspective Cicero \textit{homo novus}, the republican orator and statesman who downplayed the importance of ancestry and preserved the republican institutions by \textit{virtus} and loyalty, incarnates the values and ideology of “modern” nobility. Velleius’ celebration of Cicero’s consulship and the suppression of the Catilinarian conspiracy is an eloquent passage (2.34.3–4):

\begin{quote}
Per haec tempora M. Cicero, qui omnia incrementa sua sibi debuit, vir novitatis nobilissimae et ut vita clarus, ita ingenio maximus, quique efectit, ne quorum arma viceramus, eorum ingenio vinceremur, consul Sergii Catilinae Lentulique et Cethegi et aliorum utriusque ordinis virorum coniurationem singularem virtute, constantia, vigilia curaque aperuit. [4.]

Catilina metu consularis imperi urbe pulsus est; Lentulus consularis et praetor iterum Cethegusque et alii clari nominis viri auctore senatu, iussu consulis in carcere necati sunt.
\end{quote}

At this time, the conspiracy of Sergius Catiline, Lentulus, Cethegus, and other men of both the equestrian and senatorial orders was detected by the extraordinary courage, firmness, and careful vigilance of the consul Marcus Cicero, a man who owed his elevation wholly to himself, who had ennobled his lowly birth, who was as distinguished in his life as he was great in genius, and who saved us from being vanquished in intellectual accomplishments by those whom we had vanquished in arms. Catiline was driven from the city by fear of the authority of the consul; Lentulus, a man of consular rank and twice a praetor, Cethegus, and other men of illustrious family were put to death in prison on the order of the consul, supported by the authority of the senate.

Opposing members of illustrious family Cicero ennobled his \textit{novitas} by displaying his powerful \textit{ingenium} and his extraordinary political abilities.\textsuperscript{22} Velleius

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{20} Brescia 2011. On Velleius’ designation of Marius as \textit{Romani nominis princeps} and the re-establishment of the notion of Roman identity as crucial to the conservation of the \textit{res publica}, see Cowan 2011.
\textsuperscript{21} Balmaceda 2017, 156.
\textsuperscript{22} Keeline 2018, 162–163.
\end{flushright}
homo novus looks at Cicero as a symbol of a political system in which moral rectitude and natural talents represent the real key to success. This celebration of Cicero’s novitas sheds also light on the conclusion of Velleius’ passage, in which the Roman historian illustrates Tiberius’ politics and points to the notion of natural ‘imitation’ of the best examples (naturalis imitatio) as fundamental to the princeps’ choice to invest his assistant with special powers. Sejanus, like his past, illustrious antecedents, is seen as an outstanding example of notable virtue; he embodies the supremacy of good intellect over the traditional equation of aristocratic origins and morality. And, in turn, by valorizing ingenium and natural skills in opposition to family traditions and achievements the optimus princeps acts as an exemplum to be followed by others. To put it in different terms, Velleius encourages Tiberius to adopt and propose a policy promoting moral and political excellence.

3 Becoming a ‘new man’ and a good politician

As we have seen, by endorsing Cicero’s redefinition of his own newness, Velleius, a devoted admirer of the republican orator, contributed to create the image of the ideal statesman, compensating for his novitas through the construction – and propagation – of a public persona. Cicero’s self-fashioning, as both homo novus and ideal politician, his life and, above all, his political triumphs served as proof of how ingenium, good intellect, and bene facta, good deeds, could lead men of humble origins to the acquisition of a status of authority within Roman élite society. Cicero’s auctoritas also provided later generations with a powerful example of political behaviour to be adopted by other new men. As Gruen notes, “Cicero was a novus homo, but no ordinary novus homo”. Cicero’s astonishing achievements acted as a stimulus and encouragement for men lacking aris-

23 Cf. also the eulogistic portrait of Agrippa at 2.96.1: Mors deinde Agrippae, qui novitatem suam multis rebus nobilitaverat (“Then occurred the death of Agrippa. Though a new man he had by his many achievements brought distinction upon his obscure birth”). See Woodman 1983, 198–199; Wiegand 2013, 137.
24 On the portrait of Sejanus in Velleius, “a guarded praise” and “more a defense of Tiberius than a panegyric for Sejanus”, see Marincola 2011, 132 (and n. 38 for further bibliography).
25 Vell. 2.126.3: Nam recte facere cives suos princeps optimus faciendo docet, cumque sit imperio maximus, exemplo maiore est (“For the best of emperors teaches his citizens to do right by doing it, and though he is greatest among us in authority, he is still greater in the example which he sets”).
26 Cf. Vell. 2.66.4–5, for the celebration of Cicero’s intellect and eloquence: see Woodman 1983, 144–155; Schmitzer 2000, 184–189.
tocratic origins and “a new generation of aspiring orators also found Cicero attractive”.27

In presenting himself as an example of nobilissima novitas, a new man capable of contesting traditional nobilitas and achieving political and rhetorical success by his merits, Cicero provided his fellow-citizens and generations to come with a modern figure of statesman. He embodied an idea of nobility depended upon the exercise of virtus. It is well known that Cicero aspired to become a model of Latin prose, the center of an educational program founded on the knowledge of good Latin.28 At the same time, Cicero longed to be the supreme model of homo novus and “best man”, the true nobilis achieving success through moral virtues and political abilities. Novitas and nobilitas were catchwords in Cicero. He placed himself at the very outset of a tradition that regarded intellect and personal skills as crucial to social and political success.

As expected, Cicero’s newness and his self-fashioning as novus nobilis were major targets for criticism and condemnation from political enemies, as Cicero himself makes it clear on several occasions.29 Not only during his lifetime, but also (and much more) after his assassination Cicero’s self-construction as homo novus – and his revolutionary idea of nobilitas – ignited fierce debate on the notion of Romanitas, at the same time eliciting reflections on issues of cultural identity and the (violent) transition from the Republic to the principate.30 Cicero, as both a man and politician, was a very controversial figure. Later responses to Cicero oscillated between praise and blame, as clearly showed by recent studies.31 Cicero’s rhetoric of newness was a key topic in later presentations of his political image. Additionally, it should be noted that the flexibility of the term nobilitas and the related ambiguity in its ideological and political use had consequences on the creation of a new, “Ciceronian” ideology of novitas. Seneca the Younger, fluctuating between deprecation of genealogical connections as guarantees of nobility (epp. 44; 76; Ben. 3.28) and praise of nobilitas as emanation of past aristocracy (Ben. 4.30.1),32 shows how unstable the relationship between past and present, morality and politics, continued to be still in the early imperial times.

28 La Bua 2019, 125–162.
29 On Cicero’s deployment of the term homo novus and nobilis in his speeches and the rhetorical-political manipulation of the notion of novitas, see van der Blom 2010, 35–59.
30 Dench 2013, 130–134.
31 Gowing 2013; see also La Bua 2019, 100–112.
32 Costa 2012.
Starting with the pseudo-Sallustian *Invectiva in Ciceronem* ([Sall.] *Inv.* 4.1), a text originated in the declamatory classrooms, it is easy to see that Cicero’s self-promotion as consul and *homo novus* represented a favorite theme of the anti-Ciceronian propaganda.\(^{33}\) Controversy raged over Cicero “new man” reaching the summit of *cursus honorum* with his consulship. Polemically labelled *peregrinus* (“foreign”, a new man from Arpinum), Cicero was constantly referred to as a “non-Roman”, a man *accitus* (“imported from abroad”) and aspiring to become a new “king” of Rome.\(^{34}\) Without claiming, in a few lines, to trace the history of the ancient diatribe over Cicero’s *novitas*, it is sufficient here to draw attention to Juvenal’ *Satire* 8, a celebration of Cicero’s ideology of *novitas* built upon the antithesis between Cicero and Catiline and the exemplary contrast between the unworthy noble and the worthy non-noble. Defined as a sort of compendium of earlier treatments of the theme of the nature of true nobility,\(^{35}\) the satire describes Cicero’s triumph over the noble conspirators and culminates in a comparison between Cicero’s *toga* and Octavian Augustus’ warfare (8.231–44):\(^{36}\)

Quid, Catilina, tuis natalibus atque Cethegi
inveniet quisquam sublimius? arma tamen vos
nocturna et flammas domibus templisque paratis,
ut bracatorum pueri Senonumque minores,
aus quod liceat tunica punire molesta.
Sed vigilat consul vexillaque vestra coercet.
hic novus Arpinas, ignobilis et modo Romae
municipalis eques, galeatum ponit ubique
praesidium attonitis et in omni monte laborat.
tantum igitur muro intra toga contulit illi
nominis ac tituli, quantum in Leucade, quantum
Thessaliae campis Octavius abstulit udo
caedibus adsiduis gladio; sed Roma parentem,
Roma patrem patriae Ciceronem libera dixit.

What ancestry more exalted than yours, Catiline, or that of Cethegus can be found? Yet you plotted to attack homes and temples at night and set them on fire, like the sons of trousered Gauls and descendants of the Senones, committing an outrage which could lawfully be punished by the uncomfortable shirt. But the consul is alert; he halts your banners. He – a new man from Arpinum, of humble origin, a municipal knight new to Rome – posts helmeted troops all around to protect the terrified people and is busy on every hill. So, with-

\(^{33}\) Cf. also Asc. 93.25C-94.6C (with the commentary of Lewis 2006, 304); schol. Bob. 80.11–23 Stangl.

\(^{34}\) [Sall.] *Inv.* 1; cf. also Sall. *Cat.* 31.7 (for the use of the term *inquilinus civis urbis Romae*). See Keeline 2018, 152–158.

\(^{35}\) Braund 1988, 98 (122–29, for a list of ancient sources on the theme of true nobility).

\(^{36}\) On Juvenal’s passage, see Di Matteo 2014, 241–252. See also Courtney 1980, 368–369.
out stepping outside the walls, his peacetime toga brought him as much titled distinction as Octavius grabbed for himself at Leucas and on the fields of Thessaly with his sword wet from nonstop slaughter. The difference is that Rome was still free when she called Cicero the Parent and Father of his Native Land.37

In the form of rhetorical suasoria, Juvenal mocks the degeneracy of contemporary nobilitas and encourages Ponticus, the addressee of the satire and a representative of aristocrats’ vanity, to follow the illustrious example of Cicero. The satirical target is obviously the idea of nobility founded on aristocratic origins.38 Cicero’s remarkable achievements, his strenuous defence of the free res publica against Catiline’s and Cethegus’ conspiracy, illustrate the very nature of true nobility. Cicero homo novus has been given the title of parens and pater patriae, “Father of Fatherland”, thanks to his virtus.39 Positioning himself at the end of a long process of historical revisitation of the ideology of novitas, Juvenal satirizes and makes fun of nobles claiming privileges and supremacy on blue-blooded origins and offers Cicero as undisputable example of true nobilitas, a man facing up to the absence of noble ancestors by his unsurpassed moral and political qualities.

Juvenal’s hyperbolical and sarcastic description of the vacuous symbols (stemmata) of the nobles is far from being a moralistic attack (in Senecan terms) against the contemporary decadence of Roman aristocratic society. However ironic it might be, the satirist’s praise of Cicero as a paradigm of nobilitas is of the greatest significance to our discussion. With his eulogistic presentation of Cicero homo novus and consul Juvenal contributes to the formation of a new humanism, political and social at the same time, centered on the notion of true nobility as dependent upon virtus. As has been noted, from the early imperial times onwards intellectuals and philosophers elaborated on the image of Cicero homo novus who created his own persona of true noble through a literary process of self-fashioning and self-configuration. A new canon of “new men” and “noble men”, not limited to politicians, was established upon Cicero as model. Seneca the Younger, Tacitus, Paulus, and Augustine, are all good examples of men experiencing an ‘anthropological transformation’ and fashioning themselves as men of virtue. If it is true that “Cicero’s self-presentation as a homo novus simply lost out in the competition with Cicero’s exemplarity as an orator and a philoso-

38 On Juvenal’s humorous depiction of the contemporary aristocrats, see Fredericks 1971.
39 For a parodic approach to Cicero’s figure, especially in the allusions to the apologetic poem De consulatu suo, see Winkler 1988, 86–87. See also Uden 2015, 126–128.
pher”, it is an undeniable fact that Cicero’s rhetoric of newness, his aspiration to be a model of new man and new noble putting his qualities at the service of the community, had a profound impact on the formation of new political classes and the creation of a modern idea of *nobilitas*.

### 4 Cicero *homo novus* in the Middle Ages and the Early Italian Renaissance

It is a well-known fact that the 13th and 14th centuries witnessed a revival of interest in Cicero’s writings, his philosophical and political treatises, regarded and used as handbooks, instruction manuals for men seeking for an active role in social and political life. Cicero’s ideal of the *otium cum dignitate* was a key point of what has been called the Roman civic spirit in the Early Italian Renaissance. As Baron explains, “in the second half of the thirteenth and during the fourteenth century the civic world of the Italian city-states came to the fore in European culture, and in this civic world Cicero was soon to become a most important guide in moral life, as he had been in the monastic humanism of the twelfth century”.

This resurgence of interest in Cicero’s political works was not separated from a renovated attention to the biography of the man from Arpinum. As recently noted, we do not know of biographical works on Cicero in the medieval times and limited information about the life of the orator were usually included in the medieval *accessus*, introductions to Cicero’s texts in the manuscripts. Celebrated as a cultural figure and teacher of virtue, as it can be seen in the mid-13th century *Speculum historiale* of Vincent de Beauvais, Cicero as a man was of little or even of no interest for intellectuals concerned with the moral education of young readers. The first, significant change of perspective seems to occur in the early fourteenth century with the anonymous epitome of Cicero’s life, titled *Epithoma* de vita gestis scientie prestancia et libris ac fine viri clarissimi et illustris Marchi Tullii Ciceronis, a biography prefaced to a consistent collection of Cicero’s philosophical and rhetorical works in the Troyes manuscript (Troyes, Bibl. Mun., ms. 552, ff. 120r-122v), probably written around 1330 and containing marginalia.

---

40 Van der Blom 2018, 287.
41 Baron 1938, 84.
42 Cook 2009.
43 Cook 2009, 349–351.
from the hand of Petrarch (who acquired the manuscript in the early 1340s). From its very outset the unidentified composer attracts attention to Cicero’s Novitas, compensated by the power of intellect, and indicates Sallustius as his source (f. 120r):

Marcus Tullius Cicero Arpinas equestris ordinis et matre Elvia ex regione Volsorum ortus est ut tradit Eusebius in cronicis. In commentis habetur quod pater ex equestri ordine ac regione prefata faber ferraius fuit. Unde Salustius dicit eum fuisse hominem novum hoc est infimi generis et quamquam in scolis pauperimus sua tamen sapientia patris inopiam superavit adeoque bone indolis extitit ut quod nulli plebeio erat licitum ipse sibi acquisiverit proprium, scilicet quod inter filios nobilium liberales didicit artes.

Tullius Cicero, man from Arpinum, knight, was born from Helvia in the Volscian region, as Eusebius says in his chronicles. From fictional stories we know that his father, a knight from the same region, was a blacksmith. So, Sallust says that Cicero was a new man of humble origins; though the poorest in the school, he overcame his father’s lack of substance because of his knowledge. His character and qualities distinguished him from the others so that he obtained things and honours not permitted to the plebeians. He learned the liberal arts along with the sons of the nobles.

Again, echoing Sallust’s and Juvenal’s words, in the reconstruction of the Catilinarian conspiracy and the consulship the author of the epitome dwells on the traditional motif of the Invidia Ciceronis and reiterates the opposition between the conspirators, noble and morally depraved, and Cicero, non-noble and reaching the pinnacle of his political career because of his merits:


This was the reason by which Cicero was declared consul: when the execrable conspiracy planned by Catiline, man of noble origins filled with greatness of mind and body, though wicked and warmonger, and his followers was disclosed, the Roman people, whose resentment was stirred by this event, was eager to entrust the consulship to Cicero. In fact, before these many aristocrats were seething with jealousy; they thought that the consulship was polluted if a new man should attain it. But when danger was at hand and the conspiracy

---

44 Tilliette 2003, 1052; Cook 2009, 363.
45 My translation.
46 The words of the epitomator reproduce Sall. Cat. 23.
47 Tilliette 2003, 1066.
was disclosed, jealousy and pride took second place: Cicero and Antonius were elected consuls after regular assemblies.

Though partial and unsystematic in the assemblage of biographical materials, the epitome deserves credit for addressing significant questions of Cicero’s political life, his newness in primis. As Cook puts it, “the epitomator is on the track of recovering some of the most important information about Cicero and his day”. In trying to depict Cicero as a “living man”, not just as an abstraction or the personification of good eloquence, the anonymous author of the Troyes epitome brings to the fore issues that are critical to Cicero’s biographical tradition. For the first time since early empire, Cicero returns to be a historical figure, a man filled with ingenium who acted for the preservation of the republican institutions and embodied the ideals of the rising political class of the “new nobles”.

In addition to being a step forward the creation of a tradition of biographical studies on the figure di Cicero, the Troyes epitome was also of the greatest significance to Petrarch’s scholarly work. In correcting the errors contained in the epitome (as far as we know from the marginia in the manuscript) Petrarch filled some gaps in the tradition and took a stance on many critical questions in Cicero’s life. His reconstruction of Cicero’s life was fundamental to the formation of a new paideia and a modern cultural system founded on the preservation of the moral values of the past. Yet it should be remembered that for Petrarch Cicero was not a moral exemplum. The discovery of Cicero’s letters left Petrarch surprised and disappointed, as they illuminated Cicero’s internal contradictions and revealed his inability to practice a philosophical life. Similarly to what happened in the early empire criticism, Petrarch deplored Cicero’s involvement in the world of politics. Following Petrarch not a few humanists called into question Cicero’s personal deeds, within a larger debate about the superiority of the sage and philosopher over the man engaged in active political life.

Leonardo Bruni’s Cicero Novus, composed in 1413 as a reaction to Jacopo Angeli’s Latin translation of Plutarch’s Cicero, is the first modern biography of Cicero and may be regarded as a foundational moment in the recovery and rebirth of Cicero as a historical figure. In the footsteps of Brunetto Latini’s re-evaluation of Cicero, Bruni provided an entirely positive image of Cicero, dismissing censures of his personality as philosopher and statesman and stressing his de-

---

48 Cook 2009, 360.
50 Cook 2013.
51 On Bruni’s humanism and his historiography, see Fryde 1983, 33–53; Ianziti 2012.
votion to the ideal of the *concordia ordinum*. Tracing the development of Cicero’s life and political career, from the humble origins to the heroic death, Bruni considered the incident of the Catilinarian conspiracy as the zenith of Cicero’s fortune, as it was in this very occasion that the designed consul preserved the civic community from the tyrannical power. Not only in the *vita activa*, but also in the *vita contemplativa*, i.e., in philosophical and literary writings, Cicero was a man of outstanding and exceptional ability. To Bruni’s eyes, Cicero balanced the negative aspects of his later political life with the magnificence of his literary works. Quite eloquent are Bruni’s final considerations on the human and political history of the man from Arpinum, placed as a preface to the detailed description of Cicero’s literary output (p. 468 Viti):

Homo novus ad prodessendum hominibus vel in re publica vel in doctrina: siquidem in re publica patriam consul, et innumerables orator servavit. In doctrina vero et litteris non cibibus suis tantum sed plane omnibus qui latina utuntur lingua lumen eruditionis sapien-teque aperuit [...] Hic ad potestatem romani imperii dominam rerum humanarum eloquen-tiam adiunxit. Itaque non magis patrem patrie appellare ipsum convenit, quam parentem eloquii et litterarum nostrarum.

He was a man born to contribute to the safety of the people in both politics and learning, as he preserved the country as consul and saved many as orator. In learning as well as in literary studies he offered the light of erudition and science not only to his fellow-citizens but also to all those who use the Latin language. [...] To the Roman imperial power, he added eloquence that dominates all the human things. Thus, it is appropriate to call him the father of his country no less than the father of Roman eloquence and literature.⁵²

Bruni’s *Cicero* is a political hero. Reworking and rewriting Plutarch’s biography,⁵³ Bruni, a representative of civic humanism, distanced himself from the prevalent moralistic tones of the biographical tradition to concentrate on the impact of Cicero as a historical and political figure on the life of the modern *res publica*. As Ianziti notes, “whereas Plutarch had emphasized Cicero’s moral failings as the cause of his tragic downfall, Bruni built up a different picture. He chose to focus instead on Cicero’s skills in navigating the political turmoil that had marked the end of the Roman Republic.”⁵⁴ What emerges from Bruni’s socio-political and intellectual biography is the image of a man who dominated the political scene of Republican Rome by his eloquence and powerful *ingenium*. In Bruni’s Cicero we find the perfect synthesis of politics and culture, the incarnation of the ideal Renaissance humanist.

---

⁵² My translation.
⁵⁴ Ianziti 2012, 302.
Bruni paved the way for later receptions of Cicero as a political figure in the Humanistic Renaissance. From Bruni onwards Cicero was to become a paradigm of political man: his historical achievements stimulated discussions about the role of intellectuals and statesmen in human and socio-political life. Within this broader context it is interesting to evaluate the impact exercised by Cicero’s rhetoric of newness and nobilitas on the humanistic debate about the nature of true nobility, a central topic in the times of social and political transformations of the early modern state.\footnote{On the Quattrocento debate over nobility, see Rabil 1991 (also Rabil 1988, 3,288 – 291). See also Donati 1988 and Jorde 1995.} Touched upon by Boethius and treated by Dante and Boccaccio,\footnote{Boeth. cons. phil. 3.6; Dante convivio III, pr. IV; mon. II 3. Hastings 1975, 86.} the theme of nobility inspired the composition of De dignitatisibus by the fourteenth-century jurist Bartolo from Sassoferrato and the fictitious dialogue De nobilitate by Buonaccorso da Montemagno (c. 1428). In 1440 Poggio Bracciolini penned his De vera nobilitate (Poggii Florentini Ad Reverendissimum Patrem Dominum Cardinalem Cumanum Libellus De Vera Nobilitate), a neo-Ciceronian dialogue in which Niccolò Niccoli’s Platonic view on nobility as founded on the exercise of virtue and wisdom is compared and contrasted with Lorenzo de’ Medici’s ideology of nobility as resulting from ancestry, wealth and political virtues.\footnote{Edition: Canfora (D.) 2002. See Castelnuovo 2009; Finzi 2010 (also Jorde 1995, 77–91).} Again, the Stoics’ view of nobility relying on learning rather than lineage is the central idea of Cristoforo Landino’s Platonic dialogue De vera nobilitate, composed between 1485 and 1487.\footnote{Edition: Liaci 1970. On the role played by Landino in the debate, see Jorde 1995.}

To devote our attention to Poggio Bracciolini’s dialogue, a text patently embedded in the social-political life of the city-state, both the contenders support their arguments by relying on the ‘Cicero-paradigm’.\footnote{Finzi 2010, 342–348. See also Celenza 2017, 152–156. Jorde 1995, 78, notes that “die eigentliche Kontroverse zwischen Niccolò und Lorenzo ist nach Ciceros Vorbild in einen ansprechenden szenischen Rahmen eingebettet”.} Lorenzo de’ Medici, \textit{defensor} of the ideology of nobility as founded on the practical emulation of the virtues of the ancestors, celebrates Cicero (together with Marius) as example of man not ennobled by his origins but ennobling himself and his social class by his achievements: because of his deeds he paved the way for ennoblement of the equester ordo (principium generis nobilitandi), bestowing a legacy of virtues on his sons and generations to come (\textit{C. Marium et Marcum Tullium non nobilitavit genus, at hi suis filiiis, si paternam virtutem imitari voluissent, insignem nobilitatem reliquere}, § 35: 18 Canfora). Later, responding to Niccolò Niccoli who advances the abstract, Stoic ideal of nobility as based on the pure exercise of personal vir-
As demonstrated by the illustrious examples of Cato and Marius (§§ 66–67), Lorenzo elevates Cicero homo novus to nobilis and model worthy of emulation by exploiting a passage from the Pro Sextio (§ 136). Here Cicero’s encouragement to the young to emulate the noble deeds of the maiores serves Lorenzo’s ideology of true nobility as centered on the replication of the virtuous actions of the illustrious ancestors (§ 78):


In fact, no one can deny that the nobility of the ancestors is transferred into the young generations and notables can be defined those who have not yet displayed their virtues. This is what Cicero thinks when he says in the speech on behalf of Sestius: “I shall stir those of you young men who are notables to imitate your ancestors”. Cicero, the wisest man, believes that notables are also to be designed those who could not replicate the virtues of their ancestors because of their age. And – I will express my opinion – I prefer to designate notable the man who, endowed with virtues (even if small ones), can vaunt the best ancestors than the man who excels in every kind of virtue but is of humble origins.

In contrast to Niccoli, a representative of the class of pure intellectuals devoted to a contemplative life, Lorenzo is a man actively engaged in political life. He interprets nobility as a practical concept, a notion embracing different aspects of communal life. For Lorenzo, Cicero homo novus is a perfect example of man dominating Roman society and politics by his virtus. Yet Cicero’s rhetoric of newness is integrated into a system of bourgeois values in which the debate about the nature of true nobility is only a part of a more profound reflection about human nature and the role played by the “new nobles” in the modern society. Cicero becomes then the embodiment of a concrete ideal of nobilitas, not only restricted to virtus but also enlarged to include social connections, lineage, wealthy and orato-rical-political skills. He symbolizes the interrelationship between morality, ethics, and politics in the Italian Humanism and Renaissance. Most signifi-

60 Niccoli’s argument can be summarized in the declamatory sentence animus facit nobilem, cui ex quacumque conditione supra fortunam licet exurgere (§ 73).
61 My translation.
63 On politics and virtue in Renaissance Italy, see now Hankins 2019.
ly, the Italian humanists looked at Cicero as a model to be followed by aspiring orators and politicians. Imitation and emulation of the noble deeds of the ancestors were reputed to be crucial to the formation of the modern political thought. Through and by Cicero, paradigm of political and rhetorical excellence, the humanist movement developed a new, modern ideology of nobility founded on political and social virtus, i.e., the exercise of those virtues that contribute to the growth and expansion of the civic community.

5 Conclusion

To sum up, from the early Empire to the Italian Renaissance Cicero is an exemplary figure of new man and new noble. As a man and intellectual acquiring a status of prestige in the society by his innate moral and political virtues, he incarnates the spirit of the new, rising nobility. In the centuries that witnessed the transformation of the early modern city-state and the development of the modern political thought, Cicero was a key figure. His personal and political deeds, worthy to be imitated by would-to-be politicians, stimulated a heated debate about the role of men of humble origins in the formation of the modern society. What is most significant, Cicero was a model for later generations of homines novi. The portrait of the ideal statesman was a Ciceronian portrait, as can be seen in the new man Niccolò Machiavelli and his depiction of Castruccio Castracani. To move to more recent times, the rhetoric of Cicero’s newness and nobility had a profound impact on the creation of the modern democracy. The new men John Adams and Barack Obama demonstrate the vitality of Cicero’s legacy and the permanence of his image of politician promoting the idea of republic relying on freedom and social mobility, in which cultural and social barriers are broken by the divine and natural laws of virtus and ingenium.

64 Brescia 2011.
1 Introduction

The twelve late-antique Latin epigrams that are the subject of this chapter are not exactly well known.¹ Life is short, of course, but these poems are too, and if you are interested in Cicero’s afterlife, I would say that they are worth knowing about. The poems, twelve “epitaphs for Cicero”, are found today in the so-called Anthologia Latina. To be precise, our cycle comprises poems 603–614 in Alexander Riese’s second edition of the Anthologia Latina.² Indeed, the Anthologia Latina itself is not exactly well known, and you might be a bit fuzzy on what precisely it is. This is understandable: in antiquity there was no such thing. The Latin Anthology did not exist. What today we call the Latin Anthology is just a collection of short Latin poems found in various sources, compiled gradually from the Renaissance onwards, that, as Michael D. Reeve has put it, “have no better home”.³ In the eighteenth century Pieter Burmann the Younger printed a vast amount of such material in his Anthologia Veterum Latinorum Epigrammatum et Poematum, and the name Anthologia stuck.⁴ The collection assumed its canonical form toward the end of the nineteenth century in Riese’s multi-part second edition, that is, the one in which our poems are numbers 603–614.

These twelve epitaphs for Cicero are actually part of a larger artistic whole. They are only one of twelve cycles on various themes, each generally comprising twelve poems (the eleventh and twelfth cycles have only eleven poems apiece):

¹ For helpful comments on and discussion of this chapter I thank Yelena Baraz, Shane Butler, Kathy Coleman, Bob Kaster, Joanna Kenty, John Ramsey, Matt Roller, Andrew Sillett, Catherine Steel, and all the participants at the Ritratti di Cicerone – Portraying Cicero conference as well as an audience at Johns Hopkins University. Special thanks to Francesca Romana Berno and Giuseppe La Bua for organizing the conference and for shepherding this volume to publication.
² Riese 1894; the full text of the poems, following the edition of Friedrich 2002, is given as an appendix to this paper. As a side note, Cicero is otherwise rare in late-antique epigrams (Friedrich 2002, 215), and he is the subject of no poem in the Carmina Latina Epigraphica. In Riese’s edition of the Anthologia Latina he seems to feature elsewhere only in 784–785 (the latter attributed to Augustine; both doubtless for manuscripts of De officiis, their subject). Oko 1932, 79–83 collects a few much later Ciceronian epitaphs.
³ OCD s.v. Anthologia Latina: “a modern invention gradually created in print [...] gathers poems mostly short that have no better home. Riese’s arrangement by date of attestation has fewest drawbacks”.
⁴ Burmann 1759–1773.
1. Monosticha de ratione tabulae senis verbis et litteris
2. Epitaphia P. Vergilii Maronis disticha
3. Disticha de unda et speculo
4. Disticha de glaciali aqua
5. Tristicha de arcu caeli
6. Tetrasticha de Vergilio
7. Tetrasticha de quattuor temporibus anni
8. Tetrasticha de aurora et sole
9. Pentasticha de duodecim libris Aeneidos
10. Hexasticha de titulo Ciceronis
11. Hexasticha de duodecim signis
12. Polysticha

In addition to twelve epitaphs for Cicero, we get twenty-four for Vergil – two twelve-poem cycles, one of distichs and one of tetrastichs – along with a twelve-poem paraphrase of the Aeneid, one poem per book. Not all is literature: the first cycle consists of twelve single hexameters on the theme of some sort of board game, each hexameter consisting of six words, and each word consisting of six letters. So, for example, Sap. 3:5

Lusuri nummos animos quoque poner ed ebent.

Those going to lay down money on a game ought to lay down their emotions too.6

From such formal showpieces we move to topics like frozen water, rainbows, and astrological signs.

It is quite a medley, and at one time it was quite a popular one: the manuscript tradition of these twelve poetic cycles is large and complex and still not entirely sorted out.7 In the manuscripts the individual poems are ascribed to twelve individual authors, the Duodecim Sapientes (“twelve wise men”) – the number twelve is something of a Leitmotif here – but no one can find anything to distinguish the supposed authors. It seems much more likely that all these variations on a theme flow from one pen.8

In 2002, Anne Friedrich published a very useful commentary on these twelve cycles of poems. She suggested, relying primarily on a corrupt notice in a single manuscript and the testimony of Jerome, that these poems were written by Lac-

---

5 In this paper I have adopted the abbreviation and numeration of Friedrich 2002 for the Carmina XII Sapientum. Thus Sap. 3 = Anth. Lat. 497 R(iese).2
6 Translations are my own unless otherwise noted.
tantius, the *Cicero Christianus*,\(^9\) in the late third century AD, and that their notional context was a sort of “symposium”.\(^10\) The supposed symposiastic context would then account for the “missing” poems in the eleventh and twelfth cycles: it is a commonplace of such symposia that one guest either leaves or threatens to leave early.\(^11\) Friedrich’s hypothesis seems unprovable at best, although not entirely impossible.\(^12\) Regardless, the general timeframe seems right; these are late-antique verse compositions. Moreover, Lactantius was a noted *rhetor*, and whether the poems are his or not, they seem very likely to originate in a schoolroom context.\(^13\) They certainly fit well with the schoolroom tradition of Cicero’s reception that both Giuseppe La Bua and I have recently explored.\(^14\)

For the most part I will not discuss these poems as works of art in their own right, although I think that the collection’s poetic architecture and formal constraints do deserve some aesthetic appreciation. Instead, I want to probe what the twelve Cicero epitaphs tell us about Cicero himself and his later reception. I begin with something unexpected: the poems appear to give us a new piece of historical information about Cicero’s death – about his burial, actually. But I am skeptical. Then I consider how the poems treat certain common themes in Cicero’s reception: (1) his death, (2) his eloquence and literary immortality, and (3) his consulship. I am particularly interested in intertextual echoes and the possible sources that the poems were drawing on, because I think that they underscore the depth of the tradition underlying Cicero’s early reception. Lastly, I point out how these poems may occasionally contain echoes of anti-Augustan voices.

---


\(^10\) Friedrich 2002, 418–448 (symposium); 479–498 (Lactantius). In Vat. Lat. 4493, one poem (*Sap. 135 = Anth. Lat. 629 R*) is introduced as *CELII FIRMINIANI* (sic) *SIMPHOSII| DE FORTVNA.* Cf. Jer. *De vir. ill. 80 habemus eius (= Lactantii) Symposium, quod adolescens scrispit.* But Rosellini 2002, 113–123 has pointed out that the notice is only found in one MS, is placed at a random point in the collection, does not contain Lactantius’ actual name, gives no particular reason to construe *simphosii* as the title of the work as a whole – and a *Symphosius* also appears as the author of 100 *Aenigmata* transmitted in some of the same MSS that contain our poems (*Anth. Lat. 286 R*, on which see Leary 2014).


\(^12\) It has not met with general acceptance but has won some adherents (e.g. Felgentreu 2002: “with her assumption that the author probably was Lactantius [...] F[r]iedrich is on relatively firm ground”).


\(^14\) Keeline 2018; La Bua 2019.
2 Cicero’s Burial

We will begin with the “new” piece of historical information. The story of Cicero’s death was retold time and again in the ancient world.¹⁵ In the turbulent year and a half that followed Julius Caesar’s assassination, Cicero returned to political prominence, but he eventually fell afoul of Octavian, Antony, and Lepidus and was proscribed. On December 7, 43 BC, he was tracked down near his villa at Formiae and killed by henchmen of the triumvirate. In an infamous bit of savagery, his head and hands – or perhaps hand, singular – were chopped off and stuck up on the rostra.¹⁶ Other grisly stories recount what befell Cicero’s head afterwards: Antony kept it on his table while he ate (App. BC 4.20); Antony’s wife, Fulvia, used its celebrated tongue as a pin-cushion (Dio Cass. 47.8.4); it was thrown to the ground, blood-flecked white hairs and all, and trampled underfoot by a mob of depraved citizens (Severus ap. Sen. suas. 6.26.17–21). But what happened to the rest of Cicero’s body? Did Cicero’s butchers collect his corpse too? Or did it just lie there in the dust beside a lonely road near Formiae, left to rot as a feast for dogs and vultures? Our sources seem not to know or not to care. At any rate they do not say: Livy, Pollio, Velleius Paterculus, Valerius Maximus, Seneca the Elder’s declaimers, poets like Cornelius Severus, Martial, and Juvenal, Plutarch, Appian, Cassius Dio, Florus, Orosius – all keep silent.

But our late-antique cycle of Ciceronian epitaphs has something to say about Cicero’s body. Since they are gravestone epigrams, by generic necessity they talk about the body at rest under the purported tombstone. And so we read in the very first of these poems (sap. 109.1–2):

Hic iacet Arpinas manibus tumulatus amici,
qui fuit orator summus et eximius.

Here lies the man from Arpinum, who was once the greatest and the best of orators, laid to rest by the hands of a friend.

And who might this friend be? Several other poems in the cycle are kind enough to specify his name, Lamia. So: at Lamia ille pio subposuit tumulo (sap. 114.6) and

¹⁵ Sources include Sen. contr. 7.2, suas. 6 (esp. the historical fragments there cited, including Livy and Pollio), 7; Val. Max. 5.3.4; Mart. 3.66, 5.69; Tac. dial. 17; Juv. 10.114–132; Flor. 2.16; Plut. Cic. 46–49, Ant. 19.3, 20.2–4; App. BC 4.6, 19–20; Dio Cass. 47.8.3–4, 11.1–2; Liv. per. 120; Oros. 6.18.10–12; vir. ill. 80.1. See further Homeyer 1977; Roller 1997; Wright 2001; Keeline 2018, 102–146.
¹⁶ Butler 2002, 124 n. 2 collects the evidence for the “one hand or two” question; his book as a whole is a sensitive exploration of just why that hand was so important.
hoc Lamiae debet, quod iacet in tumulo (sap. 117.6) and inquitus hic Cicero est Lamiae pietate sepultus (sap. 120.1). Lamia's burying Cicero is simply treated as a known fact, although it seems not to have been known to scholarship until a short article by H. H. Davis in 1958, and I think it is safe to say that it is still not widely known.

These poems also tell us, in effect, that Cicero was cremated before burial, because his remains can be held by a “little urn” (sap. 113.1–2):¹

Marcus eram Cicero toto notissimus orbe,
cuius relliquias occulit urna brevis.

Once I was Marcus Cicero, of unmatched renown through the whole world. Now this small urn conceals my remains.

Cremation before burial was standard in the late Republic,¹⁸ and so there is no surprise here. But who was this Lamia fellow? Something is known about a Lamia who fits the circumstances quite well. Suspiciously well. All too well. Although the few scholars who have taken note of this story treat it as a historical fact, I think that in Lamia we see the invention of a tradition.¹⁹ Just as Matthew Roller and Andrew Wright have shown that Cicero's supposed killer, a man named Popillius whom he allegedly once defended against a charge of parricide, is a declamatory fiction, I suggest that we can see a similar fiction in Lamia.²⁰ He was a colorful figure inserted into the story of Cicero's death to fill a gap.

What do we know about Lamia? Horace tells us that the Aelii Lamiae come from Formiae, the area where Cicero died (carm. 3.17.1–9):

Aelii vetusto nobilis ab Lamo –
quando et priores hinc Lamias ferunt
denominatos et nepotum
per memores genus omne fastus
auctore ab illo ducit originem,

¹ The “little urn” (urna brevis) may be an echo of Ovid's tr. 3.3.65 ossa tamen facito parva referantur in urna, which precedes Ovid's own verse epitaph (cf. too am. 3.9.39–40: Iacet, ecce, Tibullus: | vix manet et toto parva quod urna capiit?). Ovidian echoes are possible in quite a few of these poems (cf. e.g. sap. 118.4, virtute ingenii venit in astra sui – Ov. fast. 3.808, meritis venit in astra suis), but I will not generally have the space to treat them here: for more see Friedrich 2002, 524 (her index s.v. Ovid).

¹⁸ Hope 2009, 81–84.


The Lamia of Horace’s Odes, as it happens, seems to have been the son of a man Cicero was on good terms with, Lucius Aelius Lamia.\textsuperscript{21} This Lamia had in fact been relegated by the consul Gabinius in 58 BC because he was such a staunch supporter of Cicero (Cic. Sest. 29):\textsuperscript{22}

L. Lamiam, qui cum me ipsum pro summa familiaritate quae mihi cum patre eius erat unice diligebat, tum pro re publica vel mortem oppetere cupiebat, in contione relegavit (scil. Gabinius), edixitque ut ab urbe abesset milia passuum ducenta, quod esset ausus pro cive, pro bene merito cive, pro amico, pro re publica deprecari.

In a public assembly Gabinius banished L. Lamia, who both had a singular regard for me because of the warm friendship which I enjoyed with his father and was eager to seek even death on behalf of the republic. Gabinius decreed that Lamia stay two hundred miles away from the city because he had dared to plead on behalf of a citizen – on behalf of a citizen who’d rendered noble service – on behalf of a friend, on behalf of the republic.

Lamia eventually returned to Rome, where he continued to be Cicero’s friend and business associate (cf. Att. 5.8.2–3, helping Cicero deal with Milo’s property in 51). By late 48, he was acting as a go-between for Cicero in negotiations with Antony about Cicero’s being allowed to return to Italy after the defeat of Pompey’s army at Pharsalus (Att. 11.7.2). In 43 Cicero was supporting his business interests (fam. 12.29) and writing letters of recommendation for him as he campaigned for

\textsuperscript{21} Cicero’s Lamia = \textit{RE s.v. Aelius} 75. The Lamia of Hor. \textit{carm.} 3.17, \textit{i.e.} the son of Cicero’s Lamia, also appears at \textit{carm.} 1.26, 1.36.6–9 (= \textit{PIR}\textsuperscript{2} A 199). The son of the Lamia of the Odes, \textit{i.e.} the grandson of Cicero’s Lamia, is found at \textit{ep.} 1.14.6 (= \textit{PIR}\textsuperscript{2} A 200; \textit{ep.} 1.14.6 is discussed below). There is some controversy over the identification of the three mentions of Lamia in the Odes as one man and the Lamia of \textit{Epist.} 1.14.6 as his son – traditionally all four mentions were referred to the grandson of Cicero’s Lamia (so \textit{e.g.} \textit{PIR}\textsuperscript{2} A 200) – but identifying the Lamia of the Odes with the son of Cicero’s Lamia seems to best account for the chronology: details in Treggiari 1973a, 251–253; Cairns 2012, 415; Gervais 2012, 48–53. For my purposes the generational details are less important than the fact that the men all come from the same family and bear the same name.

\textsuperscript{22} Cf. Cic. \textit{p. red. in sen.} 12, Pis. 64.
the praetorship (fam. 11.16, 17). It might seem extremely plausible then that this man, a long-time friend of Cicero’s who must have owned property near the very spot where Cicero died, would have seen to Cicero’s last rites. Indeed, as he was also on good terms with Antony and the Caesarians, he was well-placed to brave the triumvirs’ displeasure by interring Cicero’s dead body.

But is this story too good to be true? We must ask in the first place why not a single other surviving source mentions it. Cicero’s death is abundantly (if problematically) well documented. Why should an interesting and accurate piece of information lurk unknown until a series of late-antique poems? This ought to raise some suspicions, although the scenario is not impossible.²³ We can be pretty sure that the author of these poems is not the origin of the Lamia legend. For one thing, it is not likely that a late-antique author would have had the necessary prosopographical knowledge to invent such a fitting fiction. Moreover, our poet refers to Lamia several times as if this is a well-known story that required no glossing, even saying Lamia ille (sap. 114.6). So there must be an earlier source, and we will return to the source question presently.

But first, a couple of other interesting tales about the Aelii Lamiae that seem relevant to evaluating the historicity of Cicero’s supposed burial at Lamia’s hands. Another Lamia in Horace, who is our Lamia’s grandson – we can call him Lamia III – also seems to have concerned himself with the dead. Horace reports to us that the pious Lamia III, overcome by grief for his dead brother, kept him from returning to his country estate (Hor. epist. 1.14.6–8):

Me quamvis Lamiae pietas et cura moratur
fratrem maerentis, rapto de fratre dolentis
insolubiliter [...]

Although Lamia’s pietas and devotion²⁴ keep me here as he mourns his brother, as he grieves inconsolably for his brother who’s been taken away from him [...]

This could be a coincidence, but look again at our poet’s words (sap. 120.1):

Inclitus hic Cicero est Lamiae pietate sepultus.

---

23 Note that while an anecdote reported only in a late source is suspicious, that does not imply that a story attested early on is true: Cicero’s killer Popillius, for one, appears on the scene already early in the Augustan period.

24 It is not entirely clear here whether Lamiae is a subjective or objective genitive, i.e., whether it is Horace’s pietas for Lamia or Lamia’s pietas for his dead brother (as I have taken it).
This strikes me as more than a coincidence. An intertextual echo is possible, of course, but in Horace’s poem we might also see one ingredient in the recipe for an invented tradition.

And the Aelii Lamiae were not just a pious family, but a family with a strange number of recorded connections to funeral pyres. Pliny the Elder tells us that the praetor L. Lamia – Cicero’s Lamia – came back to life on his funeral pyre, but alas, it was too late, and he was burned alive and died again (Plin. HN 7.173):

Aviola consularis in rogo revixit et, quoniam subveniri non potuerat praevalente flamma, vivus crematus est. similis causa in L. Lamia praetorio viro traditur.

The ex-consul Aviola came back to life on the funeral pyre, and since the flames were too strong for him to be rescued, he was burned alive. It’s said that something similar happened to L. Lamia the ex-praetor.

So too Valerius Maximus (1.8.12). A bit much to swallow – not just that Lamia rose from the dead, but also that an otherwise unknown and prosopographically perfect truth is preserved only in an obscure series of late-antique poems, and that Lamiae pietas and concern for the dead just happen to run in the family.²⁵

But if our poet did not invent the tradition himself, where did it come from? The missing link may be provided by Asconius, the first century AD commentator on Cicero’s speeches. In the extant portions of his commentary, Asconius mentions Lamia only once, briefly but tantalizingly. In commenting on Cicero’s In Pisonem, he writes (Asconius 9C, on Pis. 23):

L. Lamiam a Gabinio consule edictum esse iam diximus.

We’ve already mentioned that L. Lamia had been relegated by decree of the consul Gabinius.

And where has he “already said” this? Very likely in a fuller note on Pro Sestio 29, i.e. the passage cited above which mentions Lamia’s relegation.²⁶ We do not know what Asconius said there – the Scholia Bobiensia, another Ciceronian commentary that drew on Asconius’ notes, are not helpful in this case.²⁷ But the nec-

²⁵ Even the cognomen may have lent itself to sepulchral associations; Lamia means “witch”. Cf. the case of Q. Lucretius Vispillo (“undertaker”), so named because he threw the body of the murdered C. Gracchus into the Tiber: [Aur. Vict.] De vir. ill. 64.8.
²⁶ So too Lewis 2006, 204.
²⁷ Schol. Bob. 129 St.: QUOD AUSUS ESSET PRO CIVE, PRO BENE MERITO CIVE, PRO AMICO, PRO RE P. DEPRECARI. insigniter et βιαίως hanc αὐξήσαν determinavit gradatim procedentibus augmentis, ita tamen, ut preces Lucii hulus Lamiae sic patrocinari voluerit Ciceroni, ut magis pro re p. laboret. On the Scholia Bobiensia more generally, see La Bua 2019, 78–84.
ecessary prosopographical information may have been provided there in compendious form, and somehow this information may have gotten contaminated with the stories in Horace and perhaps Pliny the Elder and formed a new legend.

There are still some loose ends to be tied up. In the first place, while the heads of the proscribed are well accounted for — the head had to be produced if the killer wanted to collect the bounty — you might wonder what we know about the fate of the bodies of the proscribed more generally. Was Cicero likely to have been buried? On the one hand, in Sulla’s proscriptions of 82 BC it seems that burial was expressly forbidden.²⁸ Lucan implies and his scholiasts state outright that Sulla forbade the proscribed to be buried (Luc. 2.169–173):

Meque ipsum memini, caesi deformia fratris
ora rogo cupidum vetitisque imponere flammis,
omnia Sullanae lustrasse cadavera pacis
perque omnes trunco, cum qua cervice recisum
conveniat, quaesisses, caput.

I remember how I myself, when I was eager to cremate the mutilated head of my murdered brother in the forbidden flames of the funeral pyre, searched through all the bodies of “Sulla’s peace” and looked through all the torsos for the neck with which his severed head would fit.

And in the Adnotationes super Lucanum ad Luc. 2.159 we read: vetabat enim eos Sylla sepeliri, and similarly in the Commenta Bernensia ad Luc. 2.152 Silla praeceperat non debere interfectorum cadavera sepeliri. These scholiastic notes are admittedly likely to be inferences from Lucan’s text, and so cannot be given much weight. But Appian, comparing the horrors of the triumviral proscriptions with those under Sulla, seems to confirm the idea (App. BC 4.16):

ἡγένετο μὲν οὖν τοιάδε ἑτέρα ἐν αὐτῇ κατὰ τε Σῦλλαν [...] ὃν ὄμοιώς τὰ γνωριμώτατα τῶν κακῶν ἐν τοῖς περὶ ἐκείνων ἀνελεξάμην, καὶ προσῆκεν ἐκείνοις ἀταφία.

Similar things had happened before in the age of Sulla [...] I’ve collected the best known of those evils in my earlier treatment of those times, to which was added the fact that the bodies went unburied.

Appian’s words imply that burial was not forbidden in the triumviral proscriptions. Indeed, in the proscription edict of 42 that he quotes (BC 4.8–11), burial is nowhere mentioned, and he in fact reports the burial of a proscribed victim

---

²⁸ On the treatment of proscribed corpses in the Sullan proscription, see Hinard 1985, 45–49.
elsewhere (BC 4.21). We have some other implied burials as well. So there is in theory no reason that Cicero’s body should not have been buried.

The fact that burial was apparently legal seems relevant to another possible loose end. We know from Seneca the Elder that Asinius Pollio gave a defense speech Pro Lamia after Cicero’s death (Sen. suas. 6.14–15):


The schoolmen often declaim on the theme: “Cicero deliberates whether to burn his speeches on the condition that Antony promises to let him live”. Anyone must realize that this is a crude fiction. Pollio wants to make us think it the truth. For this is what he said in his published speech for Lamia: “Thus Cicero never hesitated to go back on his passionate outpourings against Antony; he promised to produce, more carefully, many times more speeches in the opposite sense, and even to recite them personally at a public meeting”. This together with other things much more shabby: from which it was quite clear that the whole was false – in fact even Pollio himself did not venture to find a place for it in his history. Indeed eye-witnesses of his speech for Lamia assert that he didn’t say these things, not being prepared to lie when the triumvirs could show him up, but composed them later (Trans. Winterbottom 1974 with light adaptation).

Susan Treggiari, one of the few scholars to notice the story of Lamia and Cicero, has suggested that the trial might have had to do with Lamia’s burial of Cicero.

It is true that the case could have touched on Cicero, since in the published version of the speech Pollio infamously claimed that Cicero was willing to disavow his Philippics in return for his life. But we have no context for this statement – in fact Seneca tells us that it was absent from the delivered version of the speech –

29 See Hinard 1985, 242 n. 70. Note that Appian is not interested in specifying where the bodies were buried; their precise location is perhaps a later (Christian?) concern. In connection with Christianity and the story of Lamia more generally, cf. also the story of Joseph of Arimathea in the New Testament and the legends that sprang up around him. It is also just possible that the interest in Cicero’s physical corpus goes along in some metapoetic sense with the contemporary late antique consolidation of his textual corpus, on which see La Bua 2019, 70–77.

30 For more on Asinius Pollio and Cicero generally, see Roller 2019; for more on Asinius Pollio and Cicero specifically in suas. 6, see Pieper 2019.

31 Treggiari 1973a, 249–251.
and if Pollio had been defending Lamia on a charge related to Cicero’s death, Seneca probably would have mentioned it (in this passage he is reporting different sources for Cicero’s death). Furthermore, this trial was probably held between Cicero’s death on December 7 and December 31, since Lamia likely entered office as praetor on January 1 and thereby gained immunity from prosecution. Even assuming Pollio was back in Rome at this time – he began the year as governor of Spain, although he eventually joined forces with Antony in Gaul (App. BC 3.81, 97) – that is still only about three weeks, a tight time frame to get up a prosecution connected to Cicero’s death.

Moreover, we know from the proscription edict that Lamia could not have aided and abetted the living Cicero without ending up on the proscription list himself, and so the trial cannot be about that. But if burial was not forbidden, he could not have been prosecuted for burying Cicero’s body either. Thus the case probably did not have to do with Cicero’s proscription, and indeed might not have concerned Cicero at all. Whatever the charge, Lamia was probably acquitted and certainly did not suffer much: his descendants continued to climb through the ranks of the imperial bureaucracy – his grandson, Lamia III, became consul in AD 3 – and they accumulated ever more wealth along the way.

There is, however, one last loose end that cannot be tied up so neatly. Near the gates of modern Formia, 139 kilometers from Rome along the Via Appia, there exists a structure called “la tomba di Cicerone”. Its date is uncertain, although the Augustan period has been suggested. Does this tomb have anything to do with Cicero? Probably not: for a variety of reasons outside the scope of this paper, any connection between this mausoleum and Cicero is probably the product of local tradition. This tomb certainly was not in the mind of our poet; for one thing, it is enormous, with a tower once stretching some twenty-four meters into the air, and this does not square with the urna brevis and generally modest

32 We do not know for a fact that Lamia was praetor in 42, but we know that he was a candidate for that year’s office, and we know that he eventually became praetor: see MRR II 359. The details of “immunity from prosecution” are also somewhat complex: see the sensible position of Treggiari 1973a, 250 with further references.
34 See https://www.formiae.it/siti/la-tomba-di-cicerone/. The dating presumably relies on the opus reticulatum construction of the surrounding wall, which is an Augustan hallmark (see e.g. Adam 2010, 131).
35 The identification of the tomb as Cicero’s was made at least by the tenth century AD: in the will of Docibilis II, the ruler of Gaeta who died in 954, we read: Et habeat (sc. Iohannes dux) omnia, et in omnibus quantum in vico Ciceriniano (sic) habemus cum omnibus sibi pertinentibus (Codex Diplomaticus Cajetanus, p. 90 ii. 9–10).
descriptions of the tomb found in these epigrams. But the tomb does raise the question of whether there were local monuments to Cicero visible along the Via Appia near Formiae, which themselves could have attracted epigrams and helped foster the tradition. We have no evidence of such monuments and so can say little about them, but “la tomba di Cicerone” might make one wonder.³⁶

So did Lucius Aelius Lamia bury Cicero? We cannot know for certain, but we can try to assess the balance of probabilities. On the one hand, a source tells us that he did, and L. Aelius Lamia is prosopographically plausible. But other sources who might have talked about Lamia keep silent. The story of Cicero’s burial could in theory have come from some lost contemporary chronicler of Cicero’s death, but if it had been in Tiro, say, then why not in Plutarch’s Life of Cicero, given that Plutarch used Tiro as a source?³⁷ Is it likely that no one else had cause to mention this interesting tidbit? Moreover, is it likely that Lamia’s grandson, Lamia III, would also have a reputation for piety concerning the dead, one expressed in the exact same turn of phrase? It seems more likely that this story was a rhetorical color invented to fill a generic gap: gravestone inscriptions very commonly record who set up the tomb and buried the body.³⁸ In antiquity, events, people, and whole works were often pieced together out of bits and bobs of truth and fiction to fill out some lacuna in an ancient life.³⁹ I think that we should be skeptical about Lamia’s burial of Cicero, and that this story is probably an example of the invention of a tradition.

³⁶ A tomb on the Greek island of Zakynthos (!) was also claimed by local tradition to be Cicero’s final resting place, and it was accompanied by a funerary epigram (Burmann 1759–1773, II 170): see further Sarton 1954, 132–133. (This legend may have something to do with the fact that the island of Zakynthos was controlled by the Republic of Venice until 1797, and Venice boasted many intellectuals and learned antiquaries.) One of Martial’s epigrams about Silius Italicus has also been (mis)read as implying that Cicero was buried at Arpinum (Mart. 11.48: Silius possesses Vergil’s tomb and Cicero’s estate) – although the idea of a monument at Arpinum is not itself improbable.

³⁷ And, specifically, as a source for Cicero’s death: Plut. Cic. 49.4.

³⁸ This helps also to explain why the color is not found in Seneca the Elder’s declaimers, for example: they had no generic reason to invent such a figure. The idea that Lamia is a color also helps explain why a simpler fiction – e.g., Cicero was buried by a family member – was not invented: Lamia is much more spectacular.

³⁹ On this process see esp. Peirano 2012.
3 Cicero’s death

Whether you think Lamia buried Cicero or not, Cicero’s interment is not the only point of interest in these poems. We will now discuss some of the poems’ other themes, starting with Cicero’s death more broadly.

Cicero’s death is one of the favorite topics of his reception in the rhetorical school. Seneca the Elder preserves three declamations on this theme (contr. 7.2, suas. 6, 7) – no other subject gets such sustained attention – and he reports that they were declaimed in the schools (suas. 6.14, 7.12); about half a century later Quintilian testifies to the same thing (3.8.46). Now you might also say that it is natural for an epitaph for a man who met an untimely end to mention his death, and that is of course true, but I think it puts the cart before the horse. These epitaphs are not real. So why choose Cicero as the subject for this literary exercise? Probably because there already was such a tradition of talking about his death. This likewise explains why we have cycles of Vergilian epitaphs: for Vergil too there was already a famous epitaph to rework, the Mantua me genuit preserved in the Suetonian-Donatan Life of Vergil.⁴⁰

Almost all of these poems make mention of Cicero’s murder, some more explicitly than others. Many also refer specifically to the proscriptions, and none more spectacularly than the first poem in the collection (sap. 109):

Hic iacet Arpinas manibus tumulatus amici,
qui fuit orator summus et eximius,
quem nece crudeli mactavit civis et hostis.
    Nil agis, Antoni: scripta diserta manent.
Vulnerem nempe uno Ciceronem conficis, at te
    Tullius aeternis vulneribus lacerat.

Here lies the man from Arpinum, who was once the greatest and best of orators, laid to rest by the hands of a friend. A man at once a citizen and an enemy of the state slaughtered him in a cruel murder. You accomplish nothing, Antony! His eloquent writings remain. You’ve done in Cicero by a single wound, but Tullius tears you apart with ever-lasting wounds.

Here, as so often in the declamatory tradition surrounding Cicero’s death, it is the wicked Antony who bears sole responsibility for Cicero’s murder. (This is simply a premise of the declamations on Cicero’s death in Seneca the Elder: “should Cicero agree to burn his writings if Antony promises to let him live?”

⁴⁰ On the Vergilian epitaphs in the Carmina XII Sapientum, see Stok 2013. Note that Vergil and Cicero are also the schoolroom authors par excellence and so are often combined; cf. e.g. Mart. 5.56.3–5.
and so forth). Furthermore, in another typical move, Antony himself is addressed directly. The phrasing, in fact, is precisely paralleled in Velleius Paterculus’ declamatory outburst of outrage over Cicero’s death (Vell. Pat. 2.66.3–5):

Nihil tamen egisti, M. Antoni [...] nihil, inquam, egisti mercedem caelestissimi oris et clarissimi capitis abscondi numero auctoramentoque funeris ad conservatoris quondam rei publicae tantique consulis irritando necem. Rapuisti tum Ciceroni lucem solam et aetas senilis et vitae miseriorem, te principe, quam sub te triumviro mortem, famam vero gloriariam facturum atque dictorum adeo non abstulisti, ut auxeris. Vivit vivetque per omnem saeculorum memoriam, dunque hoc vel forte vel providentia vel utcumque constitutum rerum naturae corpus, quod ille paene solus Romanorum animo vidit, ingenio simplex est, eloquentia illuminavit, manebit incolume, comitem aevi sui laudem Ciceronis trahet omnisque posteritas illius in te scripta mirabitur, tuum in eum factum eximabitur citiusique [in] mundo genus hominum quam <M. Cicero> cedet.

But you accomplished nothing, Mark Antony [...] you accomplished nothing, I say, by counting out a reward for the sealing of Cicero’s godlike mouth and the severing of his most famous head and by provoking with a hit contract the death of the man who once saved the republic and who was so great a consul. You snatched away from Cicero a few troubled days and senile years and a life that would have been more miserable under your power than was his death in your triumvirate. But you did not take away from him the fame and glory of his words and deeds; in fact you increased them. He lives and will live on in the memory of the ages, and as long as this universe (whether established by chance or divine providence or any other way), which he almost alone of all the Romans saw with his soul, grasped with his mind, illuminated with his eloquence, as long as this universe endures, it will carry with it as a companion for all time Cicero’s fame, and all posterity will admire what he wrote against you, while what you did to him will be cursed, and sooner will the human race disappear from this world than Marcus Tullius Cicero.

Our poet continues, just as Vellelius had, by claiming that the reason Antony accomplished nothing is that Cicero’s writings will remain (scripta diserta manent). This idea, however, certainly did not originate with Velleius Paterculus. In fact, the theme of Cicero’s literary immortality is everywhere in declamation. I will pick just one example that parallels both our poem and Velleius particularly closely, a sentence from Arellius Fuscus, who was Ovid’s teacher and so doubtless preceded Velleius (apud Sen. suas. 7.8):⁴¹

Quoad humanum genus incolum manserit, quamdiu suus litteris honor, suum eloquentiae pretium erit, quamdiu rei publicae nostrae aut fortuna steterit aut memoria duraverit, admirabile posteris vilegit ingenium <tuum>, et uno proscriptus saeculo proscribes Antonium omnibus.

⁴¹ For prosopographical details concerning Arellius Fuscus, see Echavarren 2007, 66–68.
As long as the human race endures, as long as literature is valued and eloquence has its reward, as long as the fortune of our state stands firm or its memory remains, your genius will flourish and be admired by posterity, and although you’ve been proscribed in this age, you will proscribe Antony forever.

Velleius uses the same language as the first part of Fuscus’ sentence: dum manebit incolume (“as long as this universe endures”) ~ quoad humanum genus incolume manserit (“as long as the human race endures”); omnisque posteritas mirabitur (“all posterity will admire”) ~ admirabile posteris vigebit ingenium (“will be admired by posterity”). Our poet, on the other hand, picks up on something else found in Fuscus, the conceit of “you’ve been proscribed in one age, but you’ll proscribe Antony in all ages” (uno proscriptus saeculo proscribe Antonium omnibus). He remodels this as: “you’ve done in Cicero with one wound, but Cicero will tear you to pieces with eternal wounds” (vulnere nempe uno Ciceronem conficis, at te | Tullius aeternis vulneribus lacerat).

All of this raises the question of our poem’s sources. The poem’s parallel with Velleius Paterculus is very close, but Velleius Paterculus seems to echo some of Arellius Fuscus, and our poem also echoes an idea of Arellius Fuscus that is not found in this form in Velleius Paterculus. Now some of these notions may be a commonplace – Seneca quotes another declaimer right before Arellius Fuscus as saying something similar, “allow your ingenium to live on after you as an eternal proscription of Antony” (sine durare post te ingenium tuam, perpetuam Antonii proscriptionem, suas. 7.8) – but our poem’s ideas seem particularly close to Fuscus, and, as we have just seen, they cannot all have come from Velleius. Maybe our poet was drawing on a fuller version of Arellius Fuscus, but it seems much more likely that all these texts are drawing on a robust declamatory tradition surrounding Cicero’s death. Our poet then, like essentially every upper-class Roman youth who did his time in the rhetorical school, was fully read into that declamatory tradition, and these poems give us another window onto it.

A few final remarks on this poem. I will not pretend that these verses are foursquare and faultless as poetry, but their individual words do seem to be well chosen. Echoing Cicero’s words, sometimes with a twist, is a common feature of Cicero-themed declamations, and our poems play this game too. For example, Antony is described paradoxically as a civis et hostis, yoking two terms that Cicero liked to oppose in describing his enemies, especially Antony. So, for example (Phil. 5.21):

---

42 See Keeline 2018, 188–195.
M. vero Antonium quis est qui civem possit iudicare potius quam taeterrimum et crudelissimum "hostem"?

Who is there who could judge Mark Antony a citizen rather than the most foul and wicked enemy of the state?\(^{43}\)

It is an apt oxymoron, and our poet doubtless had read his *Philippics* in school.\(^{44}\)

The poet likewise uses the choice verb *mactavit* for "killed"; the word is a technical term used of butchering sacrificial victims (*OLD* s.v. 4). It does not occur earlier in extant Latin in connection with Cicero’s death, but in the Greek tradition we often find the word σφαξω and its congers in such descriptions – and σφαξω is a common translation of *macto* (*TLL* VIII 23.3). So Plutarch writes: "when Cicero had been slaughtered, Antony ordered both his head and his right hand to be chopped off" (Κικέρωνος δὲ σφαγέντος ἐκέλευσεν Ἀντώνιος τὴν τε κεφαλὴν ἀποκοπὴν καὶ τὴν χεῖρα τὴν δεξιὰν, Plut. Ant. 20.2), and Cassius Dio has: "he fled and was caught and slaughtered" (φεύγων γὰρ καὶ καταληφθεὶς σφάγην, Dio Cass. 7.8.3).\(^{45}\) You might wonder then whether the vivid word *macto* was introduced in Latin at some early stage of the declamatory tradition, whence it radiated out to the Greek historians on the one hand and our poet on the other. Indeed, it could even have its origin in Cicero’s own presentation of himself as a sacrificial victim in his *post reditum* speeches.\(^{46}\)

Such an analysis can be conducted on many of the words in this poemlet, but I will give just one more example. The precise force of *conficio* “kill” (*OLD* 16a) is hard to gauge, but Donatus on Terence’s *Eunuchus* says that it is a term used for gladiators: *proprius conficere convenit gladiatoribus* (Donatus ad Ter. Eun. 926). Now in the *Philippics* Cicero called Antony a gladiator so often that...

\(^{43}\) Cf. Cat. 2.12 (of Catiline): *Quis denique ita aspexit ut perditum civem ac non potius ut importunissimum hostem*?; p. red. in sen. 19 (of Clodius): *Qui [scil. Milo] cum videret sceleratum civem aut domesticum potius hostem* [...] *iudicio esse frangendum*; Sest. 29 (of the consul Gabinius): *Quid hoc homine facias, aut quo civem importunum aut quo potius hostem* *tam sceleratum reservas*?

\(^{44}\) For further echoes of the *Philippics*, cf. e.g. sap. 111.1: *Lumen decusque senatus* ~ Phil. 2.54: *Imperii populi Romani decus et lumen*, Phil. 11.14: *Lumen et decus* [...] *exercitus*, Phil. 11.24: *Reddite prius nobis Brutum, lumen et decus civitatis*. In classical authors the *iunctura* is found elsewhere only at Val. Max. 5.8.4.

\(^{45}\) Cf. Plut. Cic. 48.4: Ἀτενεὺς ὕπερ τοῦ σφαγέοντος ("Cicero stared steadfastly at his murderers"); App. BC 4.20 (of Quintus Cicero and son): Κόιντος δὲ, ὁ τοῦ Κικέρωνος ἀδελφός, ἄμα τῷ παιδὶ καταληφθείς ἐξείτο τῶν σφαγέων πρὸ τοῦ παιδὸς αὐτῶν ἀνελειν ("and Quintus, Cicero’s brother, was captured along with his son and begged the murderers to kill him instead of the boy").

\(^{46}\) For Ciceronian *devotio ducis*, following the *exempla* of the P. Decii Mures, see Dyck 2004.
it became, as John Dewar Denniston put it, something like a regular nickname (ad Phil. 2.7), and it is a description that gets picked up in the declamatory tradition and elsewhere.\(^{47}\) With this verb, then, is our poet cleverly characterizing Antony as a gladiator?

### 4 Cicero’s eloquence and literary immortality

The poem just discussed also offers a good way to conceptualize many of the other ideas about Cicero mentioned in these epitaphs. Cicero was the greatest orator, our poet says, and his eloquent writings remain and ensure his immortality (*scripta diserta manent, sap.* 109.4). All these themes stem from the early declamatory tradition, and they are repeated over and over again in these poems.\(^{48}\) Cicero’s *ingenium* is repeatedly praised: *claro qui fuit ingenio* (*sap.* 110.2) and so forth.\(^{49}\) The same can be said for his *eloquium*: Cicero is, for example, *conditor eloquii* (*sap.* 111.2) and *eloquii princeps* (*sap.* 119.1) and *maximus eloquio* (*sap.* 120.3); *tenet eloquii fastigia summa Latini* (*sap.* 115.1).\(^{50}\) It is these traits above all that were remembered after Cicero’s death, because Cicero’s once living *corpus* was reduced to a textual corpus that was read and studied in the schools as a model of Latin eloquence.\(^{51}\)

We can look at another poem that makes all of this quite explicit (*sap.* 112):

> Quicumque in libris nomen Ciceronis adoras,  
> aspice, quo iaceat conditus ille loco.


\(^{48}\) Literary immortality is both a poetic topos (cf. e.g. *Hor. carm.* 3.30) and one specific to grave-stone epitaphs for authors (e.g. book 7 of the *Greek Anthology*), but it has a particularly strong resonance with the treatment of Cicero in the declamatory tradition. The pervasiveness of other declamatory themes (e.g., the focus on how Cicero died) persuades me that the prediction of literary immortality in these poems goes beyond generic commonplaces and looks specifically to the declamatory tradition: the opposition in these poems is not between the smallness of the tomb and the magnitude of Cicero’s literary achievement (as often in the *Greek Anthology*), but between Cicero’s literary survival and his murderers’ attempts to kill him and silence his voice.


Ille vel orator vel civis maximus; idem
clarus erat factis, clarior eloquio;
ac, ne quid Fortuna vir onocuisses putetur,
vivus in aeternum docta per ora volat.

 Whoever worships the name of Cicero in books, behold the place where that famous man lies buried. Take your pick: he was the greatest of orators and the greatest of citizens. He was renowned for his deeds, and more renowned still for his eloquence. And, lest Fortune be thought to have harmed him in any way, he flies forever alive on the lips of the learned.

The students of late antiquity do not know Cicero the man, nor had their parents or grandparents or great-grandparents: they have met Cicero’s name in books. As Quintilian so famously said, Cicero was no longer the name of a man, but of eloquence itself (*Cicero iam non hominis nomen sed eloquentiae*, Quint. 10.1.112). “Cicero” became eloquence embodied, or rather the disembodied Cicero, reduced to words on the page, was refigured as eloquence personified. Moreover, the verb *adoro* is pointed too, and the phrase *nomen adoro* seems specifically Christian: reverence and worship is expected for this god-like pinnacle of eloquence; schoolboys are on their knees day and night saying prayers to Cicero’s guiding light.⁵²

Now in these poems Cicero is not just an orator but also a great citizen, and yet there is a general vagueness about his greatness as a citizen: *clarus erat factis, clarior eloquio* (“he was famous for his deeds, more famous for his eloquence”). This again seems common to the poems: they are more comfortable with Cicero as the *orator summus et eximius* (*sap.* 109.2) than as an outstanding citizen. He was *maximus eloquio, civis bonus* (*sap.* 120.3), and the contrast between the superlative and positive degrees is telling. When his good citizenship is acknowledged, it is often in somewhat ahistorical terms, *e.g.* (*sap.* 117.1–2):

> Romani princeps populi, decus ordinis ampli,
> maximus orator, civis et egregius.

The leader of the Roman people, the glory of the senate, the greatest orator and an outstanding citizen.

In reality Cicero was hardly the *popularis* politician that might be implied by *Romani princeps populi*, but there was a long tradition that made him a defender of the people against the *infandus* [...] *tyrannus*, as one of our poems describes Mark

---

⁵² For *nomen adoro* as a common Christian expression, see Friedrich 2002, 222.
Antony (sap. 116.5).⁵³ Note here too the superlative primacy placed on Cicero the speaker (orator maximus).

To return to sap. 112, the poem closes with an echo of a famous phrase from Ennius’ epitaph, volito vivos per ora virum (“I fly about alive on the mouths of men”, Var. 18 Vahlen = Epigram 2 Manuwal). I imagine our poet is in the first instance simply making a sort of ornamental allusion, showing learned readers that he too is well equipped to enter into this literary-funerary tradition.⁵⁴ But the additions and reworkings are not without point: our poet adds in aeternum, making the element of immortality explicit. Furthermore, specifying docta per ora looks specifically to the classroom: Cicero lives on in the mouths of well-taught schoolboys, who read his speeches as part of their education.

5 Cicero’s consulship

There is only one aspect of Cicero’s earlier life as a citizen that is mentioned with some real knowledge in these poems, and that, predictably, is his consulship and his role in crushing the Catilinarian conspiracy. Stray references mark him as the servator patriae (sap. 111.2) and the coniuratorum vindex (sap. 117.3), the man who saved the fatherland from ruin (sap. 113.4 eripui patriam qui prius exitio, sap. 115.2 qui consul patriam caedibus eripuit). These themes are well exemplified by sap. 114:

Tullius Arpinas ex ordine natus equestri,  
   sed virtute sua consul in Urbe fuit.  
Quem Catilina malus coniuratique nocentes  
   senserunt vigilem civibus esse suis.  
Hunc tamen (o pietas!) tres occidere tyranni;  
   at Lamia ille pio subposuit tumulo.

Tullius was a man from Arpinum, born into the equestrian class, but by his own virtue he became consul in Rome. The wicked Catiline and his baleful band of conspirators learned how vigilant the consul was on behalf of his citizens. But this man (oh, the horror!) the three tyrants slew – but the well-known Lamia laid him to rest beneath a pious tomb.

Catiline is here mentioned by name, as are the dread conspirators. But Cicero’s vigilance as consul saved the city and its citizens. Cicero himself had emphasized

---

⁵³ On the tradition of Cicero as popularis politician, see Keeline 2018, 84–89.
⁵⁴ Cf. e.g. Verg. georg. 3.8–9, Aen. 12.234–235. It seems doubtful in the extreme that our poet had actually read Ennius, but the tag would have been familiar through various sources (e.g. Cic. Tusc. 1.34), and it is well known to later authors (e.g. Macrobr. Sat. 5.175, Cassiod. var. 3.51.2).
his salutary vigilance, and our poet has perhaps picked up on Cicero's very words in the second Catilinarian: *sentiet in hac urbe esse consules vigilantes* (“he will learn that in this city the consuls are vigilant”, *Cat*. 2.27).\(^{55}\)

Or does he look to those words? This idea was echoed by later authors as well, like Juvenal, who also includes some other details that are found in our poem (8.236–238):

\[
\text{Sed vigilat consul vexillaque vestra coercet.}
\]

\[
\text{Hic novus Arpinas, ignobilis et modo Romae municipalis eques}
\]

But the *consul is vigilant* and halts your troops. *This new man from Arpinum* – not a noble, just arrived in Rome, *an eques from a municipium*

Juvenal too mentions that Cicero is a new man from Arpinum, sprung from the equestrian order.\(^{56}\) And so we might also be tempted to think that our poet was looking to Juvenal, but Velleius Paterculus may again give us pause (2.34.3–4):

\[
\text{Per haec tempora, M. Cicero, qui omnia incrementa sua sibi debuit, vir novitatis nobilissimae et, ut vita clarus, ita ingenio maximus, qui effecit ne, quorum arma viceramus, eorum ingenio vinceremur, consul Sergii Catilinae Lentulique et Cethegi et aliorum utriusque ordinis virorum coniurationem singulari virtute, constantia, vigilia curaque aperuit. Catilina metu consularis imperii urbe pulsus est.}
\]

At this time Marcus Cicero – a man who had pulled himself up entirely by his own bootstraps, a man of most noble newness and as famous for his way of life as he was outstanding in his genius, a man who ensured that we would not be conquered in intellectual achievement by those whom we had conquered in war – was serving as consul and exposed the conspiracy of Sergius Catiline and Lentulus and Cethegus and other men of both orders by his singular bravery, steadfastness, vigilance, and care. Catiline was driven from the city out of fear of the consul’s power.

In Velleius we see the same emphasis on Cicero as a new man who rose by his own virtue to the consulship, and again we see an emphasis on Cicero’s vigilance; indeed, Velleius’ pairing of “vigilance” and “care” is found in another poem in our collection\(^{57}\) – it is admittedly a common *iunctura*, but it is not

\(^{55}\) Cf. *Cat*. 1.8: *Intelleges multo me vigilare acius ad salutem, quam te ad perniciem rei publicae*; 2.19: *Primum omnium me ipsum vigilare, adesse, providere rei publicae*; 3.3: *Semper vigilavi et providi*.

\(^{56}\) Cf. further [Sall.] *inv. in Cic*. 4: *Homo novus Arpinas*. On the reception of Cicero’s *novitas*, see La Bua (p. 103–118) in this volume.

\(^{57}\) *Sap*. 110.5–6: *Sed vigilii cura detectis (v.l. deiectis) hostibus urbem | supplicioque datis praestit incolurem*. 
found in the *Catilinarians*. We likewise see in Velleius the emphasis found elsewhere in these poems on Cicero’s fame deriving from his actions and, more importantly, his *ingenium* (*ut vita clarus, ita ingeniō maximus*). Was it Velleius then to whom our poet was looking? Perhaps, but this swirling storm of similarities leads me again to believe that we are really detecting the traces of a common source, or more probably a common tradition, that underlies all of these assessments.

These epitaphs do not report many other details about Cicero. The present poem mentions his status as a new man, a theme which recurs once elsewhere in the cycle (*Tullius existens nobilis ex humili, sap. 118.2*). So too does it mention his birthplace, Arpinum, which likewise occurs one other time in the collection (*hic iacet Arpinas, sap. 109.1*). But precious little other information about Cicero can be found in these verses. The last couplet of the last poem of the cycle notes that he was sixty-three at the time of his death (*sexaginta completis ac tribus annis, sap. 120.5*). And with that we have isolated the main pieces of information about Cicero that these poems have to work with.

## 6 Anti-Augustan Voices?

One final bit of archaeology. It may be just possible to excavate the remains of an anti-Augustan tradition from long ago. To look at the last couplet of the cycle in full, we read a somewhat unexpected description of Cicero’s death (*sap. 120.5–6*):

\[
\text{Qui sexaginta completis ac tribus annis} \\
\text{servitio pressam destituit patriam.}
\]

Who at the age of sixty-three left the fatherland when it was oppressed by slavery.

The verb *destituo* is rather remarkable for a departure that seems hardly a voluntary choice, and I cannot immediately find a good parallel. But even more striking is *servitio pressam [...] patriam*: even if we make due allowance for the contaminating presence of Antony, this is a damning way to describe the triumvirate, and implies a rather dark view of Octavian’s future. The same nearly muted voice might be found, for example, in *hunc tamen (o pietas!) tres occidere tyranni* (*sap. 114.5*), where Octavian is lumped in with Antony and Lepidus as a “tyrant” and given a share of the responsibility for Cicero’s death (cf. *sap. 115.3: Trium saevo [...] ense virorum, sap. 117.4: Proscriptus perit a tribus ille viris*). These echoes of anti-Augustan voices, however muted, seem to show that the pro-Augustan propaganda could never entirely silence competing viewpoints.
7 Conclusion

To conclude, let us consider an easy question: what goes unmentioned? Basically anything not discussed above. There is a fairly deafening silence about Cicero the philosopher or poet or letter writer, for example. There is no real mention of his role in public life beyond simplified versions of 63 and 44–43 BC. There is no attempt to deal with Cicero the complex and contradictory man. He has instead been textualized, reduced to words on a page, and those words retell again and again a series of truths very convenient for the rhetorical schoolroom. “Cicero is the paragon of Roman eloquence and the paragon of Roman virtue”: what more could you hope to transmit to the ambitious young men who would one day be running the Roman Empire? In these poems, we see a continuation of the schoolroom reception that stretches all the way back to the decades immediately following Cicero’s death. The themes were set early on, and they were played and replayed for centuries. But while the themes were the same, there was a constant pressure for innovation, for more sparkling sententiae and creative colores; the tradition was constantly innovating and renewing itself: hence Lamia. These poems give us another vantage point on that interplay of tradition and originality, and they help fill out our picture of the schoolroom reception of Cicero. But they probably cannot tell us who buried him.

Appendix: Complete text of the poems (following Friedrich 2002, 62–66)

X [Hexasticha de titulo Ciceronis]

sap. 109 (= Anth. Lat. 603 R²) EVPHORBIVS
Hic iacet Arpinas manibus tumulatus amici,
qui fuit orator summus et eximius,
 quem nece crudeli mactavit civis et hostis.
Nila gis, Antoni: scripta diserta manent.
Vulnerem uno Ciceronem conficis, at te
Tullius aeternis vulneribus lacerat.

sap. 110 (= Anth. Lat. 604 R²) IVLIANVS
Corpus in hoc tumulo magni Ciceronis humatum
contegitur, claro qui fuit ingenio,
quique malis gravis hostis erat tutorque bonorum,
quo paene indigne consule Roma perit.
Sed vigili cura detectis hostibus urbem
supplicioque datis praestitit incolmem.
Unicus orator, lumenque decusque senatus,
servator patriae, conditor eloqui,
cuius ab ingenio laude illustrata perenni
lumine praetorto lingua Latina viget,
occidit indigne manibus laceratus iniquis
Tullius ac tumulo subditus exiguo est.

Quicumque in libris nomen Ciceronis adorat,
aspe, quo iaceat conditus ille loco.
Ille vel orator vel civis maximus; idem
clarus erat factis, clarior eloquio;
ac, ne quid Fortuna viro nocuisse putetur,
vivus in aeternum docta per ora volat.

Marcus eram Cicero toto notissimus orbe,
cuius relickias occultit urna brevis.
Dextera me patriae nuper civilis ademit,
eripui patriam qui prius exitio.
Si quis in hoc saxo Tulli legis, advena, nomen,
non dedignaris dicere: "Marce, vale!"

Tullius Arpinas ex ordine natus equestri,
sed virtute sua consul in Urbe fuit.
Quem Catilina malus coniuratique nocentes
senserunt vigilem civibus esse suis.
Hunc tamen (o pietas!) tres occidere tyranni;
at Lamia ille pio subposuit tumulo.

Qui tenet eloquii fastigia summa Latini,
qui consul patriam caedibus erupit,
quique trium saevum vitam dedit ense virorum,
Tullius en hac est ipse sepultus humo.
Sed vitae brevitas pensatur laude perenni;
quod mors erupit, gloria restituuit.

Tullius hic situs est, venerabile nomen in aevum,
clarus honore simul, clarus et ingenio,
quem scelerata neci crudeliter arma dederunt,
quod patriae vindix ille fidelis erat.
Sed nihil infamius profecit caede tyrannus:
ingenium vivit; corpus inane perit.

Romani princeps populi, decus ordinis ampli,
maximus orator, civis et egregius,  
coniuratorum vindex hostisque malorum  
proscriptus perit a tribus ille viris.  
Qui caesus graviter, qui detruncatus acerbe  
hoc Lamiae debet, quod iacet in tumulo.

*sap.* 118 (*Anth. Lat.* 612 R²) BASILIVS  
Doctrinae antistes, rerum mirabilis auctor,  
Tullius existens nobilis ex humili,  
cui dedit excellens ars oratoria nomen,  
virtute ingenii venit in astra sui.  
Sed Fortuna nocens miserando funere raptum  
carpsit et hoc voluit membra iacere loco.

*sap.* 119 (*Anth. Lat.* 613 R²) ASMENIVS  
Eloquii princeps, magnis memorabilis actis,  
Tullius indigna caede peremptus obit.  
Sed terras omnes implevit nomine claro;  
ingeniun caeso corpore morte caret.  
Vivit et ingenti pollet cum laude per orbem,  
cuius in hoc tumulo membra sepulta iacent.

*sap.* 120 (*Anth. Lat.* 614 R²) VOMANIVS  
Inclitus hic Cicero est Lamiae pietate sepultus,  
quem Fortuna neci tradidit immitaeae.  
Maximus eloquio, ciuis bonus, urbis amator,  
perniciesque malis perfugiumque bonis.  
Qui sexaginta completis ac tribus annis  
servitio pressam destituit patriam.
1 Introducción: Panorama general y antecedentes

La representación de los autores griegos y latinos en las diferentes disciplinas artísticas y soportes es un aspecto relevante de la Recepción clásica. Respecto a Cicerón, antes de centrar mi atención en los manuscritos, es necesario señalar que, fuera de este ámbito artístico, en la Edad Media y el Renacimiento su efigie aparece en representaciones de la Siete Artes Liberales junto a una dama que personifica a Retórica, porque es considerado el maestro por excelencia de esta disciplina. Así lo vemos, por ejemplo, en la arquivolta exterior del pórtico de derecha de la Catedral de Chartres; en el Triunfo de Santo Tomás de Aquino, fresco de Andrea de Bonaiuto, en la Iglesia de Santa María Novella en Florencia; en la Allégorie des Arts libéraux óleo del pintor Biagio d’Antonio Tucci que custodia el Museo Condé de Chantilly; en la representación de las Artes Liberales con la que Giovanni dal Ponte decora el frontal de un arcón que hoy está en el Museo del Prado de Madrid; en el fresco de las Artes Liberales en la Capilla de Invierno de la Catedral de Nôtre Dame de Le Puy-en-Velay; en los frescos de la Biblioteca de El Escorial realizados por Pellegrino Tibaldi y sus colaboradores o en la Biblioteca del Castillo de Windhag. Por otro lado, como autor destacado en el ámbito de la filosofía aparece, por ejemplo, en un plato de bronce del siglo XII junto a Filosofía, Sócrates, Platón, Prisciano, Aristóteles y Boecio y en un cuenco de madera para la limosna de la catedral de Halberstadt (Alemania), junto a Virgilio, Juvenal, Platón, Aristóteles, Diógenes, Hipócrates, Galeno, etc.¹ Tanto en un caso como en otro se le representa en calidad de autor canónico y filósofo. Sin embargo, en el Quattrocento italiano el autor de las Catilinarijas fue más bien un ícono de las virtudes cívicas y como tal aparece en las galerías de hombres famosos.² También la pintura de gran formato y la escultura de los siglos XVII a XX lo representan más en su faceta de hombre de estado y de orador que en la de autor literario.³

³ Martín Puente 2021a.
Pero, dejando por el momento estas interesantes representaciones, que merecen un estudio detallado aún no realizado, me centraré en el retrato de Cicerón en los manuscritos,⁴ que, por supuesto, es ideal y ficticio y, además, extraordinariamente parecido a los de Dante, Petrarca o Boccaccio de esa época. En general, siempre tiene el propósito de embellecer ediciones más o menos lujosas hechas para el disfrute del lector y subrayar que se trata de un autor digno de ser leído y estudiado en la escuela, a pesar de ser pagano, pero, dependiendo de los casos, tiene funciones específicas. Cuando aparece en la primera página o en el interior de libros que contienen sus obras, ya sea en latín o en traducciones, su imagen pretende garantizar que Cicerón es el autor de esa obra, por eso, es una prueba más de que la archiconocida Rhetorica ad Herennium en estos siglos era considerada de manera unánime del arpinate.⁵ En una miscelánea que recoge una galería de autores canónicos, donde aparece en un folio junto a Retórica y en otro acompañado de Marciano Capela, estamos ante retratos muy similares a los excultóricos y pictóricos mencionados antes, que lo destacan como máximo representante de la Retórica. Finalmente la escena de la decapitación de Cicerón en la versión francesa del De casibus virorum illustrium de Boccaccio, no solo ilustra el texto, también lo señala como un personaje histórico digno de ser conocido como un referente moral.

Cicerón fue un autor sumamente importante en la Antigüedad y desde el siglo II hasta el IV paganos y cristianos⁶ estudiaron en profundidad sus obras con distintos objetivos.⁷ Su transmisión se resintió entre el 550 y el 750, pero a partir de ese momento y, sobre todo, desde Petrarca, que lo tenía entre sus autores predilectos, siguió siendo un autor de referencia fundamental, aunque cada una de sus obras corrió diferente suerte. La Rhetorica ad Herennium, el De inventione, los Topica, las obras filosóficas y algunos discursos fueron muy copiados y tuvieron gran éxito. Sin embargo, el De oratore no fue descubierto hasta 1421 y el De republica hasta 1819, pero muchos otros textos se perdieron.⁸ Las traducciones, como la del tratado De inventione al francés de Jean d’Antioche en 1282, la del Pro Marcello al italiano de Brunetto Latini, las que

---

⁴ Este tema también ha sido estudiado por Lazzi 2000 y 2012 en otros manuscritos. Este trabajo es complementario a los suyos.

⁵ Sobre esta cuestión, cf. el reciente trabajo de Calboli 2020.

⁶ Lo imitaron Minucio Félix en su Octavius (inspirado en el De natura deorum), Lactancio en sus Divinae institutiones, San Ambrosio en el De officiis clericorum (inspirado en el De officiis), San Jerónimo, San Agustín, etc.

⁷ Cf., por ejemplo, MacCormack 2013 y Kendeffy 2015.

hicieron en el siglo XV Anjourent Bourré y XV Laurent de Premierfait al francés, las de Alonso de Cartagena al castellano, etc. contribuyeron a su mayor difusión.\textsuperscript{9} Poco a poco eruditos como Petrarca mostraron un gran interés por el personaje\textsuperscript{10} y sin duda propiciaron que se le retratara en miniaturas, al igual que ocurre con otros autores.\textsuperscript{11}

Aquí mostraré una serie de retratos de Cicerón que aparecen en manuscritos de los siglos XIII al XV. En los que contienen la \textit{Rhetorica ad Herennium}, \textit{De senectute}, \textit{De amicitia}, \textit{De finibus}, \textit{De officiis} y \textit{Pro Marcello}, los retratos dan sello de autenticidad a la autoría ciceroniana de esas obras. Cuando aparece junto a Retórica, el retrato lo muestra como uno de los máximos representantes de esta disciplina. Y, cuando aparece una miniatura con su decapitación en la versión francesa del \textit{De casibus virorum illustrium} de Boccaccio, Cicerón es retratado como un hombre de estado digno de admiración por sus virtudes cívicas y morales.

\section{Los retratos en los manuscritos}

Las primeras seis miniaturas\textsuperscript{12} (de 2.1 a 2.5.) retratan a Cicerón en tanto que máxima autoridad en la retórica, ya sea junto a una figura femenina que representa a esta disciplina, una de las siete Artes Liberales, ya sea como autor de la \textit{Rhetorica ad Herennium}. Las diez siguientes (de 2.6 a 2.12) lo presentan como filósofo y, en menor medida, como orador. Las dos últimas miniaturas (2.13 y


\textsuperscript{11} Por ejemplo, encontramos retratos de Séneca en diversos manuscritos que trasmiten su obra, así como de este autor y su esposa Paulina en el \textit{Des cleres et nobles femmes} (BL Royal 20 C V fol. 143; BL Royal 16 G V fol. 110) y en el \textit{Livre des femmes nobles et renommees} (BnF Français 598, fol. 139v), ambas traducciones francesas anónimas del \textit{De claris mulieribus} de Boccaccio. Sin embargo, aparece un retrato de Séneca sin Paulina en el \textit{Roman de la Rose} (BL Harley 4425, fol. 59v.). (Martín Puente 2021a). Algo similar ocurre con Ovidio (Martín Puente/Andújar Cantón 2017, 437).

\textsuperscript{12} Recojo aquí todos retratos de Cicerón de cuya existencia tengo constancia hasta la fecha, un total de 18.
2.14), en las que le dan muerte por orden de Antonio, lo muestran como excónsul y hombre de estado.

2.1. El manuscrito München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Cod. lat. 2599 (Aldersbach, Kreis Passau, c. 1225–1230)\(^{13}\) recoge los *Sermones* de Petrus Comestor, el tratado *Musica des Johannes*, que corresponde al *De musica cum tonario* de Jean d’Afflighem, y finalmente, desde el folio 102v hasta el 112r, una galería de miniaturas sin colorear integrada por cada una de las Artes Liberales acompañada por uno de sus máximos representantes y, a continuación, por los autores que constituirían el canon vigente en esa escuela, entre ellos Cicerón.\(^{14}\)

Dentro de esta última sección, encontramos en la parte superior izquierda del folio 104v la leyenda *Rethorice studio verbapoliere cisco*, y dentro un doble arco románico que reposa sobre dos columnas, a la izquierda, a la personificación de la Retórica como una joven y bella dama con una espada y, a la derecha, a un Cicerón muy joven y apuesto, sin barba, con vestimenta corta y quizá con un birrete. Este porta una flecha en la mano izquierda y un filacterio en la derecha sujeto también por Retórica en el que leemos *artem disce meam qui vis bene dicere causam*.\(^{15}\) Ambos son identificados con sendas inscripciones en mayúsculas en el doble arco: *Retorica* y *Tullius*. Cicerón fue el retórico con más predicamento en la Edad Media gracias a que el *De inventione* y la *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, consideradas sus obras de juventud, se convirtieron en los pilares del aprendizaje de la retórica en la Edad Media.

---

\(^{13}\) Klemm 1998, 91.

\(^{14}\) Cicerón sería, por tanto, un autor canónico en Aldersbach (Klemm 1978), al igual que lo era en las escuelas de Italia (Ward 2015, 313).

De nuevo aparece el autor del *De inventione* en el folio 109r, identificado por la inscripción *Cicero Tullius*, esta vez junto a su cabeza. Pero aquí es retratado a una edad madura con barba y pelo largo, al estilo de un profeta, y, a su lado, a la derecha, Marciano Capela (*Martianus Capella*). Ambos rétores están dentro de un arco doble como el anterior, en la parte izquierda del cual, sobre Cicerón, se lee la inscripción *DICIMVS INNATA LEX* y en sus manos porta una filacteria en el que leemos *QVID SIT QVID POSITVRA*. La parte final de la tercera sección es una galería de escritores ilustres similar a la representada siglos más tarde en el Studiolo de Federico da Montefeltrro en el Palacio Ducal de Urbino.

---

2.2. Otro códice realizado en Padua alrededor de 1380, que contiene la *Rhetorica ad Herennium* y pertenece a manos privadas, está decorado con varias miniaturas que presumiblemente representan a Cicerón. En el folio 1r, dentro de la inicial E se ve a un profesor, vestido de rojo, con capa corta de armiño, similar a la que lleva en el retrato que le hizo Justo Gante para el Studiolo de Federico da Montefeltro en el Palacio Ducal de Urbino y a la que lleva Ovidio en el manuscrito Holkham Hall, MS 324, fol. 159v, que contiene el *Ars amatoria*. También lleva capucha roja quizá forrada de armiño. Está sentado en un escritorio con un libro abierto y mirando hacia abajo a otro personaje masculino retratado en un medallón que forma parte de la decoración vegetal del borde. Ambos parecen dialogar porque están gesticulando con las manos. Según la descripción que ofrece Christie’s, en el folio 10r el autor aparece en la inicial I con atuendo similar, de pie y sosteniendo un libro; en el folio 41r, dentro de la inicial A, con un tocado y un traje

---

diferentes en actitud de hablar y, por fin, en el folio 61r, en el interior de la inicial Q, con un libro y moviendo las manos.

2.3. En el manuscrito italiano Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Lat. XI, 143, fol. 1r de la *Rhetorica ad Herennium*¹⁸ que data de 1335 – 1338, hay una miniatura que representa a un Cicerón maduro con barba gris. El personaje es retratado con el birrete de los doctorandos que optaban a ingresar en el círculo de los doctores y que es símbolo tanto de investidura como de estatus.¹⁹ Está de pie sobre una tarima redonda pequeña pronunciando un discurso delante de un grupo numeroso de personajes masculinos con trajes académicos sentados a la derecha y a la izquierda. Algunos de ellos escuchan atentamente, mientras otros

---

parecen comentar lo que está diciendo con otro colega. Es posible que la dama que aparece en la E (inicial de etsi) sea una alegoría que representa a Retórica.²⁰

2.4. Otro volumen que ofrece en su primer folio un retrato de busto muy detallado y realista de su supuesto autor es Città del Vaticano, Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Pal. lat. 1459, fol. 1r.²¹ Confeccionado en Italia y datado entre los años 1376 y 1425 -aunque posiblemente la miniatura sea posterior- recoge, entre otras obras, la Rhetorica ad Herennium y el De inventione. La inicial miniada E(tsi) presenta a un Cicerón sin barba, de edad media y ataviado con túnica (o capa corta) azul con capucha azul y blanca (quizá porque el interior está forrado de armiño).

---

20 Cf. Ward 2018, VII.
2.5. Por fin en el folio 240r. del manuscrito denominado *Planetenkinder · Artes liberales*,²² Salzburg, Universitätsbibliothek Salzburg, Cod. M III 36, realizado en Basilea entre 1400 y 1450, aparece en la mitad superior una dama joven cortando leña con un hacha que representa a la Retórica y en la parte inferior un personaje identificado con una inscripción en la que se lee *Magister Tulius*. Se trata de una especie de enciclopedia ilustrada que recoge, por un lado, los planetas y, por otro, un catálogo de las Artes Liberales y sus más conspicuos representantes (como ocurre en el BSB ms. lat. 2599 visto en el apartado 2.1.). Cicerón es retratado de cuerpo entero sentado *in cathedra*,²³ con las manos

---


²³ Esta es una forma muy común de representar, por ejemplo, a Ovidio (Martín Puente 2018, 33 – 39), Séneca (Martín Puente 2021b), Virgilio, Livio, etc.
levantadas en actitud de dictar de un libro que descansa sobre un atril, con capa roja por fuera y verde por dentro y un birrete parecido al que luce en el manuscrito recogido en 2.3. En esta ocasión lleva larga barba rubia. Sobre la joven aparece el nombre Retorica y sobre el autor aparece la leyenda Est mea dicendi ratio cum flore loquendi. Sermone polliceor cultum lepore dum loquor.

2.6. El manuscrito Paris, Bibliothéque Nationale de France, Latin 7789,\(^{24}\) confeccionado en París y datado entre 1405 y 1410, contiene el Pro Marcello en latín, el De senectute en latín y la traducción al francés que Laurent de Premierfait realizó de esta obra en 1405 y tituló Livre de vieillesse.\(^{25}\) En los folios 8r, 37r y 39r encontramos tres retratos de Cicerón realizados por el iluminador conocido como El Maestrod Cleres femmes o por su círculo. El Pro Marcello, que ya citan los gramáticos latinos, gozaba de bastante fama en la Edad Media y el Renacimiento, como también ocurriría con las obras filosóficas de Cicerón.\(^ {26}\)


Premierfai
t experimentó con el empleo de ilustraciones para acercar aún más la traducción de este texto de la Antigüedad a su tiempo.27 Él mismo28 aparece en el folio 34r entregando el libro a Luis de Borbón, a quien se lo dedica, de la misma manera que en manuscritos que contienen la obra de Tito Livio aparecen retratos de su traductor francés Pierre Bersuire.29

En el folio 8r -dentro del prólogo latino del tratado De senectute-, aparece por primera vez Cicerón, con el traje académico y birrete negro en su cabeza. Está sentado in cathedra en un paisaje exterior con cielo azul y tres árboles y encomienda una copia encuadernada en rojo a un joven, que vuelve a aparecer entregándosela a otro varón sabio con túnica que no llega hasta el suelo y barba bifurcada larga y oscura como su pelo. Hay discrepancias en cuanto a quiénes son los tres personajes.30 Esta ilustración tiene su equivalente en el folio 9r del manuscrito Milano, Biblioteca Trivulziana 693 (cf. 2.7).

y el De senectute, pero sin retratos. En general los manuscritos con las obras filosóficas son muy numerosos en el siglo XV.

28 También hay un retrato de la escena en que Premierfait presenta el libro a Jean, Duque de Berry en el manuscrito Walters Ms. W.312, fol. 1r (Brujas c. 1470), que contiene la traducción que hizo del De amicitia (De la vraye amistie).
29 Por ejemplo, en BnF Arsenal 3693, fol. 9 y en BnF français 33, fol. 2.
Fig. 7: Cicerón sentado *in cathedra* encomienda su libro a un joven para que se le entregue a otro varón docto. París, Bibliothéque Nationale de France, Latin 7789, fol. 8r.

En la segunda ilustración, que aparece en el folio 37r, el artista presenta a Cicerón y a Catón, ataviados como académicos de la época, de pie delante de un Ático de edad avanzada (como indican su barba y su pelo blancos), que está sentado *in cathedra* con una túnica larga de académico que tapa sus pies y un tocado en la cabeza. Lo flanquean dos jóvenes que llevan vestimenta típica de la época, pero no de los académicos.
Fig. 8: Cicerón y Catón de pie delante de Ático sentado in cathedra y flanqueado por doce jóvenes. París, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Latin 7789, fol. 37r.

En la miniatura del folio 39r Cicerón está hablando a Escipión y Lelio.³¹

2.7. Existe una copia casi gemela del anterior códice, el manuscrito Milano, Biblioteca Trivulziana, Triv. 693 (datable entre 1426 y 1450). Contiene las mismas obras, Pro Marcello, De senectute y la traducción que hizo al francés Premierfait (Livre de vieillesse), pero menos ilustraciones. El folio 9r es casi idéntico al 8r del BnF, Latin 7789.\textsuperscript{32}

2.8. La traducción al castellano que hizo Alfonso de Cartagena del tratado *De officiis*,\(^{33}\) del tratado *De senectute* encargadas ambas por el secretario del rey Juan II de Trastámara, Juan Alfonso de Zamora para uso del entonces príncipe Duarte de Portugal- y del discurso *Pro Marcello* se recogen en un manuscrito realizado en España en la primera mitad del siglo XV, el London, British Library, Harley MS 4796.\(^{34}\) Dentro de la inicial O del folio 66r hay una miniatura que pone en escena a Cicerón dialogando supuestamente con su hijo. Los dos aparecen sentados. Cicerón lleva un atuendo parecido al que viste en el BnF, Latin 7789,

\(^{33}\) La obra *De officiis* tuvo menos éxito que las anteriores (Reynolds 1986, 130–131; Ward 2015, 315, 319, 322), pero los humanistas encontraron representado en ella el ideal humanidad.

fol. 8r (2.6.) de un azul intenso, con capa corta de azul claro y birrete negro que lo identifica como doctor o magister.

2.9. Otra maravillosa miniatura ocupa media columna de las dos que tiene el folio 1r de un manuscrito magníficamente decorado y copiado en Francia entre finales del siglo XIV y principios del siglo XV, el Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Pal. lat. 1523. Incluye obras de Cicerón, un texto de Jerónimo, el De amicitia, un Accesus a este tratado y otras obras atribuidas erró-
neamente al arpinate. La obra que aborda el tema de la amistad era muy conocida en la Edad Media, por ejemplo, por Eloísa, Abelardo, y Dante, a quien impulsó a estudiar filosofía. En la ilustración aparecen sentados en el poyo de una ventana de castillo gótico dos personajes con toca y con barba que presumiblemente son Cicerón y Ático de edad madura. Cicerón, a la izquierda, con túnica roja abierta por el lateral izquierdo y forrada de piel, o bien una capa, que permite entrever un sayo rojo debajo, con la mano derecha levantada, en actitud de hablar, y Ático, a la derecha, de azul, estaría escuchando muy atento, con las manos entrelazadas sobre el regazo. Ambos llevan en la cabeza una prenda muy parecida a la de Boccaccio en el retrato que le hiciera Andrea del Castagno (1423–1457) en el fresco de las Artes Liberales (finales del siglo XV) en la Capilla de Invierno de la Catedral de Nôtre Dame de Le Puy-en-Velay.

Dentro de este mismo códice, en el folio 33r, al comienzo del De senectute, hay otro personaje masculino anciano y sabio, a juzgar por su barba larga y blanca bifurcada, como en manuscritos ya vistos anteriormente, y por el bastón de la mano derecha. No es fácil dilucidar si está de pie o sentado apoyándose en el brazo de una silla o sillón, pero lleva la misma indumentaria que Ático en la miniatura anterior, excepto por lo que respecta al tocado de la cabeza. Dado que el título de la obra es Cato maior, probablemente se trata de Catón.

Fig. 12: Cicerón y Ático dialogan sentados en el poyo de una ventana. Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Pal. lat. 1523, fol. 1r.

2.10. El manuscrito London, British Library, Harley 4329 (Tours? 1460), ricamente decorado, recoge la traducción al francés por Laurent de Premierfait del tratado *De amicitia* de Cicerón (*Le livre de l’amitié*). En la primera página de esta traducción (fol. 130) hay una gran ilustración (del Maestro del Boccaccio de Múnich, quizá Louis Fouquet o François Fouquet) con Cicerón sentado en cátedra en actitud de hablar a un varón que le escucha a la izquierda de la escena, mientras otro a la derecha presencia la conversación. Viste túника blanca y capa con capucha azul. El marco arquitectónico es un espacio abovedado con numerosas nervaduras marcadas por finos baquetones, que se unen en el centro y descansan sobre una columnilla que sirve de eje compositivo.

Fig. 13: Cicerón sentado in cathedra habla a un varón en presencia de orto. London, British Library, Harley 4329, fol. 130.

2.11. Tenemos otros dos retratos de Cicerón en el manuscrito New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS. M.1002, fol. 2v y fol. 71r, que fue realizado en 1410 en Signa (Italia) y contiene el tratado *De finibus bonorum et malorum*. El primero ocupa todo el folio 2v y muestra al personaje con barba blanca de pie soste-

niendo el libro con dos broches debajo del brazo derecho. Lleva una túnica roja con capucha, muy similar a la que portan Petrarca y Dante en los retratos que hiciera Andrea del Castaño para la Serie de hombres y mujeres famosos de Villa Carducci en Legnaia entre 1448 y 1451. Como en estos casos, Cicerón está delante del marco de una puerta vestido de rojo coral y su figura se destaca sobre un fondo de azul intenso.

En el folio 71r encontramos dentro de la inicial $C(um)$ un retrato de busto del autor con capucha roja y túnica verde.39 Sus manos están entrelazadas y con el antebrazo izquierdo sujeta un libro rojo. Esta pequeña representación es también muy similar a los retratos de Petrarca de esta época tanto en miniaturas como en pintura de gran formato, así como, por ejemplo, a los de Séneca que encontramos en los manuscritos BL King’s 30, fol. 2. y BL Harley 2483, fol. 2.

2.12. El manuscrito del siglo XV Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional de España, RES/236, nos transmite una traducción al italiano de los tratados *De officiis*, *De amicitia*, *Paradoxa Stoicorum* y *De senectute*. Todos los tratados comienzan con una inicial miniatizada, pero solo el primero tiene además un retrato del autor latino en el folio 1r. dentro de la inicial dorada A sobre fondo azul decorado. Dos putti sujetan la inicial y una filacteria en la que se lee MARCO TVLIO CICERONE, de modo que no cabe ninguna duda de quién es el personaje retratado. El autor es representado con cabellera y barba largas y completamente blancas, es decir, como un hombre sabio. Lleva un traje rojo forrado de verde y gorro rojo y blanco. Sujeta en su mano izquierda un enorme libro azul cerrado. Este retrato se parece bastante al de Séneca de cuerpo entero escribiendo en el manuscrito del siglo XV Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional de España, RES/7, fol. 7, donde se recogen las traducciones también al italiano de las *Epistulae morales ad Lucilium* y del *De providentia* y la correspondencia entre Agustín de Hipona y Bonifacio.

2.13. Tras una primera traducción al francés en 1400, en 1409 Laurent de Premierfait concluyó una segunda traducción de la obra de Giovanni Boccaccio⁴¹ que lleva por título *De casibus virorum illustrium* (entre 1355 y 1374), bajo el título *Les Cas des nobles hommes et femmes*, que el traductor quiso se decorara con miniaturas.⁴² Dentro de la T inicial que abre el capítulo 12 del libro 6, del manuscrito Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale, 1440, f. 213v (Francia, segundo tercio del siglo XV),⁴³ junto a la rúbrica «Le XIIe chapitre contient le cas du noble philosophe et prince de eloquence Tullus consul rommain», el interior de una habitación muestra a un soldado que está a punto de decapitar, espada en mano, al autor de las *Catilinarias*, que está arrodillado con una mano en el pecho y la otra extendida y con la cabeza inclinada hacia delante. Ya ha debido de asestarle un golpe porque, aunque los personajes no están coloreados, del cuello de Cicerón, chorrea sangre roja. El personaje tiene cara juvenil, va vestido

---

⁴¹ Sobre el conocimiento que este poeta tenía de Cicerón, cf. Reynolds 1983, XL, 71, 86 – 88, 94 y 430. Por su parte, Boccaccio es retratado por Jean Fouquet escribiendo en su estudio mientras un mensajero lleva su obra a Meibardo dei Cavalcanti en BSB Cod. Gall. 6, fol. 10 (Bretaña?, siglo XV) y en BL. Royal 14 E V, fol. 391 (Brujas c. de 1479) junto a Petrarcha en una biblioteca leyendo libros.


con el traje académico y lleva birrete o bien un corte de pelo a modo de casquete.
El tratamiento que hace Boccaccio de Cicerón tenía también la intención de ilustrar la inestabilidad de los logros humanos, según se desprende de la frase *huius ergo clarissimi viri gloria licet grandis fuerit non tamen solida*.⁴⁴ El tema de la muerte de Cicerón se hará más tarde muy recurrente en el arte. Por ejemplo, en *La muerte de Cicerón* (c. 1635) de François Perrier (Bad Homburg, Alemania, Staatliche Schlösser), donde Herenio, tras interceptar con sus hombres la litera de Cicerón, se dispone a decapitarlo; en *La ira de Fulvia* (c. 1692) de Gregorio Lazzarini (Museumslandschaft Hessen Kassel, Alemania); o en un grabado realizado por Christian Bernhard Rode en 1775 que se guarda en el British Museum y representa a Cicerón sentado en una litera al que se aproxima Herenio para matarlo con su espada.⁴⁵

2.14. Existe otro manuscrito realizado en Brujas entre 1479 y 1480 con esta misma traducción del *De casibus virorum illustrium* que hizo Premierfaut, el London, British Library, Royal 14 E V, que muestra en el folio 334 a Cicerón decapitado desplomado en el suelo boca abajo y al centurión, con armadura y casco y sonriendo casco, que sonríe, sosteniendo su cabeza clavada en una lanzas y su mano derecha amputada clavada en una espada. Esta vez los dos personajes están en un camino a campo abierto en un paisaje idílico con prado, río, árboles, montañas y cielo azul.

⁴⁵ Martín Puente 2021a.
3 Conclusiones

El repertorio que acabamos de mostrar nos permite concluir que existen numerosos retratos de Cicerón en manuscritos europeos desde principios del siglo XIII hasta finales del siglo XV. Muchos de ellos aparecen en códices que recogen la *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, los tratados filosóficos *De amicitia*, *De senectute*, *De officiis* y *De finibus* o el discurso *Pro Marcello*. La efigie puede estar incluida dentro de una inicial, ocupar buena parte del folio o llenar incluso el folio entero. También encontramos a Cicerón acompañando a Retórica dentro de una colección de representaciones de las Artes liberales acompañadas por sus respectivos máximos cultivadores, dado que durante la Edad Media y parte del Humanismo fue el máximo exponente de esta disciplina. Y, después, en la galería de los autores latinos canónicos (Virgilio, Ovidio, Lucano, etc.), vemos al arpinate en el mismo folio que Marciano Capela. Se trata de una galería de hombres ilustres similar a las que adornan bibliotecas, palacios y catedrales. Finalmente, en tanto que ciudadano ejemplar, ilustra el apartado sobre la decapitación de Cicerón de la traducción al francés que Premierfait hizo del *De casibus virorum illustrium* de Boccaccio.
En cuanto al retrato mismo, a veces es un busto que no forma parte de una escena –como los que representan muchas esculturas desde la Antigüedad–, otras veces Cicerón aparece escribiendo o leyendo en cátedra (como muchos otros escritores en la Edad Media), dialogando con Catón, Ático, su hijo u otros personajes aún no identificados (no hay que olvidar que sus obras filosóficas son diálogos) o impartiendo una lección magistral ante un público en el ámbito académico. Podemos verlo con las facciones de un varón joven, de edad madura o de edad avanzada. Puede ir sin barba o con barba negra, rubia o blanca (esta última, además de la edad, simboliza la sabiduría). Aparte de algunos casos en el que tiene los rasgos de un profeta con cabellera y barba largas, lo normal es que vista el traje típico de los doctorandos, doctores y magistri (en rojo, azul o blanco), una capa corta, a veces, y el birrete negro o algún otro tipo de tocado similar a los que llevan los humanistas italianos. De hecho, en alguna de las miniaturas se asemeja mucho a los retratos contemporáneos de Petrarca, Boccaccio o Dante, personajes cuya fisonomía sí conocía el público. En algunas ocasiones la imagen aparece identificada por una inscripción con su nombre o está muy cerca del encabezamiento donde aparece el nombre del autor y de la obra.
Fabio Gatti

Il «santissimo» Cicerone. La *Quaestura* di Sebastiano Corradi (1555) nella tradizione biografica sull’Arpinate

1 Introduzione

Nella premessa della *Vita Ciceronis* (1415) rivolta a Niccolò Niccoli, Leonardo Bruni auspicava che la propria opera venisse superata da altre più eleganti ed esaustive biografie ciceroniane, perché sul «principe delle lettere» doveva innescarsi un *certamen* letterario tra dotti.¹ A distanza di centoquarant'anni la sfida del Bruni sarebbe stata raccolta da Sebastiano Corradi (ca. 1510–1556) con la *Quaestura*, ampia e singolare biografia ciceroniana in forma di dialogo pubblicata a Bologna nel 1555;² in quest’epoca Cicerone aveva a tal punto catalizzato gli interessi dei dotti da essere ormai definitivamente assurto a somma *auctoritas*, oggetto di una vera e propria venerazione non solo per lo stile, ma anche per l’alto pensiero, ritenuto moralmente edificante e conciliabile con la dottrina cristiana.³ Grazie all’influenzante teorizzazione del cardinale Pietro Bembo, che in Cicerone aveva individuato, nella polemica sull’imitazione con Giovanfrancesco Pico della Mirandola (1512–1513) e nelle *Prose della volgar lingua* (1525), il modello di prosa latina da assimilarsi e da riprodursi in tutte le sue caratteristiche, il ciceronianismo era riuscito vittorioso dalle periodiche dispute umanistiche sul migliore stile latino, diventando, agli albori della Controriforma, marca identitaria della cultura ufficiale egemonizzata dagli ambienti ecclesiastici, che furono i più ferventi fautori dell’autorità ciceroniana.⁴ L’ammirazione per l’Arpinate si

---

¹ Viti 1996, 418.
era perlopiù sostanziatata in emulazione stilistica nell’oratoria della Curia romana, bersaglio polemico del *Ciceronianus* erasmiano, mentre aveva percorso un versante più professionale a Venezia, grazie all’erudizione degli umanisti e all’attività di Paolo Manuzio, nella quale i lavori ciceroniani (edizioni, commenti, traduzioni) costituiscono oltre il 65% della produzione tipografica relativa agli autori antichi, e le *Epistulae ad familiares* rappresentano il titolo in assoluto più frequente nel suo quasi trentennale periodo di attività lagunare (1533–1561).⁵ Luogo di congiunzione geografica e ideale tra la capitale della Serenissima e la Roma papalina era Bologna: avamposto settentrionale dello Stato pontificio (nonché sede, tra il 1547 e il 1549, del Concilio temporaneamente trasferito da Trento), la città era però culturalmente legata a Venezia, da dove per tutto il Cinquecento continueranno a provenire i docenti di umanità dell’*Alma Mater* come Corradi, che vi mantenne la cattedra dal 1544 sino al 1556.⁶ La sua attività riflette in forme esemplari questa pluralità di influenze, perché all’attenta esegesi delle opere ciceroniane, che si riversa anche in commenti di notevole erudizione, si accompagna nella *Quaestura* una presentazione intensamente celebrativa della vita di Cicerone.

### 2 Tra Venezia e Bologna: Cicerone e Corradi nell’umanesimo contemporaneo

La stessa *Quaestura* è legata ai maggiori poli culturali dell’epoca: benché il contesto sia in apparenza integralmente bolognese, non soltanto per il luogo della pubblicazione, ma anche per la dedica *ad senatum populumque Bono-niensem* e per la fisionomia dell’autore, nativo di Arceto, nei pressi di Reggio Emilia, l’opera è in maggior debito con l’ambiente veneziano, dove Corradi si era formato risiedendo nella città lagunare sino al 1540, quando il comune di Reggio Emilia lo reclamò come pubblico docente. Proprio a Venezia, nel 1537, Corradi aveva esordito con la pubblicazione di una prima *Quaestura*,⁷ che però, in quanto discussione testuale di passi di autori antichi, è un lavoro diversamente dallo

---


6 Cf. Mazzetti 1847, 110; Costa (E.) 1907, 6–9; Sorbelli/Simeoni 1987, II 43; Calcaterra 2009, 247.

7 Corradi 1537.
Quaestura del 1555 di cui qui si tratta, al di là della comunanza di titolo, cornice dialogica e personaggi. Il legame che Corradi continuò a mantenere con la città lagunare emerge comunque anche dalla seconda Quaestura, a cominciare dall’ambientazione del dialogo, che si immagina svolto a Venezia in uno dei soggiorni che l’autore, ormai ritornato a Reggio Emilia, periodicamente vi compiva, oltretutto dai personaggi che interloquiscono con lui, i più anziani umanisti veneti Battista Egnazio, alias Giovanni Battista Cipelli (1478 – 1553), e Pierio Valeriano, al secolo Giovanni Pietro Bolzani Dalle Fosse (1477 – 1558). Gli interessi ciceroniani del bellunese Valeriano sono testimoniati da Paolo Manuzio, che nella dedicatoria dell’edizione delle Epistulae ad familiares da lui curata nel 1533 afferma di essersi avvalso del suo contributo.⁸ Nella Quaestura è però l’Egnazio, definito praeceptor meus (p. 88) dal Corradi, a interpretare un ruolo di primo piano, come appare sin dall’intitolazione dell’opera, dove figura il suo nome (Quaestura sive Egnatius), e dalle prime righe, nelle quali Corradi tesse un encomio del maestro, elogiato per la divina memoria e per la straordinaria versatilità intellettuale, che lo rende una sorta di novello Gorgia, capace di discettare di ogni branca del sapere (p. 3 – 4 e 78). Collaboratore di Aldo Manuzio e del figlio Paolo, corrispondente di Erasmo, che nel suo Ciceronianus lo presenta come vir non minus probus et integer quam eruditus et eloquens,⁹ l’Egnazio fu senz’altro decisivo nell’avviare Corradi a interessi ciceroniani, avendo collaborato alla preparazione e al commento di edizioni aldine di Cicerone, dal De officiis alla Pro Caelio, e avendo dedicato alle Epistulae dell’Arpinate le sue affollate lezioni veneziane del 1531.¹⁰ In lui gli interessi esegetici su Cicerone si accompagnavano a un’adesione moderata all’indirizzo stilistico teorizzato dal Bembo, suo concittadino e corrispondente;¹¹ significativa al riguardo è una responsiva del 1526 nella quale l’Egnazio confessava all’umanista Giovanni Francesco Conti che avrebbe gradito di più le sue lettere se avessero dimostrato una più solerte, ma non esclusiva, imitazione ciceroniana.¹²

---

¹¹ Dei contatti epistolari tra Egnazio e Bembo è rimasta una lettera inedita inviata dal primo (Vat. Barb. Lat. 2158) e un’altra, scritta dal secondo, compresa in Bembo 1729, IV 230; sul moderato ciceronianismo dell’Egnazio cf. Fera 2003, xxv.
¹² Cf. Planerius 1584, 27r.–v.: Illud vero praetereire non possum, quod ab initio debueram, tuas mihi literas multo gratissimas extitisse, quae tamen aliquanto plus iucunditatis attulissent, si ingenii tui felicitatem ad meliora vertisses. Hoc est, si te Ciceronis, aut eius aetatis scriptorum, similiorem esse maluisse.
La presenza di Cicerone è centrale nella biografia del Corradi, e sembra in qualche modo orientare anche la scelta dei suoi contatti, a partire dal Bembo, da lui definito **vir clarissimus familiaris** nella *Quaestura* (p. 10): in una lettera del 1538 indirizzata all’alto funzionario urbinato Pietro Panfilo, Bembo segnala come precettore per Giulio della Rovere, figlio del duca di Urbino, «Sebastian Corrado da Reggio prete molto dotto in Lattino e convenevolmente in Greco», rilevandone, oltre allo **status** ecclesiastico, la conoscenza di entrambe le lingue classiche; in un’altra epistola dello stesso anno, Corradi sottopone al Bembo, apostrofato come **doctorum hominum huius aetatis coryphaeus**, l’interpretazione del grecismo βοωης di Cic. Att. 2.9.1 come maliziosa allusione a Clodia, che, tacciata di una relazione incestuosa con il fratello Clodio, è degna di essere paragonata alla «boopide» Giunone, sorella e moglie di Giove: l’interpretazione, in effetti corretta, ottenne l’autorevole approvazione del Bembo. Altro importante contatto veneziano del Corradi fu Paolo Manuzio, con il quale, anche dopo il trasferimento a Reggio Emilia nel 1540 e poi a Bologna dal 1544, egli mise a frutto le lezioni dell’Egnazio nell’emendazione di passi ciceroniani; con l’editore Corradi manterrà per tutta la vita un rapporto confidenziale, tanto da pro- digarsi invano, nel 1555, perché trasferisse la stamperia a Bologna, e da essere da lui affettuosamente definito «compare» in una lettera dell’anno successivo. Gli esiti dell’esegesi ciceroniana del Corradi videro la luce sul finire degli anni ’30, e poi, soprattutto, tra anni ’40 e ’50: già la prima *Quaestura* garanti al suo autore l’ammirazione, secondo quanto lo stesso Corradi racconta nell’omonima opera posteriore (p. 8–10), non soltanto dei maggiori esponenti dell’umanesimo italiano, ma anche di intellettuali europei come l’editore basileano Johannes Oporinus, che nel 1556 rieditò la seconda *Quaestura*.

Il debito del Corradi nei confronti dell’umanesimo veneziano è del resto comprovato dal fatto che nel 1540 egli accettò l’incarico di docenza nella città natale, Reggio Emilia, solo grazie alle sollecitazioni dell’Egnazio, quando avrebbe invece preferito trattenersi nella città lagunare per continuare a godere...
della frequentazione dei massimi dotti del tempo: tra questi Pier Vettori, editore tra il 1534 e il 1537 dell’intero Cicerone presso i tipi veneziani di Lucantonio Giunta e suo commentatore, al quale Corradi indirizzò una lettera nel 1542 in cui lamentava la difficoltà di coltivare a distanza l’amicizia con lui, *vir literatissimus et eruditissimus*. L’insegnamento reggiano, dominato, come il periodo di apprendistato veneziano, dall’esegesi ciceroniana, si concretizzò nel 1544 in un commento alle *Epistulae ad Atticum* pubblicato non a caso ancora a Venezia e aperto, oltre che da una dedica al cardinale Alessandro Farnese, da una premessa al lettore nella quale Corradi allude a propri precedenti τὰ σχόλια in epistolās, quae Familiares dicuntur di cui è rimasta testimonianza in una miscellanea di annotazioni alle Familiares, compendenti anche quelle del Vettori, edita nel 1540 a Basilea. Il commento sistematico alle *Epistulae ad Atticum* viene presentato dal Corradi come particolarmente gravoso, tanto che, come si fa notare, i dottissimi amici Pier Vettori e Paolo Manuzio si erano limitati rispettivamente a sparse osservazioni filologiche e a sintetici scolii. Il lavoro gli era stato però richiesto da Romolo Amaseo (1489–1552) e da Marcantonio Flaminio (1498–1550), entrambi desiderosi che il materiale raccolto per le sue lezioni reggiane fosse reso noto al pubblico; il primo, predecessore del Corradi sulla cattedra bolognese di umanità (1538–1544), era infatti oratore di stretta osservanza ciceroniana e strenuo propugnatore della superiorità del latino sul volgare; il secondo è introdotto come fervente ciceroniano nel *Cicero revocatus et Cicero relegatus. Dialogi festivissimi*, curioso dialogo dell’umanista milanese Ortesio Lando del 1534, nel quale viene inscenata una dissacrante disputa sull’Arpinate, dapprima condannato all’esilio in quanto reo di ogni vizio morale.

---

19 Cf. Corradi 1555a, 10–11.
21 Corradi 1544, f. 3r.
22 Vettori 1540. È invece priva di riscontri un’edizione del 1537 riferita in Tiraboschi 1781–1786, 83.
23 Cf. Corradi 1544, f. 3r.: *Amicissimi mei Petrus Victorius et Paulus Manutius, viri doctissimi et de literis latinis optime meriti, plurimum opera et studii in eam rem contulerint, quia tamen neuter illorum totum opus exposuit, sed alter castigationibus, ut vocat, alter σχόλιοις et his admodum paucis contentus fuit.* Le due opere evocate sono, rispettivamente, Vettori 1540 e Manuzio 1540.
e letterario, ma poi richiamato in patria grazie al solerte intervento di personaggi che ne ristabiliscono la statura intellettuale.25

Nella premessa al commento ai sedici libri delle *Epistulae ad Atticum*, Corradi cita le parole di Cornelio Nepote (*Att*. 16.3) per evidenziare una peculiarità dell’epistolario ciceroniano che lo renderà del tutto adatto a essere sfruttato nella *Quaestura* come fonte biografica e storica, ossia il suo contenere lettere scritte in più di vent’anni, dal consolato di Cicerone fino alla sua morte, cosicché «chi le legge non rimpiange più di tanto una storia sistematica di quei tempi» (*qui legat, non multum desideret historiam contextum eorum temporum*): del resto l’intento di abbozzare una storia della Roma tardorepubblicana attraverso l’epistolario sembra essere appartenuta a Cicerone stesso, che vi volle includere anche lettere ricevute da personalità terze.26 Il commento all’opera si avvale anche di lavori precedenti, rispetto ai quali Corradi annuncia, diversamente da quanto aveva fatto per gli scolii alle *Familiares*, di dichiarare costantemente il proprio debito per rendere giustizia a quei pochi eruditi che hanno saputo illuminare aspetti di un’opera quanto mai complessa e perciò tra le più trascurate.27 Le figure menzionate sono ancora Pier Vettori e Paolo Manuzio, ma anche Andreas Cratander (Andreas Hartmann), prolifico editore riformato che nel 1528, a Basilea, stampò gli *opera omnia* ciceroniani;28 a loro viene riconosciuto il merito di essersi dedicati all’epistolario ad Attico e di averlo emendato per quanto possibile, benché il risultato sarebbe stato più soddisfacente se essi avessero potuto basarsi su un maggior numero di manoscritti rispetto ai due soli codici autorevoli, ancorché corrotti e guasti, sopravvissuti all’epoca: l’uno, che si diceva fosse appartenuto al Petrarca (in realtà un apografo di un suo manoscritto), nelle mani del Vettori; l’altro, noto all’umanista alsaziano Beato Rennano, impiegato dal Cratander.29 Nel congedarsi dal lettore, Corradi insiste

---

26 Cf. Corradi 1544, f. 3r.: *Et sane Cicero historiam quasi contexte videtur voluisse, quum epistolam non solum suas, sed alienas etiam in haec volumina referenda curavit.*
27 Corradi 1544, f. 3v.: *Nullius scriptoris nomen, quod in nostris Familiaarum σχόλιοις scimus desideratum, tacitus. A primo quidem non ita cogitaram, ut minima quaque quasi interpretum persequerer, sed me postea et rei susceptae amor, et communis utilitas movit, ut nihil fere, de quo vel dubitari posset, praetermitterem, praesertim si ab aliis aliter vel descriptum, vel interpretatum fuisset. Videmus nullum esse librum, in quo tam librarum quam interpretarum minus operaet et studiis posuerint.*
29 Cf. Corradi 1544, f. 3v.: *Semper tamen excipio Andream Cratandum, Petrum Victorium et Paulum Manutium, qui pro virile laborarunt, ut librum nobis hunc quam emendatissimum tradierent: quod illi, quae fuit illorum diligentia, essent assecuti, si plures libros manu scriptos ha-
sull’obiettivo del lavoro, ossia la chiarificazione dei *Realien* che si affollano nell’epistolario ciceroniano, talmente fitto di rimandi a *leges, plebiscita, senatusconsultae, Praetorum edita* da essere l’opera latina di gran lunga più complessa.

L’interesse per gli aspetti storici, sociali e istituzionali presupposti dalle opere antiche rappresenta un’acquisizione tipica dell’umanesimo veneziano cinquecentesco, che, ben digerita la fase di ammirazione estatica dei classici, vi affianca una più matura attività di contestualizzazione erudita. Nel Corradi tale aspetto si ritrova nel suo secondo lavoro ciceroniano, un commento al *Brutus* pubblicato a Firenze nel 1552. L’opera, edita dallo stampatore olandese Lorenzo Torrentino (Laurens van den Bleeck, 1499–1563), che Corradi aveva probabilmente conosciuto a Bologna prima che quegli si trasferisse a Firenze nel 1546, è aperta come di consueto da una dedica (datata primo giugno 1552) indirizzata a una personalità dell’alta società del tempo, in questo caso il padre e censore Sebastiano Antonio Pighini (1500–1553), padre conciliare di cui si saluta la fresca nomina cardinalizia. Più interessante, per comprendere il retroterra e i propositi del lavoro, è però la premessa al lettore, dalla quale emerge il legame sempre stretto tra le pubblicazioni e l’attività di docenza del Corradi, dal 1544 definitivamente approdato allo Studio bolognese: qui, dopo aver inaugurato le lezioni con un discorso di natura pedagogica sui rispettivi doveri del docente e dei discenti pubblicato dal Torrentino, tenne un corso sul *Brutus*.

Presentando l’opera come la riproduzione pressoché integrale di sue lezioni tenute per tre anni, Corradi riferisce di avere atteso per due anni un giudizio, prima di pubblicarla, non soltanto da studiosi dell’antichità, ma anche dai

---

buissent; sed quum duo tantummodo huiuscemodi libri, qui auctoritatis habeant, hodie reperiantur, alter in Italia apud Petrum Victorium, qui Francisci Petrarchae fuisse dicitur, alter in Germania, quem Beatus Rhenanus legit et Cratander videtur securus, et hi quoque, ut appareat, dimidiat et corrupti, ex his difficile esset, vel potius plane ἀδύνατον, ita omnia restituere, ut nihil desiderares.


34 Corradi 1552: p. n. n. (=4a della premessa al lettore): *Volumus enim te [scil. lectorem] nunc omnium, quae in hoc commentario scriptum, esse iudicem, quamvis ipse scire possis [...] nos ea treis annos totidem paene verbis, quot edita sunt, in hoc nobilissimo Gymnasio Bononiensi exposuisse, deinde duos annos, Apellis exemplo, quid de his homines iudicarent, expectasse, donec ita iudicarunt omnes, quicunque nos audiebant aut literas sciebant, ut ipsi nec possimus nec velimus ad alios iudices appellare.*
maggiori della città (*principes civitatis*), membri dell’alta aristocrazia ecclesiastica e del consesso tridentino (da Giovanni Angelo Medici, futuro papa Pio IV, al delegato pontificio Camillo Mentuati, da Marcello Crescenzi a Girolamo Sauli), tra i quali spicca il nome dell’influente cardinal Giovanni Morone (1509 – 1580). Sembra infatti che proprio a quest’ultimo, legato apostolico a Bologna tra il 1544 e il 1548, Corradi dovesse l’ottenimento della prestigiosa cattedra bolognese, stando almeno a quanto lui stesso afferma nella dedica, indirizzata al Morone, del proprio ultimo lavoro, un commento al primo libro dell’*Eneide* pubblicato ancora dal Torrentino nel 1555. Il riferimento rappresenta una significativa testimonianza del fatto che all’epoca l’interesse per Cicerone non era relegato a ristrette cerchie di specialisti, ma costituiva una sorta di comune denominatore di tutti i colti, e in particolare degli ambienti ecclesiastici; è proprio la sua presenza nel *curriculum*, infatti, a rappresentare per uno studioso dell’epoca la migliore credenziale per ambire a cattedre di rilievo, tanto più agli occhi di personalità come Morone, introdotto come personaggio decisamente ciceroniano nei citati *Dialogi* del Land: in quest’opera, infatti, il futuro cardinale perorava con veemenza la causa dell’Arpinate, tessendone un incondizionato elogio, facendone, nel quadro di consolidate riflessioni risalenti almeno al Petrarca, un antesignano del messaggio cristiano («per quanto mi riguarda, tutte le volte che leggo Cicerone mi sembra di leggere non un esperto di diritto, non un retore, ma un uomo cristianissimo, un esimio araldo del Vangelo»), e conclude ndo che nulla vi fosse di meglio per la formazione di un giovane che la lettura dell’opera ciceroniana.

La pacifica conciliazione di fede religiosa e interessi ciceroniani, avvertita in tutte le sue problematiche implicanze almeno sin dal celebre sogno di san Girolamo (*epist.* 22.30), era all’epoca preoccupazione particolarmente viva negli ambienti ecclesiastici ai quali Corradi si dichiara vicino, soprattutto dopo le aspre polemiche innescate dal *Ciceronianus* di Erasmo, che aveva ravvisato un

---

36 Cf. Corradi 1555b, 7: *Haec vero, quae nos ipsi scripsumus, tamquam tua munera cape, quae tibi Corradus tuorum beneficiorum inde mittat ubi tu, quae tua summa fuit humanitas, eum Bononiae, quum legatus esses, collocasti.*
malcelato paganesimo nell’idolatria di cui l’opera e la figura dell’Arpinate venivano fatte oggetto nel cattolicesimo italiano. Echi di tali polemiche si riverberano anche negli scritti del Corradi, in particolare nella Quaestura, dove un vivace scambio di battute con l’Egnazio rivela la volontà dell’autore di scagionarsi dall’accusa di essere «poco cristiano» per la scelta di dedicarsi allo studio dell’antichità pagana (p. 16):

Egn.: Scimus te diu multumque in veterum rebus esse versatum, neque id ipsum sine reprehensione. Cor.: Qui me tandem reprehendunt? Egn. Qui suum studium in philosophia, vel in iure civili, vel in sacris litteris collocarunt. Cor.: Quid me reprehendunt? Egn.: Christianum hominem tantum temporis hisce rebus perquirendis consumem. Cor.: Quasi vero parum, vel nihil omnino, iuvet hominem Christianum, quam quae iactant isti, quantum satis est, norit, historias quoque, quas maiores nostri prorsus ediscebant, nosse; aut iam convicerint ipsi, Christianos esse magis, qui terrarum orbem cognitionibus, litibus et erroribus replent ac perturbant, quam qui historias ita legunt, ut interea tamen vere philosophentur, leges servent et Deum colant?

Egn.: Sappiamo che tu ti sei dedicato molto e a lungo alle questioni di antichità, e ciò non senza rimproveri. Cor.: Chi mi rimprovera? Egn.: Chi ha rivolto il proprio impegno alla filosofia, al diritto civile o alle sacre scritture. Cor.: Che cosa mi rimproverano? Egn.: Che un cristiano spenda tanto tempo nello studiare queste cose. Cor.: Come se davvero al cristiano giovasse poco o nulla, quando ha imparato quanto basta le cose a cui si dedicano costoro, studiare anche la storia che i nostri avvi imparavano addirittura a memoria; o ormai ci avranno convinti che sono più cristiani proprio loro, che riempiono e turbano la terra con inganni, liti ed errori, di quanti studiano la storia in modo tale che nel frattempo fanno davvero filosofia, onorano le leggi e venerano Dio?

Protestando la piena compatibilità dei propri studi con l’identità cristiana, Corradi pone l’accento sulla massima utilità della storia antica per l’epoca presente, replicando alle accuse, già rintuzzate nella premessa del commento al Brutus del 1552, secondo le quali un uomo del suo tempo avrebbe fatto meglio a dedicarsi ad altro genere di studi. Nelle parole del Corradi si riflettono invece le convinzioni degli ambienti ecclesiastici e della cultura ufficiale dell’epoca, che sotto l’influsso della temperie umanistica continuavano a considerare l’antichità, e il suo massimo rappresentante Cicerone, come summa di ogni sapere:

---

39 Cf. Corradi 1552, p. n. n. (= III della premessa al lettore): Et sane quidem nos ita semper utilitati communi studuimus, ut, ea contenti, quum res alias, tum vero vel in primis quorumdam calumnias neglexerimus qui solean eos, qui res huiuscemodi paulo diligentius perscrutentur, accusare, quasi vero convicerint eas aut hodie nihil prodesse aut a magnis viris olim spretas fuisse; quum satis appareat contra, nihil esse, quod studiosis hominibus magis prosit, nihil, in quod magni viri plus studii videantur contulisse.
emblematica, in proposito, sarà, meno di dieci anni dopo, la scelta dei padri tridentini di assegnare l’orazione conclusiva del Concilio a un giovane vescovo veneziano, Girolamo Ragazzoni (1537–1592), che a soli ventisei anni non poteva vantare particolari meriti pastorali, ma che già si era segnalato per un commento latino alle Epistulæ ad familiares e un volgarizzamento delle Filippiche ciceroniane, pubblicati intorno alla metà degli anni ’50 da Paolo Manuzio.⁴⁰

Il solido legame del Corradi con gli ambienti ciceroniani emerge anche laddove l’autore riconduce la genesi del commento al Brutus alle sollecitazioni del bresciano Giovita Ravizza (Rapicius, 1476–1553), dal 1523 rinomato docente a Venezia e autore di un trattato sul ritmo della prosa oratoria, il De numero oratorio, pubblicato postumo da Paolo Manuzio nel 1554.⁴¹ Ravizza leggerà il proprio nome a Cicerone a tal punto che il suo testamento sarà pubblicato insieme ad altri, nel 1581, nel commentario aldino al De officiis, opera su cui egli aveva tenuto alcuni corsi veneziani.⁴² A lui Corradi aveva sottoposto la bozza della Quaestura del 1537, ottenendo un giudizio lusinghiero e ricevendo l’invito a comporre un volume prosopografico de personis Ciceronianis volto a fornire informazioni sui personaggi che si affollano nell’opera dell’Arpinate; l’utilità dell’operazione viene condivisa dallo stesso Corradi, che, accantonato l’iniziale scetticismo dovuto alla gravosa mole del lavoro, ritiene che gli studiosi vi potranno trarre non poco giovamento, ancor più di quello prodotto dai già esistenti studi prosopografici sulle personae oraziane, figure perlopiù di scarsa importanza.⁴³ La scelta di dare seguito alle esortazioni di Ravizza concentrandosi sul Brutus, pur senza prescindere dall’attenta lettura di Ciceronis omnes libros, è giustificata dal Corradi con la constatazione che in quell’opera, più che in ogni altra, si concentrano, «come in un cavallo di Troia», così tanti oratori greci e latini che «chi conosc ebene quelli, può ritenere ed ic onoscere quasi tutti ip er-
sonaggi ciceroniani».

Già nel commento alle lettere ad Attico Corradi si era posto il problema di identificare sul piano storico le personalità menzionate dall’Arpinate, ma in quel caso aveva confessato di lasciare volentieri ad altri l’identificazione di nomi ignoti e perlopiù trascurati anche dai precedenti studiosi, specialmente quando si trattava di figure marginali. Nel caso del Brutus l’identificazione storica delle numerosissime personalità citate diviene invece necessaria, trattandosi di illustri oratori, assertori di specifiche teorie retoriche; essa costituirà un motivo di orgoglio per Corradi, deciso a segnare non senza polemica un contrasto con i precedenti esegeti ciceroniani, rei di riproporre confusamente concetti già ampiamente noti o non pertinenti, senza contribuire al benché minimo progresso negli studi sul massimo esponente della latinità e sulla sua epoca:

Interpretes enim, si quid occurrat historiae, solent, quod «lippis et tonsoribus est notum» [Hor. serm. 1.7.3] et a re saepius alienum, referre; is [sc. meus liber] nihil, nisi quod reconditum sit, et ad rem maxime pertineat, edendum curabit. Illi, si M. Cato, M. Piso, L. Torquatus, L. Lucullus aliquid apud Ciceronem de philosophia disputabunt, multa quidem congrerent, sed ita confundent, ut ea nec caput, nec pedes habere videantur; is vero, cur Cato, Piso, Torquatus, Lucullus potius, quam Varro, Cotta, Balbus, Triarius et cur eo modo potius, quam ario loquantur, quam planissime fieri poterit, explicabit [...] Quid multa? Is in Ciceronis operibus, quicquid ad historiam, quicquid ad philosophiam, quicquid ad artem dicendi pertinent, ita nobis, si modo studii tantum, quantum requiritur, in eam rem conferre volet, explanabit, nihil ut amplius desiderare possimus.⁴⁶

Infatti gli interpreti, se capita qualche questione di storia, sogliono riferire ciò che «è noto ai cisposi e ai barbieri» [Hor. serm. 1.7.3] ed è molto spesso estraneo al tema; questo libro, invece, non si occuperà di nulla se non di ciò che è oscuro e del tutto pertinente. Quelli, se Catone, Pisone, Torquato, Lucullo discuteranno di filosofia nell’opera di Cicerone, raccoglieranno si molto materiale, ma lo confonderanno in modo tale che esso sembrerà non avere né capo né coda; questo libro, invece, spiegherà il più chiaramente possibile perché parlino Catone, Pisone, Torquato, Lucullo invece che Varrone, Cotta, Balbo e Triario, e perché parlino in quel modo e non in un altro [...] Insomma: qualunque cosa nell’opera di

⁴⁴ Corradi 1552, p. n. n. (= II della premessa al lettore): Videremus in eum librum, tanquam in equum Troianum, quam Graecos tum Latinos oratores a Cicerone ita fuisse congestos, ut, qui bene norit illos, omne paene Ciceronianas personas cognosse videri possit.

⁴⁵ Cf. Corradi 1544, f. 3r.: De propiis nominibus, quam doctorum hominum diversas opiniones esse videremus, quod alii ne quaerenda quidem putarent, alii vero epistolae hasce a nmine posse interpretari crederent, nisi ab eo, qui historias omnes etiam privatorem hominem ut ungues nosset suas, nos, qui neque multum neque nihil operae dandum huic rei semper censimus, nomina eorum, qui vel ita ignobiles fuere, vel ita reeci a scriptoribus, vel recepti illi quidem, sed ita quum illorum libris desiderati, ut vix, ac ne vix quidem, inveniri posse viderentur, curiosis quaerenda reliquimus, praesertim si ea cognosse non magni referre putavimus.

⁴⁶ Corradi 1552, p. n. n. (= I-II della premessa al lettore).
Cicerone riguardi la storia, la filosofia, l’arte oratoria, questo libro ce lo spiegherà, se solo vorrà dedicare a questo compito tanto impegno quanto è richiesto, in modo tale che non possiamo desiderare nulla di più.

Le preoccupazioni espresse dal Corradi si inseriscono perfettamente nell’umanesimo della metà del Cinquecento, intenzionato a ricostruire minuziosamente lo sfondo storico e culturale delle opere antiche. Se centro propulsore di tale orientamento era stata la Venezia primo-cinquecentesca, esso verrà ulteriormente valorizzato a Bologna, alla cui cattedra di umanità si succederanno per tutto il sedicesimo secolo studiosi – lo stesso Corradi (1544–1556), Francesco Robortello (1557–1561), Carlo Sigonio (1563–1584), Aldo Manuzio il Giovane (1585–1586) – formatisi nella città lagunare, ma che proprio con la docenza presso l’Alma Mater e le correlate pubblicazioni produrranno i migliori frutti in tal senso.⁴⁷

3 La biografia di Cicerone nella Quaestura

L’esito più maturo di tale prospettiva è avvertibile nella Quaestura del 1555, dove l’interesse per la figura di Cicerone si estende a tutti gli aspetti correlati che possono contribuire a illuminarne ulteriormente il contesto e la vicenda storica: l’opera incontrò non a caso larga fortuna in epoche animate da zelo antiquario, tanto da essere ristampata nel 1754 a Lipsia per le cure di uno dei maggiori antichisti di area germanica dell’epoca, Johann August Ernesti.⁴⁸ Oltre alla biografia di Cicerone, la Quaestura contiene, come indicato nel sommario iniziale, la cronologia delle sue opere pervenute e perdute (p. 286–310), ricostruita sulla base di testimonianze dello stesso Cicerone e di fonti successive, la biografia del figlio Marco (p. 310–313), del fratello Quinto e di suo figlio (p. 314–321), un’analisi del Commentariolum petitionis (p. 321–337) e un’ampia discussione dell’Invectiva in Ciceronem (p. 96–120) e dell’Invectiva in Sallustium (p. 121–143), di cui Corradi confuta, tra i primi, le rispettive paternità sallustiana e ciceroniana.⁴⁹ L’esigenza di calarsi quanto più possibile nella realtà storica romana, comprendendone a fondo gli aspetti sociali e istituzionali, si riflette nell’inedito impianto dell’opera, nella quale i tre protagonisti, vestendo i panni

⁴⁷ Sugli studi classici connessi con la cattedra di umanità dell’Alma Mater dell’epoca si vedano Costa 1907; Sorbelli/Simeoni 1987, II 42–47; Calcaterra 2009, 239–252.
⁴⁸ Corradi 1754. L’edizione contiene anche la prima Quaestura del 1537.
di magistrati della Roma repubblicana e ripropone dinamiche delle istituzioni antiche, si fingono contemporanei di Cicerone e inscenano il momento in cui al questore latino era richiesta dinanzi ai consoli la rendicontazione dei tributi riscossi:

Cor.: Venetias profectus, illum [sc. Egnatium], Ioannemque Pierium Valerianum, quum Consules etiam tunc essent et de Republica, cuius aerarium videbant exhaustum, loquee- rentur, conveni: qui me quum vidissent, benigneque et comiter, ut ante solebant, exce- pissent, quum salvum venisse gavisi sint, tum divinitus esse factum crediderint, ut is, qui Quaestor esset, eo potissimum tempore, quo de Reipublicae rationibus ipsi commentam- bantur, adveniret. Itaque me rogare, vel potius urgere, coeperunt, ut Quaesturae rationem, quam prius inchoassem, aliquando tandem to- tam referrem.

Cor.: Partito per Venezia, raggiunsi lui [sc. l’Egnazio] e Giovanni Pierio Valeriano, quando allora erano ancora Consoli e parlavano dello Stato, il cui erario vedevano esausto; i due, dopo avermi visto e accolto con affetto e affabilità, come già erano soliti fare, si rallegra- rono che io fossi giunto sano e salvo e credettero che accadesse per volere divino il fatto che chi era Questore sopraggiungesse proprio in quel tempo in cui loro discutevano dei conti dello Stato. E così cominciarono a chiedere, e anzi a incalzare, che io finalmente una buona volta riferissi tutto il bilancio della Questura che avevo precedentemente intrapreso.

La natura allegorica della situazione è trasparente: la Repubblica non è più quella romana, bensì la Respublica litterarum; i suoi massimi magistrati, i Consoli, sono gli anziani esponenti dell’umanesimo veneziano, l’Egnazio e il Valeriano, mentre il più giovane Corradi, ancora agli inizi del cursus honorum, è il questore che lascia la capitale degli studi, dove però saltuariamente torna, per svolgere il suo insegnamento nella provincia assegnatagli, Reggio Emilia; l’erario statale è il patrimonio di opere esistenti sulla figura di Cicerone, un tesoro bisognoso di essere riminguato per mezzo delle risorse riscosse dal Corradi, ossia grazie ai frutti delle sue ricerche e dei suoi insegnamenti, che una volta depositate nelle casse pubbliche saranno redistribuite ai poveri, cioè pubblicate e rese disponibili agli indotti e ai desiderosi di apprendere.50 L’ori- ginalità della cornice entro cui il discorso viene inserito è evidente sin dal titolo dell’opera, giocato sull’ambiguità del termine quaestura, che rimanda all’esazione dei tributi connessa con l’istituzione romana e all’indagine (da quaerere,
«ricercare») promossa nel dialogo.\textsuperscript{51} La consegna dei tributi riscossi, che comprende in misura minore monete straniere, cioè notizie ricavate da autori non latini,\textsuperscript{52} contribuisce a lumegeggiare, attraverso la biografia di Cicerone, anche la vita e l’opera di altre personalità a lui variamente legate, con il risultato che «rinasceranno» uomini cancellati dal tempo o dalla trascuratezza degli studiosi.

La polemica contro la \textit{negligentia} dei precedenti scrittori, già affacciata nella premessa del commento al \textit{Brutus}, riaffiora con ulteriore vigore nella \textit{Quaestura}, il cui dichiarato obiettivo è quello di riaffermare una serie di verità storiche, circa Cicerone e il suo tempo, contro le falsità presenti in Plutarco, Dione, Appiano e altri (Plutarchus, Dion, Appianus et alii tam multa falsa retulerunt, p. 15). Reale bersaglio polemico del Corradi è l’atteggiamento ostile a Cicerone, o comunque il ritratto negativo che emerge a più riprese nell’opera dei predecessori moderni e antichi, evidentemente inaccettabile in un contesto che aveva elevato l’Arpinate a suprema autorità stilistica, morale e sapienziale: il vero obiettivo della \textit{Quaestura} è infatti un’accorata difesa di Cicerone, come appare evidente nell’indice, dove si annuncia la \textit{Ciceronis vita undique collecta et defensa}; l’opera mira in sostanza a ristabilirne il buon nome anche sotto quegli aspetti per i quali l’Arpinate era stato screditato nella tradizione biografica, senza implicare una falsificazione del dato storico da parte del Corradi, ma certo comportandone un uso tendenzioso. Dell’impostazione sostanzialmente panegiristica dell’opera si accorrerà un altro biografo di Cicerone, l’inglese Conyers Middleton, che nella sua \textit{The History of the Life of M. Tullius Cicero} (1741), pur riconoscendo l’immutata utilità della \textit{Quaestura}, la sua vasta informazione, la generale fonteza dei giudizi e la sua eleganza stilistica, non mancherà di rilevarne la prospettiva integralmente filo-ciceroniana:

There are two books, however, which have been of real use to me, Sebastiani Corradi \textit{Quaestura} and \textit{M.T. Ciceronis Historia} a Francisco Fabricio: the first was the work of an Italian Critic of eminent learning, who spent a great part of his life in explaining Cicero’s writings; but it is rather an apology for Cicero, than the History of his life; it’s chief end being to vindicate Cicero’s character from all the objections, that ever been made to it, and particularly from the misrepresentations of Plutarch and the calumnies of Dio. The piece is

\textsuperscript{51} Corradi 1555a, 6: Cor.: \textit{Hic noster [sc. dialogus], quum de magnorum virorum moribus et vita, tum de numis, quibus Respublica servari solet, habetur, et de rebus hisce disputando, vel potius exigendo, quaerit ita ut vel ob id Quaestura dicatur.} 

\textsuperscript{52} Corradi 1555a, 17–18: Egn.: \textit{Cogitat hic homo non Romanos solum et veteres, ut pollicitus est, sed externos etiam numos, dare. Cor.: Id vestra referit nihil, dum sint probi, quanquam sunt ii quidem omnes fere Ciceronianii et ita Romanii; fieri tamen potest, ut externi etiam multi sint admissi, qui si in manus venerint, non credo vos propter legem latam reiecturos. Egn.: Bene credis, nisi fuerint reiciendi.}
learned and ingenious, and written in good Latin; yet the dialogue is carried on with to
harsh and forced an Allegory, of a Quaestor or Treasurer producing the several testimonies
of Cicero’s acts, under the form of genuine money, in opposition to the spurious coins of the
Greek historians, that none can read it with pleasure, few with patience: the observations,
however, are generally just and well-grounded, except that the Author’s zeal for Cicero’s
honour gets the better sometimes of his judgment, and draws him into a defence of his
conduct where Cicero himself has even condemned it.⁵³

Lo scandaglio critico delle fonti, riferito sin dall’indice (multa e Plutarcho ca-
terisque Graeca conversa. Multa comprobata. Multa confutata), pone al centro la
sola biografia ciceroniana completa sopravvissuta dall’antichità, quella di
Plutarco. Il primato d’importanza dell’opera, dovuto a questa sua unicità, riflette
peraltro un interesse particolarmente vivo nella Bologna del tempo grazie alla
traduzione latina della vita plutarchea pubblicata nel 1508 dall’allora lettere di
greco dello Studio cittadino Achille Bocchi (1488–1562), ricordato per questo suo
lavoro anche nel Ciceronianus erasmiano.⁵⁴ Personalità di rilievo nella cultura
bolognese, nel 1546 Bocchi aveva fondato l’Hermathena, un’accademia patroci-
nata dal cardinale Alessandro Farnese e frequentata dalle maggiori personalità
della cultura cittadina; con Corradi, che lo definisce noster amicus e vir nobi-
limissimus (p. 44) e cita passi della sua traduzione, egli condiviveva anche interessi
ciceroniani, testimoniati da tuttora inedite Praelectiones a un corso sul De legibus
del 1557.⁵⁵ La completezza cronologica della vita plutarchea permette al Corradi
di seguirne l’ordine di esposizione, riportandone in traduzione latina interi passi
trascurati o non bene intesi da precedenti interpreti, specialmente dal Bruni,⁵⁶
benché egli presenti l’opera del greco come una trama da «ritessere» in più
punti, in quanto fonte lacunosa ed erronea (p. 35). Mentre l’Egnazio ravvisa in
Plutarco uno scrittore equo e non partigiano, come si conviene a un biografo,
Corradi ne denuncia la parzialità, includendolo nella folla schiera di quanti
hanno dato di Cicerone un’immagine pregiudizialmente negativa, tralasciando i
pur numerosi motivi di elogio di cui avrebbero dovuto dare conto (p. 158–159):

Egn.: Meminisse debes eos, qui vitas scribunt, oportere non virtutes modo, sed etiam vitia,
quaeunque fuerint illa, complecti. Cor.: At hic ille [sc. Plutarchus] multa, quae laudari,

⁵³ Middleton 1741, I, xxx-xxxi; sull’opera e l’autore si veda, oltre a Kenty (p. 205–206) e Berno
(p. 370) in questo volume, Ingram 2015.
⁵⁴ Cf. Gambaro 1965, 216; la traduzione è Bocchi 1508.
⁵⁶ Corradi 1555a, 47: Haec verba nos idcirco vertimus, quod ab aliiis ea vel male conversa, vel
omissa prorsus videamus. Nam Leonardus Arretinus neque sensum more suo, neque verba con-
vertit, vel quod ea in suo libro non invenerit, vel quod indigna putarit, quae a Plutarcho et de
Cicerone scripta dicantur.
certe referri debeban t, tacuit; unum quod vituperari posse credidit, multis etiam verbis est persecutus. [...] Graecos omnes, quem caeteris Latinis, tum Ciceroni, qui primus eorum luminibus officere coepit, iniquissimos fuisse.

Egn.: Devi ricordare che quanti raccontano le vite bisogna che trattino non solo le virtù, ma anche i vizi, di qualunque natura essi siano. Cor.: Ma qui egli [sc. Plutarco] tacque molte cose che senz’altro dovevano essere riferite e lodate, mentre affrontò con molte parole soltanto ciò che ritenne potesse essere biasimato. [...] Tutti i Greci sono stati ingiustissimi non solo verso tutti i Latini, ma soprattutto verso Cicerone, che per primo cominciò a offuscare il loro lustro.

Persino il capitolo plutarcheo dedicato al proconsolato di Cicerone in Cilicia (Cic. 36), che restituisce un’immagine assolutamente lusinghiera dell’Arpinate, appare al Corradi inadeguato, perché troppo sbrigativo rispetto alla più ampia trattazione che i meriti e i successi di Cicerone avrebbero meritato, e che viene integrata dallo stesso Corradi sulla base dell’epistolario dell’oratore.\(^{57}\) Il giudizio negativo su Plutarco investe anche gli altri autori greci che forniscono informazioni sulla vita di Cicerone, quali Dione e Appiano, tutti tacciati di non costante affidabilità e perciò in genere svalutati rispetto alle fonti latine: di Dione, in particolare, si dice che «mente spesso con l’intenzione di denigrare Cicerone» (studio de Cicerone detrahendi saepe mentitur, p. 24), e la falsità da lui raccolte nel discorso di Caleno sono talmente palesi da essere indegne di confutazione.\(^{58}\) La critica generalizzata alle fonti greche, che suscita la perplessità dell’Egnazio, viene giustificata dal Corradi in relazione al racconto della vicenda di Catilina, rispetto alla quale anche autori latini stringati e ineleganti appaiono preferibili agli autori greci, magari stilisticamente migliori, in quanto più attenti alla meticolosa ricostruzione dei fatti, con il metaforico risultato che le monete dei Latini, piccole ma di oro puro, vengono guaste dal bronzo mischiatovi dai Greci per renderle più grosse e appariscenti (p. 92–93):

Cor.: Qui numos diligenter spectant et bene probant, eos [sc. Paterculi] malunt, ita circuncisos, quam quos Diodorus Siculus, Plutarchus, Dion, Appianus et alii Graeci quam maximos formarunt. Pie.: Quid ita? Cor.: Quod illi, dum numos veteres probos illos quidem,  

\(^{57}\) Corradi 1555a, 215: Egn.: Si quid ante Plutarchus, ut saepe questus es, detraxit, id hoc elogio quasi plena manu reddidit ita ut amplius queris non possis, eum, quem de Ciceronis laude scriberet, parcum fuisse. Cor.: Gratias agit et rem, quae fuerit omnium iudicio et testimonio probata, refert et tamen eam parcius multo, quam fuit aequum, describit. Nam res a Cicerone tunc in Cilicia gestas, quae vel longo commentario fuerant explicandae, paucis versibus ipse complectitur.  

et ex optimo aureo factos, sed nimis, ut ipse dicis, circuncisos, renovare ac reficere conantur, tantum aeris admiscuerunt, ut eos nemo amplius aureos esse dicat. Egn.: Nos dicimus, qui scimus a Plutarcho paene nihil expressum, quod auro non sit etiam purius. Cor.: Ita vobis videri potest, sed mihi neque Plutarchus, neque alius quispiam Graecus, praeter Polybium et Dioysium, satís in ea re facit [...] Egn.: Tu malis numos Flori, Orosii, Eutropii, Rufi et aliorum, qui vix latine loquuntur, et, dum breves esse laborant, obscuri et negligentes fiunt, quam Graecorum, qui et elegantissime graece scripserunt et minima quaeque diligentissime sunt persecuti? Cor.: Vide quam diligenter: saepe quae nusquam gentium sunt facta scribunt; saepius tempora, magistratus et magistratum atque privatorum nomina confundunt; saepissime in his, quae facta sunt, more suo mentiuntur.

Cor.: Quanti valutano attentamente e soppesano bene le monete, preferiscono queste [scil. quelle di Velleio Patercolo], così minute, a quelle molto grandi che produssero Diodoro Siculo, Plutarco, Dione, Appiano e altri Greci. Pie.: Perché? Cor.: Perché questi, tentando di rifare e riparare le antiche monete, autentiche e fatte di ottimo oro, ma, come dici tu, troppo minute, vi hanno mischiato tanto bronzo che nessuno direbbe più che esse siano di oro. Egn.: Lo diciamo noi, che sappiamo che da Plutarch non è stato prodotto nulla che non sia anche più puro dell’oro. Cor.: A voi può apparire così, ma a me sotto questo aspetto non soddisfa né Plutarco né altro greco, ecetto Polibio e Dionigi di Alicarnasso [...] Egn.: Tu preferisci le monete di Floro, Orosio, Eutropio, Rufo e di altri, che a stento parlano latino, e, mentre si impegnano a essere brevi, divengono oscuri e sciatti, rispetto ai Greci che non solo hanno scritto con somma eleganza in greco, ma hanno anche curato con somma attenzione tutti i minimi dettagli? Cor.: Guarda con quanta attenzione: spesso scrivono cose che non sono accadute in nessun luogo; più spesso confondono tempi, cariche, nomi di magistrati e di privati cittadini; spessissimo mentono, come è loro costume, sui fatti accaduti.

La centralità di Plutarco per chiunque voglia scrivere la biografia di Cicerone era implicitamente riconosciuta già dal Bruni, il quale, proprio nel ricondurre l’idea di comporre il Cicero novus all’insoddisfazione per quanto contenuto nella vita plutarchea, confessava però che l’intento iniziale era stato quello di tradurlo in latino l’opera.⁵⁹ L’influenza esercitata da Plutarco sul Bruni viene rilevata dal Corradi, che perciò non risparmia critiche anche all’Aretino, perché per molti aspetti Plutarco fu per lui come un caecus dux per un cieco, tanto che obiettivo dichiarato della Quaestura è riuscire a «vedere dove Plutarco e il Bruni non hanno saputo vedere» (p. 19).

L’atteggiamento decisamente favorevole a Cicerone non è del resto tacito dal Corradi, che fornisce ampio materiale («molte monete») volto a restituirne un’immagine positiva, dichiarando apertamente la propria felicità per il suo acclamato e trionfante ritorno dall’esilio (p. 202). L’innegabile parzialità della prospettiva si riflette, da un lato, nella condanna senza appello delle fonti ostili a Cicerone, come l’Invettiva pseudo-sallustiana, prodotto di un mediocre decla-
mator a cui si rifà Dione e di cui Corradi dimostra il carattere falso e diffamatorio, e dall’altro nell’ampio ricorso alla stessa opera ciceroniana come fonte autobiografica: quest’ultima scelta, dall’Egnazio giudicata rischiosa, perché ognuno non può che fornire un ritratto interessato di se stesso, è invece difesa da Corradi come assolutamente logica, tanto più a causa della perdita delle biografie ciceroniane cronologicamente più vicine al protagonista, ossia quelle di Nepote, Tirone e Fenestella (p. 19).

Notizie prive di riscontro nell’opera ciceroniana vengono così rigettate come false, come per esempio l’accusa, riferita da Plut. Cic. 8.1, secondo la quale Cicerone si sarebbe fatto corrompere per ridurre l’entità della sanzione a Verre: secondo Corradi la notizia è infondata, perché, se davvero Cicerone fosse stato accusato di corruzione, non avrebbe mancato di scagionarsi in qualche passo della propria opera. Il ricorso agli scritti ciceroniani appare ammesso ragionevole in relazione agli argomenti e ai periodi sui quali le biografie tacchiano, mentre in caso di discordanza tra le fonti il credito viene immancabilmente accordato alla testimonianza ciceroniana: il confronto è particolarmente serrato con la vita di Plutarco, che viene corretto in tutti i punti in cui discorda da Cicerone, mentre viene apprezzato quando mutua le informazioni direttamente da lui (come nel caso del racconto sulla vicenda di Catilina), o quando (troppo di rado secondo Corradi) ne offre un’immagine positiva.

Il ritratto intensamente apologetico, e anzi celebrativo, che Corradi offre dell’Arpinate emerge con particolare evidenza in riferimento a circostanze nelle quali il suo comportamento viene da sempre oggetto di critiche e accuse

60 Corradi 1555a, 112: *Suspiciose et criminosae de immacatorio more dicebas* [sc. Ps. Sallustius], *pro quibus te nunc etiam gravissimas poenas apud Inferos dare credimus, qui viro sanctissimo non solum turpitudine male dixeris ipse, sed etiam causa fueris ut alii maledicerceret, ut Dion, qui sic ista maledicta collegit et te sic imitatus est ut simia quaedam fuisses videatur.*

61 Cf. e.g. Corradi 1555a, 53, in relazione alla discrepanza tra Plut. Cic. 6.1 e Cic. Planc. 64–65 circa le reazioni alla questura ciceroniana in Sicilia: Egn.: *Hic ego Plutarcho potius, quam Ciceroni credendum puto: quod hic de se loquens in eo praeertim, quod ad laudem pertinet, fortasse mentiatur, ille, ut historicus, quod verum sit, scribat, et causas addat cur molestus esset.*

62 Corradi 1555a, 64: Cor.: *Quod si ea unquam fuisset opinio, aliquis aliquando adversarius Ciceroni obieciisset. Egn.: Obiecerunt fortasse multi, sed scripta non extant in quibus id cognosci possit. Cor.: At ipsius Ciceronis extant orationes, in quibus quum reliqua, quae sunt objecta, confutet, id quoque, si objectum fuisset, aliqua ratione confutaret.*

63 Cf. e.g. Corradi 1555a, 149: Cor.: *In quattuor libris, quos Cicero contra Catilinam scripsit, unde Plutarchus, quicquid de coniuratione bene scripsit, est mutatus.*

64 Corradi 1555a, 195: Cor.: *Videtis iam quod omnes vident, Plutarchum, qui de nugis saepe tam multa scripsit, in hisce rebus, quae ad gloriam Ciceronis pertinent, ita parcum fuisse, vix ut eas indicarit.*
nella tradizione biografica. Uno dei momenti più controversi della vita di Cicerone è lo scoppio della guerra civile tra Cesare e Pompeo, quando già i contemporanei e poi i posteri lo accusarono di atteggiamento ambiguo e incerto (Att. 9.1.3), sospettandone addirittura un’iniziale collocazione filo-cesariana per il fatto che sulle prime egli non seguì Pompeo lontano da Roma dopo il passaggio del Rubicone (Plut. Cic. 37.2 – 3). L’eventuale indecisione di Cicerone nello schierarsi viene negata dal Corradi, preoccupato soprattutto di scagionarlo dal sospetto più inquietante, ossia quello di aver parteggiato per Cesare: Cicerone aveva in realtà deciso sin da subito di schierarsi con Pompeo, secondo quanto si ricava dalle sue lettere ad Attico, in particolare da Att. 7.3.5, fonti dal Corradi giudicate attendibili perché non si tratta di opere scritte con intenti apologetici, ma di corrispondenza privata nella quale il mittente ha l’urgenza di condividere il da farsi con un amico fidato; la sua posizione fu però cauta e poco esibita perché egli tentò in ogni modo di invitare i due contendenti alla pace, da lui auspicata più di ogni altra cosa (Att. 8.2.1), e perché un’esposizione troppo aperta al fianco di Pompeo, se i due contendenti si fossero poi riconciliati, avrebbe provocato le ritorsioni di Cesare (Att. 8.11d. 7–8); quando Pompeo decise di lasciare Roma, Cicerone aveva già deciso di seguirlo, ma dissimulò le proprie intenzioni per timore di essere ostacolato nei suoi progetti. Alla perplessità dell’Egnazio, disposto a concedere che inizialmente Cicerone parteggiasse per Pompeo, ma convinto che avesse poi cambiato idea più volte, Corradi replica spiegando che l’Arpinate ponderò con cura la situazione, domandandosi (Att. 8.7.2) se il Pompeo di un tempo, garante della tradizione repubblicana, fosse ancora lo stesso Pompeo, che respingeva le condizioni di pace ed era ormai pronto a tutto (Att. 8.8.1). Il suo dubbio, in sostanza, non riguardò mai quale comandante seguire, ma se seguire Pompeo o rimanere neutrale.

---

65 Per la presenza di simili accuse, e in parte anche delle difese addotte da Corradi, già in epoca antica si vedano in questo volume Stoner (p. 83 – 99), in relazione a Quintiliano, e La Bu (p. 103 – 118), in relazione agli storici antichi.

66 Corradi 1555a, 225: Cor.: [sc. Scio] Ciceronem iam inde a principio consituisse in bello Pompeium sequi nec unquam postea mutasse sententiam: sed quam videret agi de pace et professionem talis voluntatis esse sibi periculosam, cunctatum et tergiversatum esse, donec Pompeius ex Italia fugit: tum vero semper de discessu cogitasse, sed occultasse consilium, ne posset vel ab Antonio vel ab aliis impediri. Egn.: Si tu ista probares, nemo posset amplius dicere Ciceronem tum mobilem vel mutabilem fuisse. Cor.: Nos, inquam, vel ex epistolis ea scire possumus. Egn.: Quid si suspectae sunt epistolae? Cor.: Ille non possunt esse suspectae, quas ille tunc ad Atticum scriptis, non ut se defenderet, sed ut illum de suis consiliis admoneret, quicum soletam omnia libere communicare.

67 Corradi 1555a, 226 – 227: Quid opus erat deliberare, si iampridem Pompeium sequi constituerat? Cor.: Illum Pompeium, qui prius erat, sequi constituerat, sed deliberabat, an eum Pompeium,
L’atteggiamento incostante dell’Arpinate si sarebbe rivelato anche durante il suo esilio, come riferito in Plut. *Cic.* 32.5, ma secondo Corradi si tratta di una calunnia, né può essere addotto come prova il tono supplichevole e lamentoso delle lettere ciceroniane, perché esso è piuttosto una posa dettata dal tentativo di esortare i familiari a perorare la sua causa (p. 186):

Cor.: *Videtis,* opinor, ut homo Graecus, omnes occasiones, ut Ciceroni maledicere possit, capret. Egn.: *Non captaret ille,* nisi Cicero, qui tam miserabiliter ad Atticum, ad Quintum fratrem et ad Terentiam scribat, offerret. Cor.: *Ille vero miserabiliter scriebat ad eos,* ut miserabilis videretur, quo magis eos ad id procurandum, quod cupiebat, excitaret.

Cor.: Vedete, credo, come un uomo greco approfitti di ogni occasione per poter denigrare Cicerone. Egn.: Ma non ne approfitterebbe se non la offrisse Cicerone, che scrive in maniera tanto lamentosa ad Attico, al fratello Quinto e a Terenzia. Cor.: In realtà scriveva loro in maniera lamentosa per apparire in una condizione miserevole e sollecitarli maggiormente a ottenere ciò che desiderava.

Cicerone è così restituito alla piena dignità del *sapiens,* capace di affrontare le tempeste della vita con saldezza d’animo e coraggio, in ciò distinguendosi da Demostene, che «compiangeva il proprio esilio con modi da donna» (*muliebriter exilium suum deflebat*, p. 187). La questione si intreccia con un altro difetto ampiamente rimproverato a Cicerone dalla tradizione biografica, ossia la sua codardia: il motivo, rinfacciatiogli sin da Plut. *Cic.* 19.5, sarà continuamente riproposto fino al Novecento, quando nel 1939 Alex F. Witley intitolerà la propria biografia ciceroniana *The Tremulous Hero.* Secondo Plut. *Cic.* 4.6, la viltà di Cicerone si sarebbe palesata già quando, subito dopo il successo forense ottenuto con la *Pro Roscio,* l’oratore lasciò Roma alla volta di Atene per timore di Silla; la notizia, accolta dal Bruni,⁶⁸ viene smentita dal Corradi sulla base di *Brut.* 313–314, dove Cicerone afferma di aver continuato a trattare cause a Roma per altri due anni prima di partire (nel 79 a. C.), sconfessando nei fatti, con il proprio impegno pubblico, la vociferata paura di Silla. La pusillanimità di Cicerone si sarebbe poi manifestata al massimo grado in occasione del processo a Milone, quando secondo Plut. *Cic.* 35.3–5 e Dio Cass. 45.54.2 l’oratore sarebbe stato così intimorito dalla presenza dei soldati pompeiani nel foro da non riuscire a pronunciare che un’orazione flebile e inghiottante, tanto che Milone fu condannato: bensché lo stesso Cicerone, in *Mil.* 1, confessi di rimanere impressionato alla vista dei soldati, l’ardore apologetico induce Corradi a ipotizzare che a terro-

---

qui tunc esset, sequetur [...] Quamvis ille nunquam deliberarit utrum ducem, sed an Pompeium an neutrum sequeretur. Sul posizionamento di Cicerone nella guerra civile si veda comunque Scardigli 1995, 524–529 con note.

⁶⁸ Cf. Viti 1996, 422.
rizzare l’oratore fu più che altro il fragore dei Clodiani (p. 211), basando l’argomentazione su Cic. Mil. 3, fam. 3.10.10 e Att. 9.7b.2, dove l’Arpinate descrive interessatamente la presenza dei soldati Pompeiani non come una minaccia, bensì come un presidio in sua difesa contro la massa inferocita dei Clodiani. La difesa di Cicerone è comunque condotta dal Corradi non negando il timore da lui provato, ma con la dimostrazione che il timore non è un vizio da biasimare, come sostiene Crasso in de orat. 1.119–121 quando afferma che è anzi qualità del bravo oratore iniziare un discorso con una certa timidezza, e del resto lo stesso Cicerone (Caec. 41) confessa di essere percorso da un tremore fisico durante le arringhe, segno che l’eventuale paura da lui provata non può essere motivo di biasimo (tantum abest, ut ob eum timorem reprehendi possit aut debeat, p. 273). La condanna di Milone non è dunque da imputare alla pavidità ciceroniana, ma alla rinuncia dell’imputato alla supplica della giuria, riferita in Plut. Cic. 35.5, e all’ostilità di Pompeo nei suoi confronti, riferita in Vell. Pat. 2.47.4 (p. 212).

Corradi non ha dubbi nemmeno sul ruolo avuto da Cicerone nell’uccisione di Cesare: benché Plut. Cic. 42.1–2 escluda una sua partecipazione alla congiura, tornando a indugiare sulla sua natura di codardo, e lo stesso Cicerone dichiari di non essere stato nemmeno informato del progetto (Phil. 2.26), un suo ruolo sembra garantito da diversi indizi, quali la deprecazione del corso degli eventi instaurato da Cesare, che sembra tradursi in un’esortazione alla sua uccisione, l’accusa rivolta da Antonio di essere mandante morale dell’assassinio (Phil. 2.25) e la menzione del suo nome da parte dei congiurati (Phil. 2.28 e 30). Il ruolo di membro, se non ispiratore, della congiura, lungi dal rappresentare una macchia morale su Cicerone, appare al Corradi come motivo di ulteriore prestigio per un uomo che dimostrò ancora una volta di agire con coraggio nell’interesse della patria e in nome della libertas repubblicana calpestata dal tiranno (p. 250):

Cor.: M. Antonius dixit Caesarem consilio Ciceronis interfectum fuisse. Egn.: Id in Philippicis ipse negat. Cor.: Negat ille quidem, sed in Bruto sic, ipso Bruto præsente, civitatis cladem deplorat, ut illum prorsus ad liberandum Rempublicam invitare videatur. Quod si vel in scriptis id ipsum faciebat, quanto magis illum, quem secreto loqueretur, id fecisse putare debemus? Non sine causa, «interfecto Caesare, statim cruentum extollens ut ad M. Brutus pugionem, Ciceronem nominatim exclamavit, atque ei recuperatam libertatem est gratulatus» [Cic. Phil. 2.28]. Egn.: Nunc Ciceronem, quem semper defendere soles, accusas. Cor.: Ego vero, ne scriptor Graecus eum timidum, quod inter coniuratos numeratus non sit, appellet, defendo et laudo, quum Bruto, ut libertatem recuperaret, autorem fuisset condendo.

Cor.: Marco Antonio ha detto che Cesare era stato ucciso su consiglio di Cicerone. Egn.: Ma lo stesso Cicerone lo nega nelle Filippiche. Cor.: Lo nega, è vero, ma nel Bruto, alla presenza di Bruto stesso, deplora a tal punto la rovina della città che sembra davvero invitarlo a liberare lo Stato. E se si comportava così negli scritti, quanto a maggior ragione dobbiamo ritenere che abbia agito così quando parlava in segreto? Non senza motivo, «ucciso Cesare,
subito Marco Bruto, alzando il pugnale insanguinato verso il cielo, gridò il nome di Cicereone e si congratulò con lui per la recuperata libertà» [Cic. Phil. 2.28]. Egn.: Ma ora accusi Cicerone, che sei solito difendere sempre. Cor.: Tutt’altro: io in realtà lo difendo e lo lodo, affinché lo scrittore greco non lo chiami pauroso per il fatto che non sarebbe tra i congiurati, dal momento che concordo fermamente con Bruto che egli fu il responsabile della recuperata libertà.

Se Cicerone nega di essere al corrente dell’azione, lo fa soltanto per non inimicarsi i sostenitori di Cesare e per non essere così escluso dalle trattative per la pacificazione interna allo Stato, anche perché un suo patente appoggio ai congiurati non sarebbe stato utile né alla sua persona né alla causa della Respublica.69 Il suo comportamento nella vicenda dimostra così, agli occhi del Corradi, che egli non fu persona pavida, ma piuttosto uomo fortissimus (p. 251).

L’altro grande difetto, insieme alla pavidità, costantemente rimproverato a Cicerone nella tradizione biografica sin da Sen. brev. 5.1–3 e Plut. Cic. 24.1–3 è lo smodato narcisismo, che lo portava a elogiare continuamente se stesso, rendendosi così insopportabile ai contemporanei: oltre a citare il passo di Quint. 11.19 in cui l’Arpinate parla con modestia di sé e delle proprie capacità retoriche, Corradi giustifica l’abbondanza di autoreferenzialità nell’opera di Cicerone, perché questi loda le proprie azioni per rispondere agli avversari (p. 274), come lui stesso sostiene in dom. 93 e in har. resp. 16–17, dove ricorda che evocare le vicende personali significa raccontare le vicende dell’intera Respublica, e dunque di tutti i Romani. Il desiderio di gloria di Cicerone, peraltro da lui stesso ammesso (Att. 2.17.2), non lo distingue da molti altri personaggi della grecedità e della romanità che vollero essere protagonisti dei propri stessi scritti e di quelli altrui; come per costoro si tratta di legittima ambizione, così questa abitudine non può costituire un motivo di biasimo di Cicerone, perché, lungi dall’essere prova di egocentrismo, essa manifesta piuttosto la consapevolezza della comune utilità che contemporanei e posteri potranno ricavare dalla lettura delle sue vicende (p. 274–276):

Cor.: qui reprehendunt [sc. Ciceronem], maximos quoque viros, ut Themistoclem, Alexandrum Magnum, Africanum, Pompeium et alios reprehendunt, qui nec minus ambitiosi fuerunt quam Cicero, nec minus quam ille res suas celebrari cupierunt, quum multi

69 Corradi 1555a, 250–251: Egn.: Si fuisset [sc. aucto cladis], ut erat gloriae cupidus, aliquando diceret. Cor.: Non erat stultus ut illi qui, quum in ea societate non fuissent, se tamen fuisses iactabant. Egn.: Stultus duci non posset, si se facti vel autorem vel participem fuisses diceret, quod ille pulcherrimum gloriosissimumque solet appellare. Cor.: Minus prudens certe videri putisset, si diceret quod ipsis et Reipublicae damni multum, sed utilissiis aut nihil aut parum, poterat afferre. Nam si dixisset, veteranos milites caeterosque Cesarianos inimicos haberet, et ita non posset de pace tractare.
scriptores ad id faciendum vel praemiis invitarint. [...] Xenophon, Aratus, Scaurus, Catulus, Caesar, Adrianus et alii res suas etiam scripserunt; ne quidam Ciceronem tam graviter, ut faciunt, accusent quod vel aliquid de se scripserit vel a Luceio, ut res suas scriberet, postularit. Quare si Ciceronem volunt accusare, illos etiam, quos diximus, et M. Varronem, C. Trebonium, qui a Cicerone, Plinium Iuniorum, qui a Corneli Taucito, ac alios innumerabiles, qui ab alis idem propemodum postularunt, accusent. [...] Res enim, quas gesserat, si scriberentur, non sibi solum, sed omnibus etiam hominibus, quum praesentibus tum futuris, etiam profuturas putabant; et idcirco, ut scriberentur et extarent, laborabant.

Cor.: quanti rimproverano [sc. Cicerone], rimproverano anche i più grandi uomini, come Temistocle, Alessandro Magno, l’Africano, Pompeo e altri, che non furono meno ambiziosi di Cicerone, né meno di lui desiderarono celebrare le loro mille imprese, ma anzi invitarono molti scrittori a farlo persino dietro ricompensa. [...] Senofonte, Arato, Scauro, Catulo, Cesare, Adriano e altri hanno raccontato le proprie imprese; dunque non accusino con tanta violenza, come fanno, nemmeno Cicerone per aver scritto qualcosa di sé o per aver chiesto di farlo a Luceio. Pertanto, se vogliono accusare Cicerone, accusino anche quelli che abbiamo citato, e Varrone, e Trebonio, che a Cicerone, e Plinio il Giovane, che a Traiano, e moltissimi altri, che ad altri, rivolsero sostanzialmente la stessa richiesta. [...] Infatti egli riteneva che le proprie azioni, se fossero state raccontate, avrebbero giovato non soltanto a lui, ma anche a tutti gli uomini, tanto ai contemporanei quanto ai posteri, e proprio per questo motivo si impegnava perché venissero raccontate e sopravvivessero.

Cicerone viene così scagionato da ogni biasimo, al punto che l’ecclesiastico Corradi, senza stridore con l’ormai avviato clima tridentino, approva senza problemi il fatto che l’Arpinate sia annoverato tra gli dei dall’imperatore Alessandro Severo, e, come se non bastasse, arriva addirittura a sostenere che Cicerone può essere legittimamente invocato contro le malattie agli occhi, richiamando l’epigramma (riportato in Plin. nat. hist. 31.8) del libero ciceroniano Tullio Laurea in cui si magnificano le miracolose proprietà curative delle acque zampillanti presso una villa campana dell’Arpinate (p. 269–270):

Cor.: Nihil mea refert, dum coelestem vocarit eum, cuius imaginem vel inter Divos, Alexander Severus Imperator Romanus, qui «Latina quum legeret, non alia magis, quam De officiis Ciceronis et De republica legebat» [SHA (Lampr. Alex. Sev.), 30.2], postea collocavit. Egn.: Quin igitur illi nos vota facimus? Cor.: Nos vero illi vota facimus, oculis ut nostris ille medeat. Egn.: Oculis ut nostris ille, cui lippitudo tam saepe molesta fuit, medeatur? Cor.: Divi morbos, quibus dum viverent, affici solebant, in coelum sublati saepe curare creduntur. Aquae certe Ciceronianae, quas Tullius Laurea carmine celebravit, oculis, ut Plinius affirmat, medebantur.

Cor.: Non mi importa per nulla il fatto che abbia chiamato celeste Cicerone, la cui effigie collocò poi tra le divinità, l’imperatore Alessandro Severo, che «quando leggeva opere latine, non leggeva altro che il De officiis di Cicerone e il De republica» [SHA (Lampr. Alex. Sev.), 30.2]. Egn.: Suvvia, adesso noi arriviamo a fare voti a Cicerone? Cor.: Ma noi facciamo voti a lui, affinché curi i nostri occhi. Egn.: Affinché curi i nostri occhi proprio lui, a cui la conjuntivite diede sempre fastidi? Cor.: Ma si ritiene che gli dei, giunti in cielo, spesso
curino proprio quelle malattie dalle quali erano affetti in vita. Sicuramente le acque ciceroniane, che Tullio Laurea celebrò in un carme, curavano gli occhi, come Plinio afferma.

Nel presentare come unico rimpianto il fatto che il vir sanctissimus (p. 112) Cicerone non abbia potuto conoscere il cristianesimo, Corradi perpetua però il già richiamato giudizio di ascendenza umanistica, risalente in prima istanza al Petrarca e ampiamente consolidato nella cultura dell’epoca, alla quale il paganesimo ciceroniano non appare un problema sostanziale, essendo la sua concezione religiosa pienamente conciliabile con la dottrina cristiana: «se Cicerone avesse conosciuto la nostra religione, non potremmo rimpiangere nulla in lui, tanto più che nemmeno su Dio ha avuto opinioni davvero sbagliate».⁷⁰

Figura lontanissima dall’avvocato senza passione né convinzione dipinto da Mommsen, dal pusillanime narcisista tratteggiato da molta critica, specialmente a partire dall’Ottocento nel quadro dell’imperante cesarismo,⁷¹ il Cicerone ritratto nella Quaestura soddisfa i consoli Egnazio e Valeriano, riconosciuti al questore Corradi per il denaro consegnato e sicuri che i conti ormai tornino.⁷² l’Arpinate viene presentato come il primo dei Romani, il salvatore della Repubblica e un fautore di pace,⁷³ un uomo persino esteticamente irreprensibile, se un detrattore come Asinio Pollione parla in Sen. suas. 6.24 del suo aspetto decorso anche in vecchiaia (p. 282), insomma una personalità talmente straordinaria da non poter essere paragonata ad altro uomo esistito sulla faccia della terra (p. 283):

Cor.: Nec omnibus ego, sed singulis ita praefero, ut audeam paene dicere, a condito orbe neminem fuisse quem prorsus cum Cicerone conferre possimus.

⁷⁰ Corradi 1555a, 280: Quod si Ciceron nostram religionem cognovisset, nihil in eo possemus desiderare, quam praeertim nec de Deo admodum male senserit.
⁷² Cf. la conclusione dell’opera in Corradi 1555a, 339: Egn.: Nos autem, quando tu iam totam Quaesturae rationem rationem retulisti et nos, qui pecuniam omnem in tabulas publicas referendarum curavimus, videmus rationum summam quadrare, teque bene, et de Republica fecisses iudicamus, te in fano pecuniam iussu nostro deposuisse, si placet, quo tibi melius caveatur, ascribemus. Cor.: Placet.
⁷³ Cf. Corradi 1555a, 117 (Cor.: Si Camillus, qui restituit, secundus Romulus est appellatus, cur Cicero, qui servavit imperium, non poterat vere Romulus appellari? Mihi tanto dignior eo nomine, quam Camillus, videtur, quanto maius eo tempore fuit imperium. Quin ego saepe mecum cogito, Ciceronem Romanis omnibus, qui Rempublicam bene vel domi vel foris unquam gesserunt, merito posse praeferri. Nam caeteri partes aliquas Reipublicae iuvavunt, sed eam Cicero solus universam conservavit) e 223 (Cicero vero semper auctor pacis fuit).
Cor.: E per parte mia non a tutti genericamente, ma ad uno ad uno io preferisco Cicerone, al punto che oserei quasi dire che dalla nascita del mondo non vi fu nessuno che possiamo davvero paragonare a lui.

Se il fatto che i pareri sull’Arpinate divergano «come il giorno dalla notte è dovuto ai differenti pregiudizi, alle opinioni e all’atteggiamento dei vari autori, più che a una vera problematica legata ai fatti principali della sua vita»,⁷⁴ non potrà certo sorprendere che il ritratto di Cicerone al culmine dell’epoca del ciceronianismo sia, in fin dei conti, un ritratto agiografico.

⁷⁴ Così Joseph Geiger nell’introduzione a Scardigli 1995, 293.
I should as soon think of closing all my window shutters, to enable me to see, as of
banishing the Classics, to improve Republican Ideas
John Adams to Benjamin Rush, 19 June 1789¹

My Dear George.

If you have a desire of a long life and a happy life I advise you to read Cicero. Your
Father has expressed sufficient admiration of his office and his other writings but I wish at
this time to recommend to you particular his treatise on Friendship. His dream of Scipio his
letter to his brother Quintus about to take upon him for the third time the Government of
Asia, and above all his treatise on old age. If you can read these writings with attention and
not love your friends, your country, your species, the Universe you inhabit, and without
adoring that eternal wisdom, power and benevolence which produced it better than you
ever did before you must have no soul.

John Adams to grandson George Washington Adams, March 13th, 1820

1 Introduction

In the early years of the United States, Cicero came to symbolize the failure of
noble republican idealism. John Adams, the second president of the United
States who lost his bid for a second term and retired from politics in disgrace,
wrote that he saw his own career mirrored in that of Cicero. Adams was an
avid lifelong reader of Cicero’s works, translating them as a young man and
again with his eldest son John Quincy (later president himself). He took partic-
ular inspiration from De republica when he wrote his Defense of the Constitutions
during the Revolution. After this idealistic time came disappointment and frus-
tration. Adams thought that he and the generation of “founding fathers” who
had helped to inspire America’s fight for independence had carried on the legacy
of Cicero as a political thinker. They were deeply committed to republican insti-
tutions and the mixed constitution as described in De republica. But like Cicero
(in Adams’ eyes), they had been stymied, relegated to political irrelevance by a
new generation of politicians, whose cabals and demagoguery threatened to de-
stroy the American republic. Cicero was powerless to stop their machinations,

¹ Quotations from letters between Adams and his correspondents are taken from the “Founders
Online” website at https://founders.archives.gov/, a project of the National Archives of the United
States.
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but he preserved his own integrity and was eventually vindicated by posterity, an idea in which Adams took much comfort. Adams thus understood his own circumstances through comparison with Roman history and defended his own career through similarities with his portrait of Cicero.

John Adams’ engagement with Cicero was not academic but deeply personal, using the classical orator’s work as a guide for life. After an ignominious end to his political career in 1800, Adams sought solace and sympathy in Cicero’s works. In a series of letters from 1808–1809, he offered a spirited defense of the orator’s character and career which clearly applied to his own situation as well. He argued that Cicero was not vain, as was often alleged, but merely naïve in supposing that his virtue would offer a defense against malicious attacks. The portrait of Cicero constructed in these letters is one of a tragic figure, a true believer in noble republican ideals who failed to grapple effectively with the forces of corruption, factionalism, and demagoguery – a description Adams also applied to himself.

In several letters in 1808–1809, to his son and to his friends, Adams quotes from Cicero (particularly the Tusculan Disputations) to explain the American political scene, and compares his contemporaries to Caesar, Catiline, and Clodius. Adams sought to justify his own political actions by comparing himself to Cicero. Through this comparison, he promulgated a representation of Cicero as an idealist whose political vision was spoiled by a sordid reality. He argued that Cicero, like himself, failed to prevent the republic’s collapse because he was too naïve to anticipate the villainy of his opponents. Adams was particularly eager to defend Cicero against the charge of vanity (not least because Adams himself was accused of the same vice), arguing that Cicero was merely conscious of his own extraordinary merit, and defending himself against the slanderous attacks of others. He represented Cicero as simple and innocent, not as a masterful rhetorician or calculating political operator, and accepted Cicero’s most damning portraits of his enemies as historical fact.

2 John Adams: life and intellectual background

John Adams was the second president of the United States, serving only a single term from 1796 to 1800 as the successor to George Washington, under whom he had served as vice president. He had been an early and leading advocate of independence from Britain in Boston, authoring letters to newspapers (sometimes
under pseudonyms like “Novanglus”),² and as a delegate to the Continental Congress in Philadelphia in 1774–1776, where he nominated George Washington to lead the Continental Army and helped Thomas Jefferson to draft the Declaration of Independence. He drafted the constitution of the state of Massachusetts in 1780, now the world’s oldest functioning constitution, and in 1787 penned his *Defence of the Constitutions of Government of the United States of America*, a sort of sourcebook on political theory to be used in writing the new federal constitution. This work drew heavily on the text of Cicero’s *De republica* known at that time, before Angelo Mai’s discovery of the Vatican palimpsest in 1822;³ he expressed regret that “the best Writings of Antiquity upon Government those I mean of Aristotle, Zeno and Cicero are lost”.⁴ He was a firm believer in the classical theory of the mixed constitution, and a Federalist who advocated for a centralized federal government with a strong executive, as opposed to the Democratic Republicans who favored a weaker executive or the anti-Federalists who advocated for greater autonomy for the states.⁵ He is now among the lesser known of the founding fathers of the United States, and no monument to him exists in Washington, D.C.

The Revolutionary and Critical periods in American history saw a flourishing of neoclassicism in the thirteen colonies.⁶ Carl Richards has suggested that the colonists used learned Latin and Greek references to demonstrate that their young frontier country was still civilized by Old World standards.⁷ The classical personifications of *Libertas* with her *pilleus*, *Fama* with her trumpet, and Justice with her scales and blindfold were common in early American iconography.⁸ George Washington was lionized as the American Cincinnatus and even as the American Fabius Maximus Cunctator,⁹ and had Joseph Addison’s popular play

---

² On the Ciceronian rhetoric of these essays, see Farrell 1992a.
⁴ Letter from John Adams to Samuel Adams, Sr., 18 October 1790; cf. letter from John Adams to Thomas Jefferson, 9 July 1813.
⁵ Siemers 2013, 102–124; Ryerson 2016.
⁶ On Cicero in America see “Ciceronianiana” 8, Rome 1994 (especially Rahe 1994, on the general popularity of Cicero’s works at the time).
⁷ Richard 1995, 51. Richard provides an eclectic account of classical traditions among the founding fathers, organized thematically. See also Shalev 2009 on classical traditions in the American Revolution.
⁹ Cincinnatus: see e.g. Charles Henry Wharton’s *Poetical Epistle to George Washington*; letter to George Washington from Count de Wengierski, 8 October 1783; letter to George Washington from
Cato performed for officers at Valley Forge during the war. Adams’ wife Abigail sometimes signed her letters “Portia”, after the wife of M. Brutus. Later, during the Critical Period and Washington’s presidency, Alexander Hamilton and his colleagues routinely accused their opponents of being Catelines and Caesars, subverting the new nation’s political order. Hannah Arendt wrote that “the American founders had donned the clothes of the Roman maiores” and assumed the venerable status arrogated to founding figures in classical antiquity, which resulted in near-worship of the new Constitution as the vessel of “the authority which the act of foundation carried within itself”. They saw themselves as a combination of Lucius Brutus and the founders of the Roman republic with Marcus Brutus, Cato the Younger, and the defenders of the republic in its final days. They were simultaneously founding a new republic and taking measures to avert its end – or mourning its immediate decline from the ideal they had imagined. Neoclassicism went out of fashion in the early 19th century, as thinkers like Thomas Jefferson and Adams’ friend Benjamin Rush advocated a new model of education based on modern sciences rather than the classics, and politicians like Jefferson and later Andrew Jackson turned to more populist, less elitist styles of political communication.

Adams, like many of his peers in the colonies, had learned Latin and read the classics from an early age, even though his father, a farmer, had not attended college. Latin and Greek translation and grammar were a staple of the entrance requirements for universities like Harvard, Adams’ alma mater. Adams first purchased a book of Cicero’s in 1750 at the age of 15 while preparing for those entrance requirements, a Dutch school edition of selections in Latin. He later helped his oldest son, John Quincy Adams, to read the same orations to prepare

Jean Baptiste Mailhe, 19 May 1784. See also Wills 1984. Fabius: see e.g. letter from John Adams to Mercy Otis Warren, 25 November 1775; from Alexander Hamilton to Robert R. Livingston, 28 June 1777; letter from John Adams to Abigail Adams, 2 September 1777; letter from Major General Arthur St. Clair to George Washington, 5 January 1778.

10 Malamud 2009, 9–14; Melton 2013, 84.
11 Malamud 2019, 120–121; Kenty 2019; see also Berno (p. 369–390) in this volume. On the influence of passages related to Catiline in the Columbian Orator, a textbook published first in 1797, see Melton 2013, 82–84; Malamud 2013, 99; 2019, 92–99.
12 Arendt 1963, 204, 200.
for his own entrance to Harvard,¹⁶ and his younger sons Charles and Thomas and daughter Abigail also learned Latin.¹⁷ John Quincy later taught rhetoric as a professor at Harvard concurrently with his career in public service, which included his own stint as president from 1825–1829, and published his lectures on rhetoric.¹⁸ Adams (senior) read Conyers Middleton’s enormously popular 1741 History of the Life of Marcus Tullius Cicero at least twice.¹⁹ His library at Braintree, catalogued in 1790, contained an 8-volume edition of the works of Cicero in Latin, the letters to Atticus, and several volumes of select orations translated into English and French.²⁰

3 Adams’ identification with Cicero

While others among America’s “founding fathers” will have had a similar education in the classics,²¹ John Adams felt a special kinship to Cicero, and regarded him as a technical and moral exemplar. Cicero was the yardstick by which Adams measured his own achievements and ambitions. James Farrell has argued that Adams chose “Syren Tully”²² as a role model at an early point in his career,

---

¹⁶ Diary entry from April 1779; Founders Online.

¹⁷ On Abigail, see Letter from Abigail Adams to John Adams, 16 March 1776. Charles and John Quincy were enrolled at the Latin School in Amsterdam and then at the University of Leiden while Adams served as American ambassador to the Netherlands in 1780 (John Adams to Abigail Adams, 25 September 1780; 18 December 1780). Thomas’ “classical taste” is referred to in a letter from John Adams to Thomas Boylston Adams, 17 October 1799.

¹⁸ Auer/Banninga 1963; Wills 1984. Adams senior worried that his son would be overworked in this post to no purpose, since oratory seemed useless in a corrupt age, and commented cynically: “Demosthenes and Cicero, the two consummate Masters died Martyrs to their Excellence” (letter to Benjamin Rush, 23 July 1806).

¹⁹ Letter to William Tudor, 4 August 1774; letter to Benjamin Rush, 4 December 1805.


²¹ The 1994 issue of Ciceronianiana (vol. 8) focused on traditions and receptions of Cicero in America.

²² This nickname comes from a poem by Samuel Dexter, delivered at a public exhibition at Harvard in 1780, which Adams may have seen; Adams inscribed the verse in his edition of the works of Cicero in Latin (Farrell 1992b, 390).
when he began to practice law in Boston. Adams was the son of a Massachusetts farmer and, like Cicero, relied on his own merit and industry in the absence of distinguished ancestors. “I find myself entering an unlimited Field. A Field in which Demosthenes, Cicero, and others of immortal Fame have exulted before me! A Field which incloses the whole Circle of Science and Literature, the History, Wisdom, and Virtue of all ages”, Adams wrote giddily as he chose his career. He marveled at the eloquence and force of Pro Milone, copying Latin passages into his diary in 1758 and offering a commentary on the persuasive strategy of the peroration: “feeling with so much sensibility, the Ingratitude, Cruelty, and folly of Banishing a Man who had rendered the Republic such Important services and was able and zealous to render still more, must have drawn Tears to their Eyes and Rage to their Breasts. [...] I take it this Peroration for Milo, may be studied as a Model of the Pathetic”. In 1765, when his friend and classmate Jonathan Sewall suggested that Adams might someday be as famous as Cicero, Adams answered:

Yet tho I have very few Hopes, I am not ashamed to own that a Prospect of an Immortality in the Memories of all the Worthy, to [the] End of Time would be a high Gratification to my Wishes. But to Return, Tully, therefore, had but few Advantages, in the Estimation of Reason more than We have, for a happy Life. – He had greater Political Objects to tempt his Ambition, he had better Opportunities to force the Hozanna’s of his Countrymen, but these are not Advantages for Happiness. On the Contrary, the Passions which these Objects were designed to gratify, were so many stings for ever smarting in his Mind, which at last goaded him into that Excess of Vanity and Pusillanimity, for which he has been as often blamed, as ever he was praised for his Genius and his Virtues.

Vanity was also a vice with which Adams struggled himself. In his diary in 1756, he wrote: “Vanity I am sensible, is my cardinal Vice and cardinal Folly, and I am in continual Danger, when in Company, of being led an ignis fatuus Chase by it, without the strictest Caution and watchfulness over myself”. Little did Adams know that his own historical circumstances would soon see a series of crises with political objects great enough to tempt any man’s ambition, and great op-

---

24 Cf. La Bua (p. 118) in this volume.
25 Letter to John Wentworth, October-November 1758. The last phrase shows the influence of De Oratore on education in rhetoric in this period; see Guthrie & Thomas’ chapters in Brigance 1955; Farrell 1992b, 377 – 379; Farrell 2011; Botein 1978.
28 Letter to Jonathan Sewall, February 1760.
29 Diary, 1 May 1756. *Founders Online*, National Archives.
opportunities to “force hosannas” (or not). Setting off for the Continental Congress, he compared himself to Cicero embarking on his quaestorship in Sicily, and to Cicero writing missives to Atticus from the capital. Farrell has argued that Adams took Cicero as an epistolary model as well, in using letters as a vehicle for deliberation and in anticipating their later circulation as historical documents.

Adams could not have known either that, like Cicero, after a great triumph in ascending to the highest office in his country, he would suffer humiliation and a kind of exile (at least in his own eyes). He was not a popular president, and had been the target of hostile press for years. He managed to avert war with France (by negotiating with the new Consul Napoleon Bonaparte, to the disappointment of his own Federalist party) during a period of high tensions, and passed the reviled Alien and Sedition Acts, which allowed him to imprison or deport anyone suspected of spying for the French or aiding their cause, including journalists. This abuse of executive power did him no favors in the election of 1800: he had hoped to win a second term, but instead came in a distant third to Aaron Burr and his own former Vice President and friend, Thomas Jefferson. He felt personally betrayed, and refused to attend Jefferson’s inauguration or even to speak to Jefferson for over a decade.

Returning home to Massachusetts, Adams began to write an autobiography to vindicate himself, which he never finished. In this project, Farrell writes, he was “driven by a personal quest to be remembered as a great orator and by the desire to emphasize oratory as a historical force in the American Revolution”, and thus to live up to the Ciceronian paradigm. In composing an autobiography, Adams worried that he was engaging in a vanity project and nurturing the very vice he had written about in his diary as a young man:

---

30 Letters to William Tudor, 4 August 1774; to Abigail Adams, 31 March 1777. See also a letter from John Adams to John Trumbull, 18 November 1805 referring to Cicero in Syracuse.  
32 He calls it exile at the end of a letter to Benjamin Rush, 18 January 1808. This was not the first period of his life which he had compared to Cicero’s exile: while serving as ambassador to France and the Netherlands in 1785, he wrote: “I find myself sometimes disposed to write Elegies and Jeremiads upon my Exile in imitation of Ovid and Cicero, but to avoid such thoughts as much as possible, I make a little America of my own Family” (Letter from John Adams to John Jay, 31 January 1785; see also the letter from John Adams to Mercy Otis Warren, 13 December 1784).  
33 Again, on the Ciceronian posture of this policy, see Farrell 2002.  
34 Farrell 1989, 510.
As the Lives of Philosophers, Statesmen or Historians written by themselves have generally been suspected of Vanity, and therefore few People have been able to read them without disgust; there is no reason to expect that any Sketches I may leave of my own Times would be received by the Public with any favour, or read by individuals with much interest. [...] My Excuse is, that having been the Object of much Misrepresentation, some of my Posterity may probably wish to see in my own handwriting a proof of the falsehood of that Mass of odious Abuse of my Character.\textsuperscript{35}

Adams felt that he had been abused unjustly by his critics; most notably, Alexander Hamilton, his fellow Federalist, had written a pamphlet for their party's electors in 1800 vilifying his “public conduct and character” as president.\textsuperscript{36} However, Adams may have felt an even greater sense of betrayal at the criticism levied against him in 1806 by his friend, the historian and playwright Mercy Otis Warren. She wrote that while Adams was serving as an ambassador and negotiator in Europe during the Revolution, “unfortunately for himself and his Country, he became so enamored with the British Constitution, and the Government, Manners and Laws of the Nation, that a Partiality for Monarchy appeared, which was inconsistent with his former Professions of Republicanism”.\textsuperscript{37} Adams was branded by Warren and others as a monarchist, a secret Tory and admirer of George III, heretical ideas in the wake of the war for independence. Perhaps he took some comfort in knowing that Cicero, too, had been accused of abusing his power in presiding over the executions of the Catilinarian conspirators, and in promoting monarchist rule by Pompey and Caesar.

\section{Vanity & naïveté}

In balancing vanity against a desire to defend himself against such attacks, Adams turned again to Cicero. In fact, he seems to offer a defense of Cicero as a sort of proxy for himself, circumventing vainglorious self-justifications by metonymy. In January of 1808, he wrote to his son John Quincy Adams (who had recently been forced to resign from the U.S. senate himself), and concluded the letter:

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{36} Farrell 2002, 84–85. Adams wrote public rebuttals in his 1809–1811 editorials to “Boston Patriot”.
\end{flushright}
When poor Cicero found himself almost the only Roman left surrounded by Clodius, Catiline Cæsar and Pompey, all alike ambitious and Selfish, the two last with Legions at their heels Sufficient to overawe every independent Soul, by four and twenty per Cent, Men in thousands to gripe the People and by Millions of the People in desperate Poverty and more desperate Vice, he had no Consolations but in his own Vanity as most men call it, but his own Conscience of Merit as I deem it. I believe you will find little other Comfort. You remember the Proclamation of Ephesus, when she banished Hormodorus [sic]. No Man among Us Shall excell. If any Such Man Shall arise let him carry his merit to Some other Country”. Nemo de nobis Unus excellat. Sed Si quis exiterit, alia in loco et apud alios Sit. You remember too, no doubt Ciceros Comment upon this memorable Vote of the Ephesians. An hoc non ita Sit, in omni populo? Nonne omnem exuperantiam virtutis oderunt? Tusc. Quest. 1.5. n. 105. The Constitution of our Country is already far advanced in decay under this corroding Cancer of Envy.

The quoted passage belongs in the context of Cicero’s repudiation of baser desires, in which the teacher in the text argues that the wise man “will scorn our ambitions and trivial aspirations and even the honors bestowed by the people” (Tusc. 5.104). Adams was also feeling isolated, frustrated with his decline from an earlier age of greatness (“almost the only Roman left”), surrounded by enemies in the midst of threats of internal and external war in a morally bankrupt society. The “cancer of envy” which had afflicted Cicero’s Rome had metastasized in his own America, and it seemed clear to Adams that what seemed like vanity in Cicero was surely only consciousness of merit, virtuous but insufficient to combat the evils of the time. Adams, too, was convinced that he had acted meritoriously and served his country well, but the more he tried to convince others of that, the more they maligned him.

Richard writes: “The only difference between the two was that Cicero, uninfluenced by Christian notions of humility, had found nothing shameful in vanity. Not only would it never have occurred to Cicero to deny the charge of vanity; it would never have occurred to his contemporaries to make it. Classical heroes

---

38 Letter from John Adams to John Quincy Adams, 17 January 1808. He also quotes this passage from Tusc. 5.105 in a letter to Abigail Adams, 14 January 1794, also with reference to John Quincy’s detractors and his own.
39 Ille vero nostras ambitiones levitatesque contentnet honoresque populi etiam ulter delatos repudiabit. On Cicero’s philosophy in early America, see Gummere 1963, 97; Caspar 2014.
40 In a letter to John Quincy a few weeks later on 12 February 1808, Adams recommended Dionysius of Halicarnassus’ history as an instructive and highly relevant account of the struggle of the orders and class warfare in Rome (he found Livy overly sympathetic to the patricians). He quotes Cicero’s De Officiis on property rights and land redistribution laws and proclaims: “in all this Cicero was right, but notwithstanding Cicero’s boast of his Efforts and Success the Evil was not eradicated, as he soon found at the expence of his head and Lands”.
were hardly known for their modesty”.

However, Cicero’s detractors did accuse the orator of arrogance and delusions of grandeur, particularly targeting his poem *De Consulatu Suo*, so that Cicero’s character came under attack even before Puritan discourse framed vanity as a sin (*Sull. 22–7, Pis. 72, Phil. 2.19–21)*.

Adams was not only consoling himself with this revisionist account of Cicero’s intentions, but was also consoling his son, the letter’s recipient. John Quincy, too, had been exiled (in a sense) despite his merit, as the target of envious political attacks and slander. The implication is that if a great man like Cicero had been so treated without deserving it, the Adams men too had no reason to blame themselves. They could blame society and circumstance rather than any fault of their own, and could hope to be vindicated by posterity, as Cicero had now been vindicated in their eyes. They had thus followed the advice of Cicero given in *Epistula ad Quintum fratrem* 1.1 (recommended reading for George Washington Adams in one of the quotations with which I began, see p. 195) and other texts.

In an effort to console himself and his son for the political trials they were facing, at a time when they were no longer able to serve their country as statesmen in elected office, Adams turned to Cicero’s *Tusculan Disputations*, themselves an effort by the orator to console himself in a period of forced political inactivity – and following the death of a child, Tullia, just as Adams was mourning the loss of his second son, Charles. This suggests that Adams was not only picking out *sententiae* from Cicero’s works, but was actively looking for comfort and advice in works of Cicero written in circumstances which seemed to him to parallel his own. To comprehend his own situation, he thought of similar situations in Cicero’s biography and seems to have sought out relevant reading from his library on the basis of that similarity.

In settling on Cicero as an *exemplum* of ill-deserved political attacks, Adams also may have been inspired by contemporaries such as the English historian Catherine Macaulay. In the fourth volume of her history of the English Civil War (an edition of which sat in Adams’ library and was donated to the Boston Public Library, where it has been digitized), she recorded a quotation by the 17-century anti-monarchist parliamentarian John Pym, comparing himself to Cicero: “My case, if we may compare lesser things with great, hath to his a very near resemblance; the reason I am so much maligned and reproached by ill-affected persons being, because I have been forward in advancing the affairs of the kingdom, and have been taken notice of for that forwardness; they out of their malice converting that to a vice, which, without boast be it spoken, I esteem

---

41 Richard 2015, 133.
my greatest virtue”. Adams may also have been responding to Conyers Middleton’s biography, in which Middleton wrote of the letter to the historian Lucceius (fam. 5.12):

This letter is constantly alleged as a proof of Cicero’s vanity, and excessive love of praise: but we must consider it as written, not by a philosopher, but a statesman, conscious of the greatest services to his country, for which he had been barbarously treated; and, on that account, the more eager to have them represented in an advantageous light, and impatient to taste some part of that glory, when living, which he was sure to reap from them when dead.

Adams extended Middleton’s rationalization, which pertained to the Catilinarian conspiracy and its aftermath, to cover Cicero’s career in general.

A day after writing to John Quincy, Adams wrote a second letter on the same theme, this one addressed to his friend and fellow Continental Congress delegate, the physician Benjamin Rush. Rush, too, had suffered from political scandal over his controversial treatments of the victims of a yellow fever outbreak in Philadelphia, and was raked over the coals in the newspapers. Adams, deploying Cicero and the Hermodorus episode again to console both Rush and himself, began: “What a pity it is; and indeed what a Shame it is, that We have not a Word in our language to express the idea of the French Word Naïveté? There is not a figure of Rhetorick So impressive as this is “tho it is no figure, but the most perfect simplicity”. He turned again to Cicero:

Poor Cicero! I pity you. But to address myself to Dr Rush, rather than a departed Spirit; What other People call Vanity in Cicero, I denominate Naïveté. The Superiority of his Virtue and Talents excited Jealousy and Envy among the Citizens in general, and Clodius Cataline Sallust, Cæsar and Pompey too appear to have hated it as fervently as any Ephesian or Athenian could have done. Debtors and Creditors, griping Usurers and Starving People, were Scrambling around him, the two Generals were Rivals one Courtig the People and the other the senate, both attanded by Legions and Spies enough to overawe the most honest and independent Soul. Poor Cicero, watched, dreaded, envied, by all: no doubt Slandered by innumerable Emissaries, despized, insulted, belied. No Press it is true to traduce

42 Macaulay 1769, IV 93.
43 Middleton 1741, I 264 – 5.
44 Schutz and Adair have collected the correspondence of Adams and Rush from this period in the 19th century in a volume entitled “The Spur of Fame”, a phrase inspired by Francis Bacon (Schutz/Adair 1966, 3) which seems to me to be drawn ultimately from Cicero’s Pro Archia, in which he describes virtus as “spurring” the minds of Roman statesmen like himself “with the goads of glory” (nunc insidet quaedam in optimo quoque virtus, quae noctes ac dies animum gloriae stimulis concitat, Arch. 29).
45 Schutz/Adair 1966, 15 – 16.
him, nor any to vindicate him. But Manuscript Libells and Hand Bills enough in Circula-

He blazoned forth his own Virtues Talents and great Services in the Face of the senate
the whole Roman People, bidding open Defiance to every Citizen to contradict him if
he could. It does not appear that any one had the impudence to attempt it. Do you call this
Vanity? It was Self Defence, Independence, Intrepidity, or in one Word Naiveté. You are not
more in an Enemies Country in Philadelphia than he was in Rome. Cæsar got rid of Pom-

He asked Rush to burn the letter upon reading it. Once again, Adams seems
eager to refute the charge of vanity, which had been levied not only against Ci-
cero but against himself. This time, the quality of naïveté is substituted for con-
sciousness of merit, but the underlying perception is the same: Cicero thought
that if he simply acted with superior virtue and explained his motivations
truly after others attacked him, he would be rewarded with fame and popularity.
It was the cabals of his corrupt enemies and the irrational envy of his fellow citi-
zens that rendered his self-defenses ineffective. Others ran roughshod over the
rules he followed, and mischaracterized or willfully misinterpreted his good in-
tentions. No one could truly rebut Cicero’s self-promoting accounts of his own
excellence, according to Adams, and yet he was scorned and ignored, and event-
ually killed by Antony; but tyrants had killed (and been killed) throughout
Roman history, after all.

5 John Adams in a Toga

Adams used his knowledge of Roman history to grasp how events were unfold-
ing in his own time, to perceive patterns and trajectories, and to foretell the sig-
nificance of individual decisions or events. He clearly saw himself as following
(unwillingly) in Cicero’s footsteps, while the American Republic seemed to be fol-

46 Letter to Benjamin Rush, 18 January 1808.
47 In his letter to John Quincy on 12 February 1808, he enclosed a second letter and asked J. Q.
A. to burn that one as well, a letter which Peter Shaw (1976, 272) supposes to be the letter to Rush
quoted above; I have been unable to corroborate the identification. However, Page Smith writes
that “New England-like [sc. Adams] never threw anything away, even the confidential family
missives that ended with the admonition, “burn this letter”; Smith 1962, I 2.
ollowing the same downward trajectory laid out in Roman history. The nascent republic of the United States seemed to have fallen rapidly into the same state of degradation and violence, in Adams’ eyes. He later wrote: “One Thing, I know that Cicero was not Sacrificed to the Vengeance of Anthony by the unfeeling Selfishness of the latter Tryumvirate, more egregiously than John Adams was to the unbridled and unbounded Ambition of Alexander Hamilton, in the American Triumvirate”. Adams particularly blamed Hamilton, the founder of Wall Street, the National Bank, and the Treasury of the United States, for promoting the interests of tycoons and robber barons at the expense of the common citizens. He blamed his successor Jefferson for fomenting partisan squabbles, blind party loyalty, and a libelous press culture. Meanwhile, he saw himself as bravely resisting these trends, but tragically doomed to failure. In eras of “commerce, luxury, and dissipation”, he wrote in a letter to Rush in the following September, “the Labours Eloquence and Patriotism of Cicero, were to as little purpose as those of Demosthenes, and were equally rewarded. We Mortals cannot work Miracles: We Struggle in vain against the Constitution and Course of Nature. Americans, I fondly hope, and candidly believe are not yet arrived at the Age of Demosthenes or Cicero. If We can preserve our Union entire, We may preserve our Republick”. Adams’ Cicero is John Adams in a toga, in historical circumstances which seemed only superficially different.

Besides the Tusculans, quoted directly, what works of Cicero inspired this reception? The Catilinarians were clearly influential, as were the Philippics, at least the Second. Adams presumably had the Philippics in mind in these references pairing Cicero with Demosthenes. Once again in 1809, in a letter to Massachusetts state representative William Sumner, Adams repeated the theme of recasting Cicero’s vanity as consciousness of merit: “I am weary, my Friend, of that unintermitted Insolence of which I have been the Object for twenty years, Stoical Patience, unlimited Submission passive obedience and Non Resistance are the only Arms I have, as yet opposed to it”. Adams’ twenty years of patience and emphasis on the repetitiveness of these attacks on Cicero echo Philippics 2.1, 2.118, and 12.24, in which Cicero announces that it is the twentieth year since enemies

48 Letter from John Adams to James Lloyd, 11 February 1815.
49 Farrell 1989, 507; Ellis 2001, 62–65. See e.g. letter from John Adams to Benjamin Stoddert, 16 November 1811.
50 Letter from John Adams to William Cranch, 23 May 1801; letter from John Adams to John Quincy Adams, 2 December 1804; letter from John Adams to Benjamin Rush, 23 June 1807; letter from John Adams to Mercy Otis Warren, 15 August 1807.
51 Letter from John Adams to Benjamin Rush, 27 September 1808.
of the republic first began to attack him in an effort to overthrow the state. The letter continues:

Mausoleums, Statues, Monuments will never be erected to me. I wish them not – Panegyrical Romances, will never be written, nor flattering Orations pronounced to transmit my Character to Posterity in glorious Colours. No nor in true Colours neither. – All Colours but the last I abhor. Nevertheless I will not die un lamented. – Cicero was libelled, Slander ed insulted by all Parties; by Caesars Party, by Catalines Crew, by Clodius’ Mermidons, Aye and by Pompey the Patricians and the senate too – He was persecuted and tormented by turns and by all Parties and all Factions, and sometimes by combinations of all of them together, and that for his most virtuous and glorious Councils and Conduct. In his anguish at times under these multiplied provocations and in the consciousness of his own Merit, which have been denominated Vanity. Instead of reproaching them with Vanity I think them, the most infalliable Demonstrations of his Purity Since no Man did or dared to contradict them. He declares that all honours are indifferent to him, because he knows that it is not in the Power of his Country to reward him in any proportion to his Services.

The preface to Tusculans V, the source of the Hermodorus episode, also alludes to Cicero’s political misfortunes (5.3–5). Clodius’ attacks are described in Pro Milone, which Adams praised explicitly (above), but also in the less often read orations of 57–56 BCE, particularly De domo sua, De haruspicum responsis, and Pro Sestio, which Adams also could have read. We should also note that Adams accepted the negative portraits of Cicero’s opponents like Clodius and Catiline in these texts as historical fact, not rhetorical polemic.

It seems to me that when Adams mentioned insults by patricians and the senate here, he could only have been thinking of Cicero’s letters. Cicero publicly claimed total unity and sympathy among the boni, but was more forthcoming in his correspondence. Adams may have been thinking of Cicero’s letters to Lentulus Spinther in 54 BCE (fam. 1.8 and 1.9), in which Cicero justified his cooperation with the “first triumvirate” partially by citing the faithlessness of the optimates (see especially 1.9.11–12, 19). The letters in exile, particularly fam. 14.4.5 to Terentia and the children, offered lamentations that he had been exiled without committing any wrongdoing. Adams’ declaration that Cicero suffered for “his most virtuous and glorious Councils and Conduct” echoed a letter to Quintus, in which Cicero wrote that “that glorious consulship of mine has stolen you, my children, my country, my fortunes from me, but I hope it has taken nothing but me from you” (Q. fr. 1.3.1, cf. Att. 3.10.2). In the same letter, Cicero confessed that he regretted his own stultitia (1.3.6), a folly not far removed from naïveté as

52 “Myrmidons” is used to mean “mercenaries” in other letters of this time.
53 Letter from John Adams to William Sumner, 28 March 1809.
Adams defined it, and also blamed Hortensius and Pompey for failing him in his hour of need (1.3.8–9, cf. Att. 3.13.2, Q. fr. 1.4.4). As for insults from Caesar’s party, Cicero worried that he had become an object of suspicion and surveillance by Caesar’s partisans at Att. 11.7.5, 11.8.1–2, 11.9.1–2 and Fam. 9.16.2–4 to Papirius Paetus. Finally, in the letter to Benjamin Rush Adams mentioned Sallust, which suggests to me that he was likely thinking of the spurious *Invectiva in Ciceronem*.

What is missing from Adams’ portrait of Cicero, no matter his sources, is the Roman orator’s strategic mastery, manipulation of political expediency, and rhetorical versatility. Cicero did not simply oppose Caesar, Pompey, Clodius, and the rest and fail in the attempt, but struggled to compromise and adapt and even collaborate with them in some circumstances. His political maneuvering extended far beyond futile claims of merit. His speeches themselves show a high degree of artifice, at odds with Adams’ perception of his simple naïveté and purity. Cicero slandered and vilified opponents as much as they attacked him. Adams’ positive representation of Cicero excludes any concern about the morality of rhetoric or manipulation, since he regards Cicero himself as morally virtuous. It is worth noting that Adams’ portrait of Cicero is thus entirely different from and indeed incompatible with Mommsen’s portrait of Cicero as “trimmer” (*Achselträger*) and “short-sighted egoist” (*ein kurzsichtiger Egoist*) from later in the same century.\(^{54}\) In addition, by claiming that Cicero’s “demonstrations of purity” were never assailed, Adams also overlooks the very pretext for Cicero’s exile: the belief, sincere or not, that Cicero had abused his power as consul in executing Roman citizens without trial.

## 6 Conclusion

John Adams was an avid reader of Cicero’s works throughout his life, and beyond the intellectual stimulation he received from his readings in classics, he also analogized his own life experience to that of his Roman role model, as a way of understanding his own role in human affairs. Adams’ sympathy for Cicero and his refutation of the charge of vanity against the Roman orator allowed him to defend himself by proxy. He also consoled those close to him who had been the victims of political attacks that the great and faultless Cicero had been so treated, and that those attacks had done nothing to diminish his merit or his legacy.

---

\(^{54}\) Mommsen 1856: V 168, 618. On this portrait see Slaughter 1921; Narducci 2004; Altman 2015a.
In Adams’ friendly view, Cicero had been a good man in a bad era, unable to halt the spread of corruption. He had acted well and had even tried to use political philosophy to inspire those around him to improve the laws of the republic. Adams, too, had tried to set the United States on a path of stability, prosperity, and good governance through political science as well as leadership, using Cicero’s theory and the traditions of thinkers who had followed Cicero. His proposals were rejected, and his good faith was called into question. He could envision the ideal, but this only made it more painful when reality thwarted his expectations. He imagined a harmonious and just system, but the system as it actually developed was discordant, contentious, and corrupt. His own contemporaries were scheming behind closed doors to enrich bankers and enslavers at the expense of the common people, to militarize the new republic, to pit state against state, to get rid of their enemies by any means, including demagoguery and slander. The American experiment had been contaminated. When Adams thought about the tragically hopeless idealism of republicanism in the face of human failings, the failure of theory in the face of reality, Cicero became his exemplum par excellence.
Kathryn H. Stutz

Law & Orator: Depicting Cicero through Modern Mystery Fiction

1 Introduction and Methodology

Cicero’s work as an advocate in the Roman law courts has been the topic of fictional narratives for centuries,¹ but to those unfamiliar with Cicero’s representation in modern popular culture, it may still be surprising that many recent depictions of Cicero’s forensic speeches have taken the form of mystery stories.² The mystery narratives that feature Cicero as a character allow authors and creators to meditate on well-trodden questions of Cicero’s controversial morality and the morality of rhetoric itself.³ As a result of these mystery narratives’ influence, certain tropes from the detective fiction genre have made their way into other works that depict Cicero’s life within more traditional genres such as historical biopic and epic. This chapter demonstrates that a more intimate understanding of mystery story conventions enables us to develop a correspondingly richer understanding of Cicero’s reception.

In this analysis, I consider not only modern novels, but also an array of contemporary media including visual and auditory materials, all of which depict Cicero acting as a legal advocate or as an orator more broadly.⁴ My argument will proceed chronologically through Cicero’s life, highlighting the tropes most com-

¹ Or rather for millennia, if one considers the work of the early declamatory tradition to be fiction. Cf. Roller 1997, Wright 2001 and Keeline 2018, explored later in this paper, as well as La Bua 2019.
² This paper mainly considers fictions written in English, with the exception of the Italian novel Il diritto dei lupi (2021).
³ For Cicero’s own discussion on the morality of rhetoric, see De oratore (explored in Wisse 2002 and Fantham 2004). See also Quintilian’s meditations on Cicero, oratory, and the vir bonus (explored in Brandenburg 1948; Gowing 2013, 244 – 250; and van der Blom, p. 247 – 266 in this volume). For an academic attempt at the to grasp Cicero’s occasionally slippery morality, see Remer 2017.
⁴ With one exception, I will also be “confining myself to works in the English language”, after the excellent example of Fotheringham 2013, 350. Fortunately, English language “works in which Cicero is the central character”, are not quite so unusual as they were at the time of Fotheringham’s study: notable new arrivals include the audio-dramas Llewellyn 2017, 2018a, 2019, and 2021, as well as the stage play Poulton 2017. Fotheringham also omits two older novels starring Cicero: Wagner/Wagner 1961, and Caldwell 1965.
mon to each phase of his career, in order to show the moral arc imposed upon Cicero’s personal, professional, and political choices. Because these phases are each tied to specific pieces of Cicero’s oratory, an understanding of the extant adaptations for each Ciceronian speech is vital; a pair of tables illustrating which modern fiction sources feature each speech can be found in Table 1 (“Modern Portrayals of Cicero’s Oratory by Date of Ciceronian Speech”) and Table 2 (“Modern Portrayals of Cicero’s Oratory by Date of Modern Media Publication”). By examining the choices that artists and authors make when portraying Cicero as an orator, both in terms of adapting ancient source material and contrasting specific characters as moral agents within a narrative framework, this study asserts that murder mystery genre tropes have played an important role in providing different answers to the contentious question: Was Cicero the orator morally just? As Ellen O’Gorman asserts in her examination of ancient Roman mystery fiction, “the comparison of history and detective fiction can put the nature of historical writing under considerable scrutiny”. Thus, this paper argues, fiction (or, what O’Gorman calls “‘fictive’ knowledge”) can illuminate the darker corners of the historiographical tradition, forcing us to examine our assumptions about truth, justice, and morality.

2 Young Cicero: The Pro Roscio Amerino

Some of the historical court cases in which Cicero served as an advocate lend themselves better to standard mystery narratives than do others. A key example is one of Cicero’s very first cases, the defense of Sextus Roscius of Ameria against the charge of parricide, known as the Pro Roscio Amerino. In this apparently paradoxical case, young Roscius faced charges before the quaestio perpetua de

7 The forensic courtroom has, at times, been a questionable place for the display of morally upright brilliance; for more discussion, see van der Blom, p. 247–266 in this volume, which characterizes Quintilian as offering “the senate and the contio as the venues in which a good orator’s glory will shine more brightly” than in the forensic courtroom (256). In Cicero’s day, forensic oratory could form the path toward a productive political career, but not necessarily toward a spotless reputation.
8 Cf. Grant 1975, 23–110, for an English translation of the Pro Roscio specifically cited by one modern creator of Cicero fiction as a significant source of inspiration and several direct quotes (Llewellyn 2018b).
sicariis for the death of his father, Roscius the Elder, despite the fact that the name of this elder Roscius had been added to the proscription lists of Lucius Cornelius Sulla. Though the importance of uniquely Roman cultural features such as the Sullan proscriptions and the larger context of the war between Marius and Sulla can make this criminal case somewhat difficult to present to modern audiences unfamiliar with Roman history,\(^9\) the traditional elements of the murder mystery that surround the death of Roscius the Elder do lend themselves plausibly well to adaptation. According to Timothy W. Boyd and Carolyn Higbie (both scholars of Greek antiquity who turned their classical scholarship toward better understanding mystery literature), for any given action to be deemed a crime and therefore “act as the motivating power” in a historical detective novel, the crime “must be linked with appropriate legal, or at least retributive, structures” both within the novel’s historical context and within the imaginative world of the reader.\(^{10}\) The Roman court system, in which Cicero acts as an advocate, serves as a legal structure in which the crime of parricide can be prosecuted, providing a relatively familiar setting even for audiences new to the world of ancient Rome. Assuming – at least for now – that a fictional Cicero is aligned with the side of truth and justice, Cicero’s forensic oratory ought to ensure that justice will be found within the Roman courtroom, but in order for Cicero the orator to lay out the facts for the court, these facts must first be uncovered during the course of an investigation. The question of who will serve as an investigator can be answered in one of two different ways, depending on how the Pro Roscio case has been fictionalized: either Cicero could hire someone else to serve as a sort of private detective, or Cicero could undertake the investigation himself. Neither of these paths necessarily demand a more or less moral Cicero by our standards, but the implications are very different from a narrative standpoint. A young Cicero digging through archives of proscription lists, questioning witnesses, and placing himself physically in danger in order to serve his client, for example, makes for a sort of Sherlockian detective-hero, searching for the truth amidst the chaos of republican Rome. We see this sort of heroic Cicero in a BBC docudrama titled *Murder in Rome*,\(^{11}\) as well as in the first episode of the audio-

---

\(^9\) Butler 2002, 14–23 examines the logical issues with these criminal charges and how Cicero navigates them.

\(^{10}\) Boyd/Higbie 1997, 20.

\(^{11}\) Swash 2005. Cf. Fotheringham 2013, 360 – 361: “Cicero is pressurized into defending Roscius at the last minute, and when the trial begins he still knows next to nothing about the case. This turns the trajectory of the episode into that of a murder-mystery. At one point the young orator is shown consulting the proscription lists himself – apparently the first person to do so – at night, by torchlight, searching for “clues”. The unexpected appearance of a further witness from Ame-
drama *Cicero*, written by David Llewellyn. About his process writing this audio-drama, Llewellyn wrote:

Cicero is interesting because he lived to a decent age, and was writing down his thoughts for much of his adult life. Like anyone, his views and his values changed with time. [Writing the audio-drama] was a case of trying to work out who he was in his twenties, while allowing for the fact that he [would] be a very different person by the end of the Republic.

Specifically, Llewellyn identified this later Cicero as a politician willing to enact violence – in this case, against the members of the Catilinarian conspiracy – whereas Llewellyn’s “young Cicero” of the Roscius trial displays a moral position cleanly opposed to violence in all its forms, and his passionate methods of investigation and forensic presentation make him a compelling protagonist. Because of his youth, this Cicero still has hope that there can one day be peace in Rome through the balance of justice and law; similarly, in the recent Italian novel *Il diritto dei lupi* – also set during the *Pro Roscio* trial – a young Cicero meets with powerful political forces who attempt to draw him into corruption, and when he refuses, they name him “Un idealista” in contrast to the gritty corruption of the Roman republic.

Llewellyn similarly includes a scene of confrontation with the corrupt higher powers controlling Rome, in which his morally upright Cicero turns away from bribery; on the whole, however, Llewellyn achieves his own hopeful characterization of his young protagonist largely through his careful inclusion of Cicero’s own words from the written *Pro Roscio Amerino*. In the
first episode of the audio-drama, the fictional Cicero addresses the courtroom with a speech closely adapted from the conclusion of the extant *Pro Roscio*.

Judges, it is up to you to stamp out this cruelty from our midst. We must suffer it no more. That cruelty – it has familiarized us with evil in all its forms, stifling pity in the hearts of merciful people. Hour after hour we hear of these appalling deeds, and this repetition of horrors drains even the gentlest natures of their humanity. Well, today let’s draw a line. Today, let us say, *enough*.¹

This oratory borrows heavily from the last section (Cic. *S. Rosc.* 154) of *Pro Roscio Amerino*, with only minor rhetorical flourishes having been added; entire phrases of the English translation remain intact in the *Cicero* audio-drama.¹⁷

By contrast, in *Roman Blood*, the first of Steven Saylor’s *Roma Sub Rosa* mystery novels, Cicero plays the role of a patron and lawyer – but not detective – within the same *Pro Roscio Amerino* narrative.¹⁸ Instead, Cicero hires the fictive detective “Gordianus the Finder” to investigate the Roscius case. With this Gordianus character presented not only as the narrator but also as the narratological protagonist and moral hero, Cicero is free to be portrayed as morally corrupt, concerned only with defending his client at all costs, regardless of the truth. Though Cicero here remains a major character – unlike the more marginal role that he receives in other media, such as HBO’s *Rome* – the contrast Saylor draws between Gordianus and Cicero casts Cicero in a negative light as soon as Cicero is introduced. As Gordianus himself suggests near the novel’s beginning, Roman advocates and orators “don’t necessarily have to believe in a point to argue for it”,¹⁹ a perspective that the historical Cicero himself appeared to voice later in his life.²⁰ While Saylor’s Gordianus searches exhaustively for the truth, no matter how unpleasant, Saylor’s Cicero has no use nor time “for anything that distracts from the simple, closed circle of logic” that comprises Sextus Roscius’ defense, irrespective of the consequences for the safety of the Roman state.²¹ Perhaps the clearest image of the contrast between Llewellyn’s heroic

---

¹ Llewellyn 2017.
¹⁷ Llewellyn’s assertion that he used Grant’s 1975 translation of the Latin (Llewellyn 2018b) can be corroborated by the direct borrowing of phrases such as “it is up to you to stamp out this cruelty from our midst”, “evil in all its forms”, “appalling deed[s]”, and the “repetition of horrors” that “drains even the gentlest natures of [...] humanity”.
¹⁹ Saylor 1991, 49.
young Cicero and Saylor’s anti-heroic one is the appearance within Saylor’s narrative of the same passage of the Pro Roscio Amerino that Llewellyn used: Cicero is made to say the same familiar sentiments, as he exhorts the judges to “suffer this wickedness no longer to stalk abroad in the land”, saying that “it has stifled all pity in a people once known as the most merciful on earth”, and “even the kindest and gentlest among us may lose all semblance of human compassion”²² but in Saylor’s text, these phrases lack the moving sentiment that Llewellyn’s voice actor Samuel Barnett provides, since, in Saylor, they are heard by Gordianus only as a distant echo from within a public Roman toilet.²³ The grimy setting mirrors the changed meaning of Cicero’s words in this context: in Saylor’s novel, Roscius is guilty, and Cicero’s speech in his defense is an inherently immoral act committed in support of a murderer and abuser. A far cry from the glory of Llewellyn’s young Cicero heard orating from the center of the forum – when placed side by side, Saylor’s and Llewellyn’s disparate interpretations of the same historical event constitute mutually exclusive claims to O’Gorman’s “fictional knowledge”.²⁴ In Saylor’s novel, evil is endemic to Rome, and Cicero embodies that evil, while in Llewellyn’s city, young Cicero’s hope in humanity is the only thing capable of standing against the corruption of the state, itself not inherently evil, but instead simply buried underneath an accumulation of many overlapping patterns of violence, just as the historical Cicero claimed.

3 Mid-Career Cicero: Corruption Cases and Concealing Cluentius

Saylor’s Cicero lacks not only a heroic narrative role and aesthetic, but also a heroic morality, at least from a modern mystery fiction perspective.²⁵ In truth, most systems of modern legal ethics instruct defense attorneys to prioritize serving their clients, but a fictional Cicero is never only a lawyer: he is also a political actor, whose ideas of truth, justice, and violence have broader ramifications. For this reason, we see a disproportionately high representation of Cicero’s mid-ca-

²³ Saylor 1991, 357.
²⁵ Cf. Fotheringham 2013, 358, who adds that “Saylor has admitted in interviews that he started off with the idea of making Cicero the detective and protagonist, but as he researched the character he found him more and more difficult to view as either a seeker after truth or a hero. The invented character of Gordianus, who is both, presents Saylor’s negative view of Cicero to the reader as first-person narrator of the novels”.

reer corruption cases in non-mystery fiction, compared to detective-style works. Biopic and epic stories such as Taylor Caldwell’s *A Pillar of Iron*, the Cicero Trilogy of Robert Harris, and Mike Poulton’s stage adaption of the Harris trilogy, often use the morally upright *In Verrem* and the more problematic *Pro Fonteio* to flesh out the complexity of their fictional Cicero’s morality. A truly broad depiction of Cicero’s life, like those offered by Harris and Caldwell, may choose to omit Cicero’s minor cases, especially non-mysterious legal matters like property disputes. *In Verrem* and *Pro Fonteio*, however, accomplish an important political balancing act: while *In Verrem* becomes a rich source for showing Cicero as a new politician stamping down government corruption, *Pro Fonteio* remains a damning piece of evidence for Cicero’s willingness to defend corruption if politically expedient. A mystery lens helps can reveal the narrative impact of this tension: though traditional tropes that characterize the heroic detective figure are largely absent from depictions of Cicero orating the *Pro Fonteio*, adaptations of the *In Verrem*, in contrast, show vivid images of Cicero’s detective processes, from Harris’ Cicero with his “toga hoisted around his knees, his fine red shoes in one hand, his warrant in the other, picking his way daintily across a muddy field in the pouring rain to take evidence from a farmer at his plow” to the triumphant verse, “trust me: Cicero wrote it all down” in “Song for Cleomenes”, an indie folk song about *In Verrem*. This is Cicero at his most heroic and, simultaneously, at his most detail-oriented, collecting the facts for his prosecution of Verres, a clear villain.

In classic detective literature, the quest that elevates the protagonist to hero status is the act of searching for the truth, but applying this mystery-quest to a figure like Cicero can become awkward in circumstances where Cicero was known to prioritize the acquittal of his clients above empirical truth. While discussing the importance of truth-value to Roman juries, Andrew Riggsby cites a well-known quote of Quintilian’s concerning Cicero: regarding Cicero’s defense of Cluentius, Quintilian says, “nor did Cicero himself lose his sight [of the truth], when he boasted that he had covered the jurors in shadow in Cluentius’

---

26 Caldwell 1965.  
27 Harris 2006; 2009; and 2015. For *In Verrem* and *Pro Fonteio* specifically, see Harris 2006.  
28 Poulton 2017, 17–20. The treatment of *In Verrem* in Poulton’s script is brief, and the *Pro Fonteio* is regrettably omitted, but this is unsurprising in a stage-play script attempting to summarize Cicero’s long career into two nights at the theatre.  
29 To my knowledge, no modern fictional treatments yet exist for the *Pro Quinctio* or the *Pro Tullio*, for example.  
30 Harris 2006, 219.  
As Riggsby explains, this statement suggests that not only did Cicero prioritize the presentation of a strong defense case over the dissemination of true facts, but he did so fully aware of the ethical implications of his choice, in the context of a Roman courtroom where “guilt and innocence [did] matter to the jury, if not to the advocate personally”.33 While, according to Quintilian, Cicero claimed afterward to have deceived these jurors with rhetoric, in the written Pro Cluentio of our tradition, Cicero asserts – in what could be construed as an act of meta-deception – that “a court of law is the abode of truth” (locum in iudiciis veritati).34

Quintilian’s quotation suggests a broader story; in fact, the Pro Cluentio has been the foundation for at least one modern courtroom-drama style mystery novel, in which the facts of the case unfold during a series of unofficial depositions that Cicero conducts with his new client, Cluentius, who has been accused of poisoning his stepfather. This depiction of the Pro Cluentio, in the 1961 novel The Gift of Rome,35 manages to present a morally grounded Cicero – despite the falseness of his legal argument – by incorporating features of Cicero’s broader political life, in the style of biopic media like the Cicero Trilogy of Robert Harris. During Cicero’s forensic speech on behalf of Cluentius, the narration reports that:

[Cicero] spoke of the law of Rome. He spoke of order imposed by the minds of men upon the disorders of their own existence; an order forever the same in the shifting tides. Behind all flux, one permanence: the gift of Rome; a structure built out of men’s many answers to the question: what is justice? 36

These same sentiments are repeated in private to Cicero’s confidant, Atticus; here is a Cicero who truly believes in an idealistic version of the broader picture. In contrast to Saylor’s Cicero, who defends his morally bankrupt client without regard to the consequences for Rome, the Wagners’ Cicero defends his guilty client precisely because of the civic consequences. His legal advocacy is a part of his own broader project to create social, political, and moral justice, to build an or-

34 Cic. Cluent. 202, transl. Grant 1975. See also the elegant discussion of truth within Quintilian’s treatment of the Pro Cluentio case in Steel, p. 243 in this volume, and compare the significance of truth-finding for Montesquieu’s reading of Cicero, in Moraes Santos, p. 341–367.
derly Rome where *equites* like himself and Cluentius may thrive; this fictive Cicero is deserving of Quintilian’s praise of a man possessing upright *voluntas*. Though Cicero’s individual actions may lack a perfect morality, his generally good intentions nevertheless redeem him. The Wagners, in *The Gift of Rome*, even reference the same Quintilian quote about Cicero’s deception in the *Pro Cluentio*, saying that Cicero “had mocked at verdicts, overthrown rulings, and *thrown dust in the eyes of jurors*”, and yet this does not make their Cicero a villain, because “in the last depths of his deep heart his love of the law of Rome lay hard and perfect, never to be touched”. Whether or not the Wagners’ Cicero has a realistic vision for Rome, or even a plan that would benefit the majority of Rome’s citizens, this Cicero’s deeply held convictions allow him to fill the role of the narrative hero.

### 4 Mature Cicero: Vis and Violence

As Cicero matured and Rome drew closer to the end of its time as a republic, more of Cicero’s court cases dealt with the intricacies of violence. As Aislinn Melchior asserts, many of the historical Cicero’s speeches served as “a call for action from his audience” that “exploit the full emotionalism of vividly portrayed violence”. As such, it is not surprising that some of Cicero’s later cases – which feature more often in modern mystery narratives – are typically violent: the *Pro Milone*, for example, so popular with early imperial writers and practitioners of rhetoric, has appeared in mystery author Kenneth Benton’s *Death on the Appian Way*, as well as within a Steven Saylor serial with a similar title, *A Murder on the Appian Way*. “Because violence is so powerful”, Melchior argues, “the way that one portrays violence is also imbued with power”. This potential for power and violence through speech can make Cicero’s motivations appear sinister when his morality does not align with our own, and sinister motives can provide an opportunity for certain authors to construct amoral or even villainous portrayals of Cicero. The importance of violence within Cicero’s legacy

---

37 See Stoner, p. 86–87 in this volume.
38 Wagner/Wagner 1961, 206 [italics mine].
40 Melchior 2004, 12.
41 See van der Blom, p. 247–266 in this volume.
43 Saylor 1996.
44 Melchior 2004, 3.
likely also explains the predominance of modern depictions of the Catilinarian conspiracy: a total of six separate works can be found under the “In Catilinam [63 BCE]” stemma in Table 1. As can be seen in the previous phases of Cicero’s career, even a contentious case like Cicero’s pursuit of Catiline and execution of the co-conspirators can be thrown in either a positive or a negative light. In his second novel, Lustrum, Robert Harris “to some extent protects his Cicero from criticism” by describing politics in Rome as a “dirty business” with which Cicero, as a politician, must engage by necessity.45 Poulton, with the sympathetic example of Harris as his source material, begins his stage play with Cicero investigating a violent murder,46 playing up the mystery tropes to paint Cicero as a detective seeking the truth first and foremost. In contrast, David Llewellyn’s first look at the Catilinarian conspiracy takes a harsher view, focusing on Cicero’s execution of the conspirators without a trial. In the crossover episode “Tartarus”, of Doctor Who – The Monthly Adventures, Cicero, here given a brief co-starring role in this on-going science fiction audio-drama based on the famed BBC TV show Doctor Who, confronts the vengeful ghosts (lemures) of those he has ordered to be killed while he was consul.47 Even so, Llewellyn’s Cicero is redeemed again by his voluntas – politics is a “dirty business” and the fact that Cicero feels guilt over his actions is enough to redeem him and bring him back to the position of co-protagonist by the episode’s end. As the Doctor says to Cicero, “I’ve met beings across the universe who’ve spent their entire lives being cruel. And that is not how you’ll be remembered” which, judging from the still-heroic Cicero of 59 BCE portrayed in the sequel series Cicero: The Crossroads, appears to be true.48 Unsurprisingly, Steven Saylor uses his own interpretation of In Catilinam, the novel Catilina’s Riddle,49 to further criticize the social violence of Cicero’s self-serving politics in contrast both with the protagonist-detective Gordianus as well as Saylor’s seductive Catiline. Yet even certain texts that retain a sympathy for Cicero despite his role as executioner, such as The Catilinarian Conspiracy by John Maddox Roberts,50 reveal an assumption that some part of the Roman republic perished with Catiline. The summer of 63 BCE was “the last summer of the old Republic”, Roberts’ fictional narrator opines: “it died in the fall” – the fall of Cicero’s consulship, that is.51 Such statements echo the sentiments

45 Fotheringham 2013, 369; Harris 2009, 475.
46 Poulton 2017.
47 Llewellyn 2019.
49 Saylor 1993.
50 Roberts 1991.
51 Roberts 1991, 12.
of scholars like Harriet Flower, who asserts that “an argument can be made that it was Cicero who was responsible for a dangerous undermining of republican values when he declared an emergency, executed Roman citizens and even a fellow magistrate without a trial, and raised the specter of civil war and arson in the city” thereby signalling an end to traditional republican forms of government.  

5 The End of Cicero: The Philippicae

The most memorable episode of brutal violence in Cicero’s life, however, is a murder for which no murderer ever stood trial: Cicero’s own proscription and slaughter in 43 BCE. Unsurprisingly, many modern historical fiction narratives narrow in on the iconic end of Cicero’s life. At first glance, there seems to be very little mystery to Cicero’s death. We know precisely why he was killed; the motive is clear, and the basic facts of his proscription by the second triumvirate are historically very well attested. There is a broader question, however, which many of these epic narratives attempt to answer: while conflating Cicero’s death with the end of the de facto rule of elected officials in Rome, and therefore the end of the republican form of government, we often ask, why did the Roman republic die? By whom was it killed? History allows a nuanced answer to this question: the republic was crumbling already: it had been broken since before Cicero was born, and many people played a role in dealing the death blows. History does not have one single explanation for this mystery – it has many. As Harriet Flower argues, the idea of the “Roman republic” died many deaths, changing radically even over the course of just Cicero’s own lifetime.  

This lack of political continuity, however, rarely makes its way into fiction, a genre where the lens of the protagonist’s journey takes preeminence over other, more sociological narratives. Robins Winks records a “saying among historians” that “one will never know precisely why the ship of state sank because there are too many eye witnesses” whereas “detective fiction in its lonely voice that insists upon individual responsibility, strips the eyewitnesses down to two: the author and the reader”.  

By refocusing on the ongoing detective narrative of Cicero’s life, we find that some of these smaller questions of individual responsibility have been left unan-
To answer these questions, we must untangle the complicated web of historical accounts and literary depictions that have preserved, in words, Cicero’s last days. In his examination of early narratives of Cicero’s death, Matthew Roller observes that the sequence of events is not, in fact, commonly agreed upon, because Cicero’s death-story does not come to us through “a purely textual, literary transmission” but instead, the oral exercises known as declamationes – fictitious legal defenses practiced in the schools of rhetoric – codified the tradition of Cicero’s death. Roller asserts that it is “the logic of these exercises, and of declamation as a whole, that largely defines the range and character of the variations in the death-of-Cicero tradition”. This path of scholarship has led to the perception, as articulated (to take one example from within the realm of scholarship on Cicero’s reception) by Eran Almagor, who finds two “strands” in Roller’s model of Imperial reception regarding Cicero’s death, and asserts that “only one strand in the tradition of Cicero’s death is committed to the relation of facts” (that is, historiography as practiced by writers like Livy) whereas “the other [strand] comes from the field of invention” – that is, declamation, or the “presentation of deliberative and legal dilemmas, in which imagination and fiction are given a free rein”. Were this the case, it should be simple enough to select one strand (i.e., the early historical sources – Livy and the Latin historians quoted directly in sources like the Suasoriae and Controversiae of the Elder Seneca) and discard the other strand; the past two decades of scholarship, however, have revealed a rather more tangled narrative knot.

In contrast to Almagor, Andrew Wright contends that the entire “historical record has been contaminated by a fiction generated by the practice of declamation”, and more recently, Keeline has argued that, from the time of the early empire, the historical “picture of Cicero, and especially of his death, is thus painted with declamatory colores”. Because of this fictionalizing influence of declamation on the story of Cicero’s death, we are left with a network of death

55 For an answer to this last question as it pertains to the rhetorical maneuvering which allowed Augustus to displace his own responsibility for Cicero’s death onto Marc Antony, see Keeline 2020.
56 Roller 1997, 110.
57 Almagor 2015, 62.
58 Wright 2001, 437.
59 Keeline 2018, 146. For another example of the type of declamatory fiction that colored the historical tradition of Cicero’s death, see Keeline, p. 119–141 in this volume, especially the discussion of Lucius Aelius Lamia beginning on page 122.
narratives that are concerned not with historical fact but with rhetorical strategies of persuasion in the same way that the historical Cicero’s speeches often prioritized victory over truth. Cicero and the texts about him have become one, united by their unique blend of fiction and falsehood. Yet this must not be understood as a lack of narrative concern for justice – as we have seen in these historical mystery works, Cicero’s perspective and morality may change, but his concern for (and, ultimately, his conflation with) the Roman republic stays the same, whether he serves as its murderer or as its fellow victim.

Right or wrong, Cicero was convinced that he knew the precise origin of the evils plaguing the republic in 43 BCE: men who disrespected the authority of the senate by supporting Caesar’s indefinite dictatorship, men like Marc Antony. Even media that portray Cicero as somewhat peripheral to the power-struggle of the late Republic, such as HBO’s television show Rome, often make use of Cicero solely as a vessel for the critique of the power-grabbing Antony. In the third episode of the second season of Rome, titled “These Being the Words of Marcus Tullius Cicero”, a messenger reads aloud Cicero’s climactic invective, a pastiche of second Philippic tropes.

When I was a young man, I defended our state. As an old man, I shall not abandon it. I give sincere thanks to Marc Antony, who has generously presented me with the most promising theme imaginable. I address you directly, Antony. Please listen, as if you were sober and intelligent, and not a drink-sodden, sex-addled wreck. You are certainly not without accomplishments. It is a rare man who can boast of becoming a bankrupt before even coming of age. You have brought upon us war, pestilence, and destruction. You are Rome’s Helen of Troy. But then, a woman’s role has always suited you best. ⁶⁰

While not as faithful a copy as the versions of other Cicero orations that appear in novels like those of Saylor, Harris and the Wagners, or in the audio-dramas of Llewellyn, traces of the Latin remain even in this televised format: from the opening line, “I defended the republic as a young man, I will not abandon it now that I am old” (defendi rem publicam adulscens, non deseram senex), ⁶¹ and the brazen exhortation, “for a moment think of the business like a sober man” (attende enim paulisper cogitationemque sobrii hominis punctum temporis suscipe), ⁶² to the references to Antony’s checkered past, “do you recollect that, while you were still clad in the praetexta, you became a bankrupt?” (tenesne me-

---

⁶¹ Cic. Phil. 2.118, transl. Yonge 1903.
⁶² Cic. Phil. 2.31, transl. Yonge 1903.
moría praetextatum te decoxisse?); and, of course, the final epic simile, “as Helen was to the Trojans, so has that man been to this republic: the cause of war, the cause of mischief, the cause of ruin” (ut Helena Troianis, sic iste huic rei publicae belli causa, causa pestis atque exiti fuit). Although scrambled, exaggerated, and placed within a modern matrix, these fragments of authentic Ciceroonian oratory provide a compelling motive for Antony’s impassioned desire for the death of Cicero. Within the episode, Antony’s reaction to this speech is sudden and violent: he very literally kills the messenger who hesitantly recites these words. Here, Cicero is used as a contrast to Antony in much the same way as he is used in Saylor’s novels as a contrast to Gordianus, though the moral implications have reversed direction. Set beside Gordianus, Cicero makes Saylor’s protagonist appear heroic, while in HBO’s Rome, Cicero makes Antony’s slow moral decent take on rapid speed. Yet this does not make HBO’s Cicero a hero – as Lynn Fotheringham observes, Cicero “shows some backbone in standing up to Antony, and he dies bravely” yet “on the whole, he comes across as faintly ridiculous”. This televised Cicero is a symbol of the problems with the Roman republic: he is hapless, out of touch with the violent, physical reality lived by the Roman people and by military men like Antony.

Other death-of-Cicero stories from diverse modern genres similarly frame Cicero’s invective in the Philippics as the inciting incident leading ultimately to his proscription. Like an unsympathetic murder victim in a classic mystery novel, guilty of numerous offenses for which anumber of personal enemies might want him dead, Cicero is shown to be flawed in much the same way that Robin Winks describes the failings of the mystery genre itself:

63 Cic. Phil. 2.44, transl. Yonge 1903.
64 Cic. Phil. 2.55, transl. Yonge 1903.
65 Fotheringham 2013, 354. Fotheringham largely locates this ridiculousness in the physicality of the actor, David Bamber, whom she calls, “not particularly attractive”, “far too young for the part, historically speaking”, and “lacking Cicero’s proper gravitas”. While these criticisms are not untrue, the focus on Bamber as an actor elides the fact that, throughout the two seasons of the show Rome, Antony’s interactions with Cicero are played as forms of sexualized violence, a pattern that hits its peak in the eighth episode of the first season, “Caesarion”. After most of the senators have left the senate hall for the day, Antony tenderly asks Cicero to place his hands in Antony’s, at which point Antony grabs Cicero by the wrists, forces him to his knees, and declares “If I ever again hear your name connected with murmurs of treachery, I will cut off these soft, pink hands, and nail them to the Senate door”, after which he kisses Cicero’s hands while Cicero struggles (MacDonald 2005, 48:30). Similar episodes of sexualized violence and domination occur between Antony and Cicero throughout the series, as well as between Cicero and Octavian.
Detective fiction is what some of its disparagers say it is: conservative, almost compulsive in its belief that one may, in truth, trace cause and effect, may place responsibility just here, may pass judgement, may even assess blame, and in its determination not to let us forget that there is evil in the world and that men and women, individual men and women, do it.\(^{66}\)

Thanks to the *Philippicae*, Cicero’s legacy is dominated by his own decision to turn his prodigious literary talents toward invective, in a passionate attempt to convince the people of Rome that there was evil in their city, and men like Antony were responsible for creating that evil. Though HBO’s *Rome* validates Cicero’s decision to attack Antony through their depiction of Antony as increasingly cruel and vindictive, not all portrayals of these events see Cicero’s *Philippicae* as part of a project toward moral justice. For example, the song *Crack-Up* by the American rock band the Fleet Foxes references the *Philippicae* in a largely negative light, with the verse:

When the world insists that the false is so
With a Philippic, as Cicero.\(^{67}\)

### 6 Conclusions: Killing Cicero

If we read the fictionalized end of Cicero’s life as we would a mystery, the point at which Cicero’s own actions will inevitably lead to his death becomes the narrative climax, that classical murder mystery sequence, the revelation of the truth. At what point in the story does any given fictive Cicero discover that, thanks to the *Philippics*, he has signed his own name on the proscription lists? Some narrative formats forbid their Cicero this revelation in various ways: HBO’s *Rome* insistently characterizes their Cicero as a symbol of what Eran Almagor calls “the clash of rhetorical art and harsh reality”\(^{68}\) rather than a fully developed character in his own right. During the scene in which Cicero is killed in HBO’s drama, the thematic focus is drawn to the brutality of the act as a contrast to Cicero’s lofty legacy – “I will be in all the history books” Cicero declares – implying the historiographic afterlife of Cicero the historical figure, but leaving Cicero the individual with no time for introspection or regret.\(^{69}\) In both Robert Harris’
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\(^{66}\) Winks 1980, 10.

\(^{67}\) Pecknold 2017.

\(^{68}\) Almagor 2015, 62.

\(^{69}\) Mahoney 2007, 18:30.
third Cicero novel, *Dictator*,⁷⁰ and Mike Poulton’s subsequent stage adaptation *Imperium*,⁷¹ Cicero’s death is filtered through the experiences of a narrator – Cicero’s freedman secretary, Tiro. In these works, it is Tiro’s reluctant acceptance of Cicero’s choices that is the resolution to the mystery, not Cicero’s own moral or philosophical understanding of his imminent death.

It is possible that the resounding popular silence around Cicero’s own experience of his death is not an accident but rather a feature of Cicero’s legacy. We can see a parallel here with how post-classical writers have conceptualized and framed the death of Cicero’s beloved daughter Tullia. As Shane Butler explains in his elegant article, “Cicero’s Grief”, the text that Cicero wrote to comfort himself after his daughter’s death, the *Consolatio*, has become a meta-symbol of destruction: “Loss, has, itself, been absorbed into and embodied by the very acts of [textual] transmission and reception”.⁷² The same loss of life – and the subsequent loss of Cicero’s voice in the Roman court, the loss of Cicero’s political perspective in the Roman government – may explain the absence of clear moral contemplation in these last moments of any given fictional Cicero. These last thoughts are lost to us, forever an unfinished mystery.

Whether Cicero is portrayed as the morally corrupt defender of a guilty client or as the brilliant Sherlockian detective searching for the truth amidst the chaos of late republican Rome, the fusion of detective tropes with popular portrayals of Cicero reveals a tension between Cicero’s own competitive and persuasive priorities and our modern valorization of truth and virtue in our legal heroes. By unpacking the language of mystery that has pervaded Cicero’s popular image in recent years, we uncover a desire to find concrete reasons for the fall of the Roman republic. In works that critique Cicero’s ethical character, Cicero himself becomes a figure to blame, a symbol for the worst parts of the dying republican regime; in many works that sympathize with Cicero’s moral program, however, he becomes the over-idealistic *vox populi*, crushed under the heel of imminent empire.

**Tab. 1: Modern Portrayals of Cicero’s Oratory by Date of Ciceronian Speech.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cicero Speech Presented (Year)</th>
<th>Name of Work</th>
<th>Author (Year)</th>
<th>Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro Roscio Amerino</em> (80 BCE)</td>
<td><em>Roman Blood</em></td>
<td>Saylor</td>
<td>Novel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁷⁰ Harris 2015.
⁷¹ Poulton 2017.
⁷² Butler 2018, 14.
**Tab. 1: Modern Portrayals of Cicero’s Oratory by Date of Ciceronian Speech. (Continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cicero Speech Presented (Year)</th>
<th>Name of Work</th>
<th>Author (Year)</th>
<th>Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Murder in Rome</em>, BBC’s <em>Timewatch</em></td>
<td><em>Swash</em> (2005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Finish’s <em>Cicero (Episode I)</em></td>
<td><em>Llewellyn</em> (2017)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Il diritto dei lupi</em></td>
<td><em>De Bellis/Fiorillo</em> (2021)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>In Verrem</em> (70 BCE)</td>
<td><em>A Pillar of Iron</em></td>
<td><em>Caldwell</em> (1965)</td>
<td>Novel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Song for Cleomenes</em></td>
<td><em>Darnielle</em> (1994)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Imperium</em></td>
<td><em>Harris</em> (2006)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Novel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSC’s <em>Imperium: The Cicero Plays</em></td>
<td><em>Poulton</em> (2017)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro Fonteio</em> (69 BCE)</td>
<td><em>A Pillar of Iron</em></td>
<td><em>Caldwell</em> (1965)</td>
<td>Novel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Imperium</em></td>
<td><em>Harris</em> (2006)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Novel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>In Catilinam</em> (63 BCE)</td>
<td><em>A Pillar of Iron</em></td>
<td><em>Caldwell</em> (1965)</td>
<td>Novel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Catilinarian Conspiracy</em></td>
<td><em>Roberts</em> (1991)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Novel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Catilina’s Riddle</em></td>
<td><em>Saylor</em> (1993)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Novel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lustrum</em></td>
<td><em>Harris</em> (2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Novel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSC’s <em>Imperium: The Cicero Plays</em></td>
<td><em>Poulton</em> (2017)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Finish’s <em>Tartarus</em></td>
<td><em>Llewellyn</em> (2019)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Audio-drama</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tab. 1: Modern Portrayals of Cicero’s Oratory by Date of Ciceronian Speech. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cicero Speech Presented (Year)</th>
<th>Name of Work</th>
<th>Author (Year)</th>
<th>Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Philippicae</em> (44–43 BCE)</td>
<td><em>A Pillar of Iron</em></td>
<td>Caldwell (1965)</td>
<td>Novel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>These Being the Words of Marcus Tullius Cicero, HBO’s Rome</em></td>
<td>Buck (2007)</td>
<td>TV show</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Dictator</em></td>
<td>Harris (2015)</td>
<td>Novel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>RSC’s Imperium: The Cicero Plays</em></td>
<td>Poulton (2017)</td>
<td>Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Crack-Up</em></td>
<td>Pecknold (2017)</td>
<td>Song</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 2: Modern Portrayals of Cicero’s Oratory by Date of Modern Media Publication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (Year)</th>
<th>Name of Work</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Cicero Speeches Presented (Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author (Year)</td>
<td>Name of Work</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Cicero Speeches Presented (Year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saylor (1991)</td>
<td>Roman Blood</td>
<td>Novel</td>
<td>Pro Roscio Amerino (80 BCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saylor (1993)</td>
<td>Catilina’s Riddle</td>
<td>Novel</td>
<td>In Catilinam (63 BCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darnielle (1994)</td>
<td>Song for Cleomenes</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>In Verrem (70 BCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saylor (1995)</td>
<td>The Venus Throw</td>
<td>Novel</td>
<td>Pro Caelio (56 BCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swash (2005)</td>
<td>Murder in Rome, BBC’s Timewatch</td>
<td>Docudrama</td>
<td>Pro Roscio Amerino (80 BCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris (2006)</td>
<td>Imperium</td>
<td>Novel</td>
<td>In Verrem (70 BCE), Pro Fonteio (69 BCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buck (2007)</td>
<td>These Being the Words of Marcus Tullius Cicero, HBO’s Rome</td>
<td>TV show</td>
<td>Philippicae (44–43 BCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris (2009)</td>
<td>Lustrum</td>
<td>Novel</td>
<td>In Catilinam (63 BCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris (2015)</td>
<td>Dictator</td>
<td>Novel</td>
<td>Philippicae (44–43 BCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llewellyn (2017)</td>
<td>Big Finish’s Cicero (Episode I)</td>
<td>Audiodrama</td>
<td>Pro Roscio Amerino (80 BCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pecknold (2017)</td>
<td>Crack-Up</td>
<td>Song</td>
<td>Philippicae (44–43 BCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poulton (2017)</td>
<td>RSC’s Imperium: The Cicero Plays</td>
<td>Play</td>
<td>In Verrem (70 BCE), In Catilinam (63 BCE), Philippicae (44–43 BCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llewellyn (2018a)</td>
<td>Big Finish’s Cicero (Episodes II-VI)</td>
<td>Audiodrama</td>
<td>Pro muliere Aretina (unknown date, cf. Pro Caecina § 97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llewellyn (2019)</td>
<td>Big Finish’s Tartarus</td>
<td>Audiodrama</td>
<td>In Catilinam (63 BCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Bellis/ Fiorillo (2021)</td>
<td>Il diritto dei lupi</td>
<td>Novel</td>
<td>Pro Roscio Amerino (80 BCE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tab. 2: Modern Portrayals of Cicero’s Oratory by Date of Modern Media Publication.  *(Continued)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (Year)</th>
<th>Name of Work</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Cicero Speeches Presented (Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Llewellyn (2021)</td>
<td>Big Finish’s <em>Cicero: The Crossroads</em></td>
<td>Audio-drama</td>
<td><em>Pro Antonio</em> (59 BCE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION III: The Portrait of the Ideal Orator
1 Introduction

The reception of Cicero in the early empire has been fortunate in its interpreters. The picture as a whole has been the object of some recent surveys.¹ And two important monographs have explored in detail the transformation of Cicero into a cultural and educational resource for the Roman elite during this period.² From their distinctive perspectives, each has shown how pedagogical engagements with Cicero were shaped both by the desire to understand and learn effective oratorical techniques and by Cicero’s position as a notable, albeit complex, cultural icon.

The object of this paper is to explore the early reception of Cicero beyond the twin poles of education and exemplarity on which both Keeline and La Bua have focused. I suggest that not all engagement with Cicero’s texts were instrumental: there is also evidence that some readers, at least, approached Cicero as an author to be read and even enjoyed for reasons that were not to be entirely explained by their desire to become better or more effective speakers. Evidence for this kind of reading can be found in a number of writers from the first century A.D. who engage with a range of rhetorical approaches and topics and who employ the tropes of didacticism to frame their works without being pedagogical writers in any straightforward sense. Through a survey of the role of Cicero within the texts of the Elder Seneca, Asconius, and Quintilian, it is possible to demonstrate how “Cicero” remained a complex and multi-faceted figure throughout the first century A.D., not reducible to a single message or interpretation.

2 The Elder Seneca

The Elder Seneca’s collections of declamatory practice, the Suasoriae and the Controversiae, provide some of the most important evidence for the reputation of Cicero in the very early empire: though written towards the end of Seneca’s

¹ Kennedy 2002; Gowing 2013.
² Keeline 2018; La Bua 2019.
life, they record material and ideas which he had encountered in the first years of Augustus’ reign. They indicated that the reception of Cicero had already, within no more than two decades of his death, developed distinct manifestations in which his skill as a speaker and the details of his biography could feature as separate elements.

In Seneca’s recollections, the figure of Cicero plays two distinct though complementary roles. On the one hand, Cicero provides a model of eloquence and, in some sense, a forebear of declamatory practice. His lifetime provides the chronological marker for when oratory flourished most at Rome: “whatever Roman eloquence has to match or surpass arrogant Greek flourished in Cicero’s time: all the intellects who have shone in our studies were born then”. In one controversia, Cicero is cited as the author of a sententia “which he delivered in a similar controversia”. This sententia was one which all the declaimers on this topic, according to Seneca, adapted for use in their own contributions. In addition the acknowledgement of Cicero’s status as a speaker, his life and actions had become a topic for declamatory activity. The events towards the end of his life, in particular, shape his death into an exemplar of self-determination in the face of tyranny by means of voluntary death. The fact that each of incidents which forms the basis for these treatments is fictional serves merely to show the potency of Cicero as a thought-experiment for testing out the limits of duty and political accommodation required in periods of civil conflict. In the course of recording material to illustrate these exercises, Seneca not only records the declamatory contributions of his peers and seniors but also creates, in Suasoria 6, an archive of Cicero’s death, quoting at length from works by Pollio, Livy, Aufidius Bassus, Cremutius Cordus and Bruttedius Niger before concluding with a 25-line quotation of hexameters by Cornelius Severus from a historical verse epic composed in the Augustan period. The loss of all of this material in any other format makes this collection of inestimable value in assessing the cultural value and points of contestation around the memory of Cicero.

3 Sen. contr. 1.6: Quidquid Romana facundia habet quod insolenti Graeciae aut opponat aut praeferat circa Ciceronem effloruit; omnia ingenia quae lucem studiis nostris attulerunt tunc nata sunt. Translations are my own.

4 Sen. contr. 1.4.7.

5 The relevant material is contr. 7.2, concerning the case of Popillius, Cicero’s assassin, who had previously been defended by him; see suas. 6, in which Cicero considers whether to beg Antony for mercy; and suas. 7, in which Cicero considers whether to burn his writings since Antony promises to spare his life if he does so.

6 Roller 1997; Richlin 1999. On Cicero’s death see also Keeline (p. 119–142) in this volume.
However, if the Elder Seneca’s *Controversiae* and *Suasoriae* were all that survived of classical literature, we would have from them very little detail about Cicero’s own works to explain why they – and he – were apparently so important in the memories and oratorical techniques of the succeeding generation. A survey of all the references to Cicero’s speeches shows how limited is the engagement of Seneca and those whose discussions he records with the details of Cicero’s record as a practising orator.

In *Suasoria* 6, some of the suggested approaches to the question of whether Cicero should ask Antonius for pardon involve discussion of particular episodes during his career: in most cases, this is done in order to present a view of Cicero which is incompatible with his deciding now to appeal to Antonius. These are episodes at which Cicero’s contributions was as a speaker, and so their representation in this context involves quotation or reminiscence from the speeches.⁷ Quintus Haterius alludes to Cicero’s presentation of Milo’s unwillingness to appeal to the jurors’ pity at Milo’s trial to construct an exhortation to Cicero against appealing to Antonius’ pity: “You say, ‘Milo forbids me to appeal to the jurors’: go now and appeal to Antonius”.⁸ Haterius’ words refer to the very end of the *pro Milone* and the words “But let there be an end: I cannot now speak for tears, and this man forbids his defence through tears”.⁹ The allusion would be clear to any reader who knew Cicero’s text, but the only linguistic overlap is the single word *vetat*, and Haterius also omits the tears which are so prominent in Cicero’s tactics. There is a direct quotation in Porcius Latro’s version: he repurposes the *Catilinarians* “*o tempora, o mores*” as the unavoidable response to the triumviral proscriptions, drawing attention as he does so to their Ciceronian origin.¹⁰ Latro also describes, among the horrors that Cicero will see if he does live, is “that place in front of the tribunal which recently the master of horse, in whom it would be disgraceful even to belch, fouled with his vomit”.¹¹ This is a rewriting of Cicero’s description of Antony’s gastric misadventure from the sec-

---

7 On the shift from Cicero as orator across a range of genre within the context of Republican politics, to Cicero as a symbol of eloquence, see Kaster 1988.
8 Sen. suas. 6.2: *Vetat, inquis, <me> Milo rogare iudices: i nunc et roga Antonium* (me suppl. Studemund).
9 Cic. Mil. 105: *Sed finis sit: neque enim prae lacrimis iam loqui possum, et hic se lacrimis defendi vetat*.
10 Sen. suas. 6.3: *Tuis verbis, Cicero, utendum est: “O tempora, o mores”*.
11 Sen. suas. 6.3: *Videbis illum pro tribunali locum quem modo magister equitum, cui ructare turpe erat, vomitu foedaverat*.
ond *Philippic*. It includes a six word quotation (allowing for a shift in the mood of esse) though it is also evident that Latro has toned down the graphicness of the visual image that Cicero created with its description of Antonius’ vomit and where it landed. He has also eliminated the constitutional impropriety which Cicero brings out by observation that Antonius was at the time of the incident “carrying out public business”. Varius Geminus also referred to the *Catilinarians* and the *Philippics* in his declamation in support of the opposite view: he quoted Cicero’s statement in the opening of the fourth *Catilinarian* – part of which Cicero himself quoted in the second *Philippic* – that death cannot be “early for a consular or miserable for a wise man” only to reject it in the new context in which Cicero found himself. Cicero’s self-quotation underscores the probability that this phrase had become a well-known Ciceronian tag.

The conspiracy of Catiline, the defence of Milo and the *Philippics* were all iconic moments in Cicero’s career and in its reception, a point to which I return below. One other speech is referred to in *Suasoria 6*, the lost *Pro Vatinio*, also by Varius Geminus in his approach to the opposite side of the question. He offers it as an example from Cicero’s own earlier career of a willingness to be won over by an enemy, which therefore offers an example of reconciliation which Cicero could draw upon in being reconciled to Antonius. Elsewhere in the *Controversiae* and *Suasoriae* there only two direct references to Cicero’s speeches. One is to the *pro Milone*, in the context of Seneca’s reminiscences of Cassius Severus in the preface to book 3 of the *Controversiae*. Severus recalled a visit to Cestius’ school when Cestius was about to offer his own *In Milonem*. The other occurs in a discussion of a *controversia* relating to familial relations during the Civil War, which hypothesises a woman forced by her father to kill herself for supporting her husband’s adherence to the opposite side. Seneca records how Albucius Silus offered, as refutation of the equation of support for the opposing side with parricide, the example of Cicero’s defence before Caesar of Ligarius. His summary

---

12 Cic. Phil. 2.63: *In coetu vero populi Romani negotium publicum gerens, magister equitum, cui ructare turpe esset, is womens frustis esculentis vinum redolentibus gremiu ms uum et totum tribunal implevit.*

13 Cic. Cat. 4.3: *nam neque turpis mors forti viro potest accidere neque immatura consulari nec misera sapienti; cf. Phil. 2.119. Sen. suas. 6.12: Quod grandia loquitur et dicit: “Mors nec immatura consulari nec misera sapienti,” non movet me.*


15 On the composition of “fictional” speeches in declamation, see Peirano 2012, 12–27.
contains a brief reference to one of Cicero’s tactics in that speech, namely the
acknowledgement that Ligarius is guilty of the charge of being in Africa.\footnote{Sen. contr. 10.3.3: \textit{Si parricidium esset fuisse in diversis partibus, numquam defendisset apud Caesarem Ligarium Cicero. M. Tulli, quam leve iudicasti crimen de quo confessus es!}}

Seneca’s self-imposed task is to record the declaimers who were his contemporaries. In the context of that piece of triumviral and Augustan literary history, Cicero is already present in a variety of ways. But it seems that from a declamatory perspective, Cicero’s biography is most interesting; his life and more particularly death provide suitable topics for treatment. He is also in some sense a forebear of recent and contemporary declamatory practice. But he is not a stylistic influence, and with the exception of the \textit{Catilinarians} and the \textit{Second Philippic} he is not a quotable source, either. It is the contextual aspect of Cicero \textit{qua orator} which provides the useful material, at least as much as his actual words. What, however, is more difficult to determine is whether this set of material shows a distinct bias towards specific speeches. The numbers are small, and only one – \textit{pro Milone} – is referenced more than once.

3 Asconius Pedianus

A generation or so later, Cicero’s oratory was for Asconius an object worthy of the most detailed and careful scrutiny, reflected in the preparation and dissemination of detailed notes and explanatory material on individual speeches.\footnote{On Asconius’ commentary format, see Lewis 2006, xiv-xvi; La Bua 2019, 77–78.} But Asconius’ surviving text is interested in a rather restricted range of questions. The focus is on contextual, political, religious and prosopographical information; it does not seek to elucidate rhetorical questions. It also seems that Asconius was interested in the whole range of Cicero’s speeches: the five commentaries which survive deal with both deliberative and forensic material. He handles two speeches delivered in the senate and three in the courts, and each of the latter was delivered in front of a different \textit{quaestio}. Moreover, only one of these five, that is the \textit{pro Milone}, seems to have had a significant presence in the educational curriculum, and there is no representation of the three collections of speeches, the \textit{Verrines}, \textit{Catilinarians}, and \textit{Philippics}, which dominated pedagogical approaches to Cicero. Given that it is quite possible that what survives of Asconius was only part of what he wrote in this format, it is difficult to draw any firm conclusions about the nature of his project overall in terms of its aspirations to comprehensiveness and the aims underpinning his choice of speeches, if it was not,
that is, conceived as a complete edition. But even from the limited sample that we have, Asconius’ Cicero looks rather different from the Cicero found in schools.

An analysis of how Asconius constructs each commentary reveals the aspects of the speeches in which he was most interested. Each begins with the *argumentum*, that is the background to the charge or debate about which the speech was delivered, and the chronology leading up to its delivery. This precedes the *enarratio* with its detailed notes on a selection of lemmata from Cicero’s text. Within this format, there is considerable variation in the relative lengths of the two sections: in the two senatorial speeches, the *argumentum* is around one-tenth of the length of the notes, whereas in the forensic speeches the *argumentum* varies from between slightly longer than one-quarter the length of the notes to approaching the same length.¹ This disparity reflects the greater level of detail required to set the scene for forensic cases: in addition to the background to the alleged offence in the defendant’s career, there is also information to include about the conduct of the trial and, in the case of Scaurus’s defence, the identities of the different advocates involved in the trial. The very long *argumentum* in the *pro Milone* commentary is linked to the amount of historiographical material that Asconius could access on the death of Clodius and its violent aftermath. A focus on historical context is also evident in the notes. To take the commentary on *pro Scauro*, the shortest of the commentaries, as a brief example: there are thirteen individual notes. Of these, four add details about earlier forensic cases to which Cicero had referred in the speech.¹⁹ Five elucidate the details of an episode or individual.²⁰ Two explain aspects of Rome’s built environment to which the speech refers, and one adds information about the defendant’s relatives, to whom Cicero had referred by relationship rather than name.²¹ So distinct, indeed, is Asconius’ focus on people, events and things that the remaining note – a discussion of the conjunction *ac neque* (24C) – was deemed non-Asconian by Madvig (a decision which following editors have accepted) on the basis that its concentration on linguistic usage is entirely out of keeping with the work

---

¹ The word-counts (based on Clark’s text) are: *Pis.*, 226: 2528; *Sc.*, 539: 1575; *Mil.*, 2499: 2640; *Cor.*, 909: 3401; *Tog. Can.*, 221: 2031.

¹⁹ Prosecutions of the elder Scaurus at a *judicium publicum* and under the *lex Servilia Caepionis* (21C), under the *lex Varia* (22C); Scaurus’ prosecution of Dolabella (25C).

²⁰ The elder Scaurus’ relationship with Cicero (22C); Tubulus as a potential defendant on poisoning charges (23C); the suicide of P. Crassus (23C and 25C); C. Claudius’ electoral ambitions (25C).

²¹ Scaurus’ house (26C-27C); the temple of Castor and Pollux (27C); Scaurus’ maternal grandfather a Metellus (27C).
as a whole (combined with an unfamiliarity with Ciceronian usage that seems improbable in Asconius).²²

The lack of engagement with rhetoric in Asconius’ text is more profound than simply an absence of comment on linguistic usage or figures or stylistic variation. There is little indication that Asconius wants his readers to approach these texts as rhetorical artefacts. So, for example, there is no analysis of individual passages in terms of the part of the speech to which they belong, or of their content as examples of a particular kind of speech, such as the point at issue in a forensic speech or the balance between advantageous and honourable within a deliberative speech. This is not of course to imply that Asconius’ readers – or Asconius – were not competent or interested in rhetoric. It is not easy to conceive of contemporary readers of Asconius who had not had a thorough rhetorical education; and many will themselves have been practitioners. But the work shapes its readers as people who do not require rhetorical instruction. What they do need is information about the individuals, circumstances and political practices with which Cicero assumes his audience is familiar. By acquiring this knowledge, Asconius’ readers can become Cicero’s original audience. By undertaking the extensive research which underpins the commentaries and then shaping that into a series of notes on topics that might be obscure, Asconius has provided a shortcut which allows the reader of the mid-50s A.D. to share – at least in the case of a specific speech – the knowledge that Cicero’s listeners and readers would have possessed in the 60s and 50s (or at least, that Cicero assumed they did). Asconius treats those who use his text as engaged and knowledgeable readers, not aspiring practitioners, and Cicero’s speeches are objects of study as part of a shared cultural landscape rather than as tools to improve oratorical practice. He assumes his readers want to understand; but he does not seek to shape the ends to which that understanding might be put.²³

4 Quintilian

The purpose of Quintilian’s Institutio oratoria is a challenge, given the extent to which its scale and ambition mark it out from other surviving works of rhetorical instruction, and has been the object of recent discussion.²⁴ It seems reasonable to see the work not as an instructional manual for teachers of rhetoric so much

---

²² I am grateful to John Ramsey for sharing with me and discussing his draft note on this passage from his forthcoming translation and commentary of Asconius.

²³ On Asconius’ historical research, see further Bishop 2015.

²⁴ Roche 2016; Whitton 2019.
as an advertisement to Rome’s cultural elite of Quintilian’s pre-eminence as a teacher. In this context, an analysis of Quintilian’s engagement with Cicero—a writer who underpins the whole of the work—supports the idea that Quintilian understood himself to be offering a contribution to a serious cultural debate about how to educate the next generation of the Roman elite. If we look closely at how Quintilian deploys Cicero’s speeches in his work, we can see how he recruits his audience to his project by offering them a broad, challenging but ultimately accessible packaging of Cicero’s speeches which flattered their sense of themselves as readers of Cicero. This results in an expansive understanding of Cicero which ranges far beyond a pedagogically-driven ‘curriculum’.

One obvious and distinctive feature of Quintilian as a reader of Cicero is the range of speeches to which there is reference in the I.O. He refers to forty-eight of Cicero’s speeches: this includes eleven speeches which do not survive in an independent manuscript tradition. There are eighteen surviving speeches to which Quintilian does not refer. There is no good reason to believe that Quintilian was not aware of the speeches which he does not cite; it is perhaps not surprising that Quintilian does not refer to every one of the large number of speeches available to him.

This kind of explanation seems more convincing than one which sees a pattern of deliberate omission to shape a specific presentation of Cicero, though there are some interesting absences from such a perspective. Quintilian’s Cicero is to a very great extent the speaker that Cicero himself wanted to preserve through the choices he made about the textual preservation of his oratory, and not the much more restricted Cicero of the educational curriculum.

However, this brief overview can be further developed. Quintilian’s engagement with the speeches to which he refers is not uniform, and some are only mentioned once or twice. Eleven speeches receive more than ten references

---

25 In Clodium et Curionem; In competitores; Pro Cornelio; Pro Fundanio; In Gabinium; Pro Gabii nio; Pro Gallio; Contra Metelli contionem; Pro Oppio; De proscriptorum libris; Pro Vareno. The figure disaggregates the different speeches within the Verrines, Catilinarians and Philippics collections. See also van der Blom (p. 247–266) in this volume.


27 For an unsystematic comparison with two modern works on Cicero which offer the impression of comprehensiveness without a format that systematically treats all Cicero’s speeches, we can note that the Cambridge Companion to Cicero refers to forty-nine of Cicero’s speeches and Gildenhard’s Creative Eloquence to sixty-one.

28 So, for example, Quintilian does not cite either the De provinciis consularibus, with its abrupt shift in Cicero’s attitude towards Caesar, or pro Marcello, with its strikingly innovative praise of Caesar.
The pattern which this reveals, of a minority of speeches the focus of sustained and recurrent interest, and a much larger number referred to only sparingly, offers a better framework for understanding the complete absence of some speeches. The significant distinction is not between no mentions and one or two, but between a small kernel of Ciceronian texts to which Quintilian returns again and again and a much wider group of material which is only of occasional interest.

Is it possible to draw any conclusions about Quintilian’s favourites? There is a distinct bias towards forensic speeches: the only deliberative speeches in this group are the first Catilinarian and the second Philippic, both capturing iconic moments in Cicero’s career. Among the forensic speeches there is an intriguing mix – from the perspective of current research – of the familiar and the less familiar. The presence of Pro Varenos confirms that this speech is one of the more significant losses from the Ciceronian corpus, and Quintilian’s interest in pro Cornelio echoes that of Asconius. A complete explanation for Quintilian’s choices is not recoverable, but they are likely to have involved a combination of the didactic imperatives of the rhetorical classroom, and the inevitable centripetal momentum that attaches to any syllabus, with more unpredictable factors. We might well hypothesise that Quintilian used some speeches more than others in his teaching and so examples from those sprang more readily to mind for illustrative purposes; but we cannot disregard, though we cannot recover, the possibility that he had personal favourites, or the effects of recent exposure on the process of composition. We simply cannot know what Quintilian might have been reading as he put together the Institutio oratoria.

Analysis of references to individual speeches show the range of different functions that they fulfilled. If we take the Pro Caelio as an example, it can be seen that Quintilian’s references divide in two general categories. Some refer to the speech as a whole or aspects of it but do not quote from the speech; others include quotations from the speech which are employed to illustrate a point. Among references in the former category, Quintilian comments in particular on the speech’s proem, identifying a range of tactics that Cicero uses. These include its allusion to the time at which the trial is taking place (that is, on a holiday) (4.1.31); the way that Cicero attempts to trivialise the charges (4.1.59; 9.2.39);

---

29 They are: Caec. (14 references); Cael. (22); Cat. 1 (19); Cluent. (65); Corn. (13); Lig. (51); Mil. (64); Mur. (24); Phil. 2 (19); Var., (12); Verr 2.5, (34). See Table 1 in van der Blom (p. 264–266 in this volume).
30 The second Philippic was among the small group of speeches quoted in the Elder Seneca.
31 The Pro Ligario and Pro Caecina are perhaps particularly striking from this perspective. On Quintilian’s interest in Lig., Johnson 2004.
and his courteous approach to the prosecutor Atratinus (11.1.68). Quintilian also highlights particular aspects of the speech’s organisation and tactics. He draws attention to the order in which its different arguments are put forward (4.2.27); Cicero’s use against the prosecution of their own contradictory arguments (5.12.20), use of humour (6.3.25), and handling of the equestrian origins of the defendant (11.1.28). The prosopopoeia of Caecus at Cael. 33–35 is discussed twice, at different points in the work (3.8.54; 12.10.61). Quintilian’s quotations from Pro Caelio involve questions of vocabulary (pusio, 8.3.22); figures (it is used to illustrate amplificatio, 8.4.1; interrogatio, 9.2.15; ethopoeia, 9.2.60; and the pursuit of elegance, 9.2.99); and rhythm (9.4.64, 97, 98, 102, 104). None of the quotations for vocabulary or rhythm identify the Pro Caelio as its source; as a result, the Institutio is a rather meagre source of fragments of Pro Caelio. The implication of this gap is not necessarily, though, that all readers were so familiar with the speech as not to need a reminder of the origin of a particular quotation. Instead, it might be that questions of prose rhythm and indeed of word choice could largely be handled in isolation from the broader issues in a speech and so it did not matter if all readers recognised the source of the quotation. However, when the example depended for its point on understanding the context of speech, as in the case of these figures, then the source is identified.

This distinction between familiarity with plot and case on the one hand and detailed linguistic analysis on the other points to the range of factors which influenced Quintilian’s engagement with Cicero’s texts. Quintilian was writing for an audience whose members were already very familiar with Cicero’s works. Those for whom Quintilian’s handbook was not of direct professional interest – that is, those readers who were not themselves engaged in teaching – could be expected to have a knowledge of Cicero’s speeches shaped by their own educational experience and then developed, potentially, through reading Cicero as adults as well as reading the many other texts which, by the time that Quintilian was at work, dealt with Cicero systematically or engaged with his speeches and career in more selective ways. This pre-existing knowledge among different readers would have shared much of its fundamentals, given its basis in an education-

32 These are the quotations which can be identified as fragments of Pro Caelio on the basis of Quintilian alone: Cael. 32: Praesertim quam omnes amicam omnium potius quam cuiusquam imicam putaverunt at 9.2.99; Cael. 35: Sed quid ego ita gravem personam introduxi? At 9.2.60; Cael. 38: Si vidua libere, proterva petulanter, dives effuse, libidinosa meretricio more viveret, adulterum ego putarem si qui hanc paulo liberius salutasset?, at 8.4.1; Cael. 39: Dictet aliquis: haec igitur est tua disciplina? Sic tu instituis adolescentis? [...] ego, si qui, iudices, hoc robore animi atque hac indole virtutis ac continentiae fuit, at 9.2.15. It is noticeable that they cluster in one limited (and particularly memorable) part of the speech.
al process with a considerable degree of uniformity, whilst accommodating divergence in matters of detail and recall. Quintilian’s text fits the prior experiences of Cicero that his readers brought to his text, but is not entirely dictated by it.

As a result, his Cicero combines the straightforwardly pedagogic with aspects that reach well beyond the classroom. His Cicero is indeed a source, through his speeches, to illustrate a range of rhetorical techniques. But Quintilian also lets his readers participate in a reading of Cicero that is both reassuringly familiar and at the same time flatteringly ambitious. It adopts the contours of the classroom and its set texts and it focusses on Cicero as an orator shaped for the needs of the legal and political elite, as a comparison with Pliny shows. But it also moves well beyond the purely instrumental. As readers, we recall with Quintilian the whole range of Cicero’s speeches, we move fluidly between different speeches and, guided by deft reminders at key moments, we remember important contextual information when that is required in order to understand a specific example. Quintilian’s is an inclusive Cicero: it generously supplements our existing recollections and shapes our understanding by its systematic and analytical approach to his corpus whilst sustaining the impression that he draws his material from a knowledge of Cicero’s texts that is already shared with his readers.

5 Conclusion

This brief survey of Cicero’s reception in the Elder Seneca, Asconius and Quintilian reveals a diversity of receptions. One aspect of this diversity is the range of different texts that each uses. As noted above, some care is needed in interpreting this range, particularly in the case of Asconius. Nonetheless, at the very least we can observe that the Ciceronian corpus has as yet undergone relatively little narrowing, at least for an educated adult audience. One specific indication of that breadth is the fact that only one speech features in all of these authors to any significant extent. This is Pro Milone: the case is alluded to twice by the Elder Seneca, is the object of by far the longest of Asconius’ commentaries and is used more often by Quintilian than any other speech with the exception of Pro Cluentio (which exceeds it by a single reference). Its prominence within the Ciceronian corpus, and its shared importance within these three dif-

---

33 In the lengthiest discussion of Cicero’s speeches in Pliny’s Letters (1.20) he refers explicitly to Pro Vareno, Pro Murena, Pro Cornelio, Pro Cluentio and to the Verrines (the quotation he includes is from 2.4,5). The first four are among Quintilian’s highly-cited speeches; the fourth Verrine just slips outside that group (Quintilian refers to it ten times).
ferent approaches to Cicero, is not, I suggest, accidental, but is due to its distinctively complex status, which allowed it to be put to different uses. The continuing interest in _Pro Milone_ underscores the extent to which the reception of Cicero in the first century A.D. resisted reduction to a single story.

The use of _Pro Milone_ in education has been discussed at length by Keeline as a case-study in how students and their teachers approached a Ciceronian text.\(^{34}\) It stands out in the reception of Cicero precisely because of the amount of ancient evidence for how it was used. In addition to Asconius, and its importance to Quintilian, it is the object of attention by the Bobbio scholiast. None of these texts reveals explicitly why – or indeed whether – this speech had acquired a distinct place within the Ciceronian corpus but the fact that Cicero's speeches had initially at least avoided complete reduction to a narrow curriculum suggests that _Pro Milone_’s popularity was not simply the result of tralatician return to a familiar text.

The origins of the events which led to Milo's trial involved political scandal and crisis at the highest level: a candidate for the consulship had murdered a candidate for the praetorship, and in the aftermath the senate house had burned down. To a greater extent than any other forensic case at which Cicero spoke – even the _Verrines_ or _Pro Cornelio_ – the trial of Milo was an eye-catching public event, and one, moreover, which involved Cicero's defence of the man accused of murdering his own great enemy Clodius. Between the offence and the trial was over three months of tumultuous public debate at which the events on the Appian way had been revisited at _contiones_ and in the senate, fresh and startling revelations had occurred, and fundamental principles of the organization of the _res publica_ had been abandoned in a frantic attempt to restore order. When Cicero defended Milo, he did so in a court set up under very recent legislation sponsored by the sole consul Pompeius and in sight of an armed guard. The scale of the crisis is only dimly discernible in the surviving speech, for reasons intimately connected to that text's composition and aims; but it remained accessible to the inquiring reader, as Asconius demonstrates. Indeed, the Elder Seneca and his contemporaries would have been in a position to hear eye-witness accounts of the trial and the events which preceded it.

That background is probably to be seen as a factor in the enduring interest in Cicero's _Pro Milone_, but it may be more important at one remove. Cicero's defence of Milo was unsuccessful. This outcome was not a surprise, given his guilt, Pompeius' clear desire for a conviction, and the ongoing turbulence to the ending of which Milo's removal from the _res publica_ might well seem to be a part. But it did

\(^{34}\) Keeline 2018, 13–72.
reveal, as so much else in the 50s B.C. did, the limits to Cicero’s influence and power. He decided to replay his defence, and attempt to overwrite his failure with a different speech. Since it is the revised *Pro Milone* which survives, it is an inherently provisional text. Milo could have been defended in a different way: because we know that he was, in fact, defended in a different way. Even in the other cases where Cicero circulated a text that he had not delivered, the illusion did not involve multiple versions; only in the case of Milo did the text evoke alternative possibilities. Brutus certainly responded to this provisionality by offering his own solution to the conundrum of how to defend Milo; and, as Seneca records, Cestius was moved to provide an *In Milonem*.\(^3\)\(^5\) It is possible, then, that the *Pro Milone* was so intriguing for subsequent audiences because it provided a unique opportunity to think through the choice of tactics in a forensic speech and to explore alternative routes to constructing a convincing defence to the ever-resonant charge of murder. The combination of the exemplary rhetorical brilliance on display in *Pro Milone*, its provisionality, and its position within the end of the Republic and Cicero’s own career, served to support a variety of different readings of Cicero.

This diversity, a diversity of audiences as well as a diversity of approaches, is evident across the reception of Cicero in the three authors discussed in this chapter. It demonstrates that in the first century or so after Cicero’s death, there were many different ways to be a reader of Cicero’s speeches. These ways of reading were shaped but not fully determined by the initial educational encounters with Cicero which were shared by authors and readers. A single speech, most notably *Pro Milone*, could be read in a variety of ways; but even more importantly, the corpus of speeches did not, in this first century of reading Cicero, definitively shrink to a small core of set texts. The textual Cicero remained one that reflected a long and varied public career. We remain the beneficiaries of this early pluralism.

\(^{35}\) There is no evidence that Milo’s actual prosecutors circulated their speeches.
Henriette van der Blom

Quintilian on Cicero’s Deliberative Oratory

1 Introduction

The portrayal of Cicero in the work on the orator’s education by M. Fabius Quintilianus (ca. AD 35–90s) has long been recognised as particularly rich and highly influential on authors and orators of the imperial period, not least Pliny and Tacitus, in various ways.¹ That Quintilian had a deep and wide knowledge of Cicero’s speeches and rhetorical works is clear from his engagement throughout the Institutio oratoria, and Quintilian is generally a good witness to Cicero the orator and one of our best sources on the availability of Ciceronian works in the imperial period, alongside Asconius. Nevertheless, Quintilian was also a product of his own time and his engagement with oratory and rhetoric reflects concerns of his own period, as well as his knowledge of republican orators and their speeches.

Quintilian’s work is well known for its preference for discussing forensic speech over epideictic and deliberative speech. It has been argued that his focus reflects a decreasing importance of deliberative oratory – speeches delivered in the senate and the popular assemblies – in the imperial period when compared to the republican period.² It is true that the parameters for public oratory in the courts, the senate and the popular assemblies changed with the advent of the emperors, bringing new power dynamics, expanded functions of the senate, altered electoral and judicial processes, and – of course – an all-powerful person at the top.³ It is also likely that these changes had an impact on the pa-

¹ But perhaps not beyond the imperial period: Winterbottom 1975, 92–95. On Quintilian’s portrayal of Cicero, see, among others, Winterbottom 1964; Cousin 1967; Richter 1968, 185–87; Connolly 2007a, 254–61; Gowing 2013, 244–250; Whitton 2018; Keeline 2018, 225–232; La Bua 2019, 120–132, 183–190, 225–230, 266–278. There are also studies of specific aspects of Quintilian’s use of Cicero, e.g. Casamento 2010; 2018b. Whitton 2019 focuses on Pliny’s numerous and variegated imitations of Quintilian’s work, including the use of Cicero.


rameters of forensic oratory, but arguably even more on deliberative oratory used in the senate and in the *contio*. However, this possible impact is difficult to assess in any specific detail.

This chapter offers one approach to this problem: I shall focus on the presentation of deliberative oratory in Quintilian’s work in order to better assess the ways in which Quintilian might have adjusted his presentation to his contemporary audience. This analysis will help to tease out how Quintilian’s presentation might reflect some of the changes in deliberative oratory when compared to our knowledge of republican deliberative oratory. The facts that Cicero is the most heavily used republican orator in Quintilian,⁴ that Cicero excelled in both forensic and deliberative oratory, and that our knowledge of Cicero’s speeches and their contexts is almost as good as Quintilian’s makes Cicero an excellent test case for Quintilian’s representation of deliberative oratory and its possible changes under the emperors.

I begin by analysing Quintilian’s chapter on deliberative oratory (3.8) to set the scene for considering his direct engagement with Cicero’s deliberative speeches in this chapter and throughout his work. That consideration takes into account the ratio between Cicero’s deliberative and non-deliberative speeches explicitly mentioned by Quintilian, Quintilian’s selection of such speeches, and the manner in which he engages with these speeches. I shall conclude by considering the ways in which Quintilian’s use of Cicero’s deliberative oratory furthers our understanding of the role and parameters of deliberative oratory in the imperial period and how Quintilian uses Cicero as a vehicle for his own agenda. I shall argue that Quintilian’s presentation of deliberative speech vacillates between republican and contemporary settings, which suggests not only his dual purpose of, on the one hand, setting out rhetorical theory in historical perspective and, on the other hand, training contemporary orators,⁵ but

---

⁴ A quick look at Russell’s 2001 index shows Cicero’s dominance. Keeline 2018, 229 has also counted up these references to Cicero as vastly outnumbering those of any other orator in Quintilian. See also Steel (p. 239–43) in this volume.

⁵ Roche’s discussion of Quintilian’s preface points out that Quintilian presents his work as one of public service, preparing young men for public life (Roche 2016, 439) and that Quintilian presents himself as an authority guiding his readers through contradictory statements in previous rhetorical handbooks (446). Although Roche does not explicitly discuss this combination of rhet-

---
also highlights the continued need for deliberative speech in a state run by a monarch. With regard to Cicero, I shall argue that Quintilian’s portrayal of Cicero reflects his variegated sources: the historical Cicero, his works as well as imperial-period reworkings and receptions of Rome’s greatest orator.

2 Quintilian on deliberative oratory

In order to understand Quintilian’s approach to deliberative oratory, we need to start at the end of his chapter on deliberative speech in Book 3 (3.8.70):

Haec adulescentes sibi scripta sciant, ne aliter quam dicturi sunt exerceri velint et in desuescendis morentur. Ceterum cum advocari coeperint in consilia amicorum, dicere sententiam in senatu, suaderes ipse consulent principes, quod praeceptis fortasse non credant usu docebuntur.

I should like my young friends [I should like young men] to know that this is written for their benefit, so that they should not want to be trained in ways other than those they will need in real speaking, or waste time acquiring habits they will have to unlearn. Anyway, when they begin to be called into consultation by friends or to give their opinion in the senate or to advise the emperor if he consults them, they will be taught by experience lessons which perhaps they do not believe when they receive them as instruction.⁶

Here, Quintilian – as is his habit throughout his work whenever ending a longer discussion – sets his advice regarding rhetoric into a wider educational and contemporary context: he says that his guidance regarding deliberative speech is written for the benefit of young men (adulescentes) so that they are trained for real-life oratorical situations and can avoid acquiring habits they need to unlearn later (with this comment, Quintilian is most likely lashing out against those rhetores who focus on the more outrageous and unrealistic declamation exercises).⁷ Moreover, he argues that once these young men get to practise

orical training for contemporaries and guidance through the history of rhetorical theory, his analysis shows that these are (among) Quintilian’s purposes with his work.

⁶ All text passages and translations of Quint. are from Russell 2001; modifications in the translation are indicated by square brackets. For a general discussion of book 3 and Quintilian’s division into epideictic, deliberative and forensic causes, see Albaladejo 2003.

their deliberative oratory, they will experience lessons they might not have believed when taught in theory, again signaling that the reality of oratory may be different from what they thought it would be and that he is the experienced and trustworthy guide into what it takes to be an orator in contemporary society. It is therefore the more significant that Quintilian in the same passage sets out clearly the settings for deliberative oratory in his own time: advocating in private consilia of friends, offering opinion (sententia) in the senate, or advising the emperor (princeps) when asked. To a scholar of Roman republican oratory – ancient as well as modern – these settings look decidedly imperial because of the mention of the emperor, and the explicit mention of private consilia alongside the mention of the senate. One of the two major republican venues for deliberative speech – the contio – is entirely omitted.⁸

This omission is at odds with some other passages listing oratorical venues in Quintilian’s work, in which the contio is included. In two passages, Quintilian mentions the venues of senate, contio and private consilia together when emphasising the need to adjust the style to these venues and their audiences, and, in a third passage, Quintilian groups the courts, consilia, contio and senate as the venues in which a good citizen must show excellence in addressing an audience.⁹ The contio is evidently not omitted throughout Quintilian’s work.¹⁰

The question is how these presentations fit with Quintilian’s presentation and discussion of deliberative speech throughout his chapter dedicated to this genre. Earlier in Book 3, Quintilian had charted the views of earlier rhetoricians on how to divide up the different genres of speech, or, as he calls them, following Cicero, “kinds of causes” (genera causarum).¹¹ In his work, he says, he will

---

⁸ The Romans, as well as the Greeks (Arist. Rhet. 1359b9 – 10 with Pepe 2013, 160 – 163), had of course always used deliberative argument in private contexts, and Aristotle mentions it under the deliberative genre, but to exclude the contio altogether while emphasising both traditional private consilia and the advice to the emperor is decidedly imperial.

⁹ Quint. 11.3.153, 12.10.69 – 70, 12.11.1. The consilia in these passages may include those of friends and the emperor, which are kept separate in chapter 3.8.

¹⁰ I am here focusing on the civic contio, not the military contio, although Quintilian’s mention of battle speeches (2.16.8, 12.1.28) makes clear that this was also a venue for deliberative speech, also in the imperial period. For discussion of military contiones in the imperial period, see Pina Polo 1988; 1989, 219 – 36, 346 – 61 (appendix of all known imperial military contiones); 1995.

¹¹ Quint. 3.3.15, implicitly referring to Cic. inv. 1.7, 1.12; part. or. 70.
follow the traditional division into forensic, deliberative and epideictic speech, and in Book 3, he engages relatively briefly with epideictic (3.7) and deliberative speech (3.8), before moving on to his long discussion of forensic speech, spanning several books (3.9–6.5). We need to look at the structure and argument of chapter 3.8 in more detail in order to understand Quintilian’s presentation of deliberative oratory.

Quintilian’s discussion of deliberative speech covers the aims of this genre (honestum and utile, 3.8.1–3), its functions (persuasion and dissuasion, 3.8.4–6), some of its parts and the most important rhetorical appeals (prooemium, narrative, emotional appeal, character of the speaker, 3.8.7–16), and Quintilian’s normative statement concerning the considerations in deliberative speech: what the proposal is, who are the people discussing it, and who is the adviser (3.8.15). He then goes on to discuss the approaches to the proposal (3.8.16–35), the character of the audience and the speaker (3.8.35–48), the rhetorical device of prosopopoeia (3.8.49–54) and the types of suasoriae and their practical use in preparing a budding orator for deliberative speech (3.8.55–70).

Quintilian’s approach to deliberative speech is in itself influenced by Cicero, as we can see from the opening of his discussion of deliberative speech. Although he adopts the traditional aims of deliberative speech – honestum and utile, the honourable and the expedient – he also brings in Cicero’s contribution to the discussion, namely that the essential characteristic of the genre is dignitas (3.8.1–3):

Deliberativas quoque miror a quibusdam sola utilitate finitas. Ac si quid in his unum sequi oportet, potior fuisset apud me Ciceronis sententia, qui hoc materiae genus dignitate maxime contineri putat. Nec dubito quin ii qui sunt in illa priore sententia secundum opinionem pulcherrimam ut utile quidem nisi quod honestum esset existimarent. 2. Et est haec ratio verissima, si consilium contingat semper bonorum atque sapientium. Verum apud imperitos, apud quos frequenter dicenda sententia est, populumque praecipue, qui ex pluribus constat indoctis, discernenda sunt haec et secundum communes magis intellectus loquendum. 3. Sunt enim multi qui etiam quae credunt honesta non tamen satis eadem utilia quoque existiment, quae turpia esse dubitare non possunt utilitatis specie ducti probent, ut foedus Numantinum iugumque Caudinum.

12 Quint. 3.4.4, 3.4.6, 3.4.11, 3.4.14–15. Pepe 2013 discusses the proliferation of genres among ancient rhetoricians, partly known from Quintilian’s discussion. Quintilian also suggests that the main division is between oratory in court or not in court.

13 Quintilian’s discussion of epideictic oratory is the first treatment by a Roman rhetorician in extant sources. Pepe 2013, 254–255 argues that this reflects the increasing use of epideictic speech in the imperial period.
I am surprised that Deliberative speeches also have been thought by some to be concerned with only one question, namely that of expediency. If one had to find a single object for them, I should have preferred Cicero's view that the essential feature of this type of theme is dignity. Not that I doubt that those who hold the former opinion also held the idealistic view that nothing that is not honourable can be expedient either. And this principle is perfectly sound, if we are fortunate enough always to be addressing a council of the good and wise. With the inexperienced however (to whom one often has to give advice) and especially with the people, which contains an uneducated majority, we have to keep the two things separate and conform more to ordinary understandings. For there are many who think that even what they believe to be honourable is not also sufficiently expedient, and who can be tempted to approve on grounds of expediency things that they must know to be disgraceful, like the Numantine treaty or the Caudine surrender.¹⁴

However, the idea of dignitas as the aim of deliberative speech sparks Quintilian's discussion about the alignment of aims with the nature of audience: in front of an audience of the boni and sapientes, deliberative speech can aim at dignitas, which includes both the honourable and the expedient. But all too often, he argues, the orator has to advise those without experience or the uneducated common people, where a clear separation between the honourable and the expedient is necessary. In this way, Quintilian characteristically uses Cicero's view as a springboard to offer his own, often practical, perspective on the matter. More importantly, Quintilian's opening discussion of the aims and venues for deliberative speech contrasts with his statement at the end of the chapter: as discussed above, he omits the contio as a venue for deliberative speech at 3.8.70, but he starts chapter 3.8 by allowing for the situations in which the deliberate orator needs to address not only the inexperienced but even the uneducated masses. Where else could this happen than in the contio? I suggest that this wavering between including and excluding contional speech reflects Quintilian's attempt to straddle rhetorical theory and oratorical practice in both historical and contemporary perspectives: on the one hand, he is trying to show the history of rhetoric and oratory and, on the other hand, to train current students of rhetoric to become effective orators in the imperial-period venues for public speech, for whom knowledge of past oratory is essential.

¹⁴ Van den Berg 2012, 192–194 has shown that Cicero's insistence on dignitas forms part of his project to tailor the theory of honestum and utile to his perspective of the orator rather than the speech. Pepe 2013, 285–288 tracks the connection between the aims and the genres of speech through Roman sources, while Michel 1960, 483–484 points out Cicero's discussion of honestas and utile in De officiis book 3 as fundamentally deriving from Panaetius (the main inspiration for books 1–2).
Alongside this blurring of venues, Quintilian openly argues for the overlaps between the genres of speech. Indeed, the impression of deliberative speech gained from this chapter is that it differs from the other two genres in the setting and audience and in the question at hand, but not markedly in the types of rhetorical appeals and the possibilities in language available. This impression emerges partly through Quintilian's explicit comparisons between the three genres and partly through his discussion, which seems to include aspects of rhetoric relevant not only to deliberative speech (for example, prosopopoeia) and to provide examples taken from both deliberative and forensic speeches among other types of material. Quintilian himself explains that these overlaps in discussion are due to the fact that aspects of these genres overlap in both theory and reality. The separation between deliberative on the one hand and epideictic and forensic speech on the other hand is not clear or always productive for the orator (as he clearly states at 3.4.16), even if declamatory exercises suggest they are: suasoriae cater for deliberative speech and controversiae for forensic speech, but even here there are overlaps. Nevertheless, the separation offers a productive tool for our analysis because it puts the spotlight on Quintilian's presentation of deliberative speech and it might therefore reflect (some of) the ways in which this type of speech was employed in his day.

Indeed, with Cicero's theory on deliberative speech explicitly mentioned, and Quintilian's two opposing perspectives on relevant venues for deliberative speech, where does this leave Quintilian's use of Cicero the orator in this chapter on deliberative speech and of Cicero's deliberative speeches elsewhere in the Institutio oratoria?

3 Quintilian's use of Cicero in 3.8

Before going into an analysis of Quintilian's use of Cicero, we need to consider Quintilian's own advice on the use of exempla and imitation to see whether he prescribes any limitations with implications for his use of Cicero's example. In

---

15 Quint. 8.3.13–14 argues that the difference in setting and audience means that different speaking styles must be adopted between addressing the senate, the people (in assemblies), the jury in criminal trials and the judge/jury in private law trials. This does not contradict his arguments in 3.8 because he does not argue for a (theoretical) difference in rhetorical appeals and choice of language between these settings, simply in the style.

16 Quintilian also discusses controversiae and suasoriae when dealing with the tasks of the grammatici and rhetores (2.1.1-3), and argues for the overlaps between deliberative, forensic and epideictic genres in many aspects as well (3.4.15–16; 3.7.28; 5.13.5–6; 7.1.23–24).
his long discussion of exempla in Book 5, Quintilian does not warn against taking exempla from contexts different from the one at hand, but he does stress the importance of some form of similarity.¹ This discussion of exempla forms part of his wider analysis of forensic speech and it is therefore unsurprising that he uses examples from forensic speeches of Cicero to illustrate some of the possibilities of this type of argument.¹² However, later in the same discussion, he includes examples from Cicero’s deliberative speeches to illustrate the use of the authority of the gods.¹³ This suggests that Quintilian did not shy away from using non-forensic speeches to illustrate points in a wider discussion of forensic oratory when the topic did not concern the difference in speech genres but rather the use of specific rhetorical devices. This ties in with his more general point about the overlap in rhetorical appeals and possibilities of language across the three genres of speech and helps us to understand his use of Cicero and his speeches in the chapter on deliberative speech.

Quintilian uses Cicero in a number of ways in chapter 3.8, but what is most striking about his use is the absence of Cicero’s deliberative oratory to illustrate a characteristic of this genre. Instead, Quintilian refers to Cicero’s authority, based on Cicero’s treatises, to support or discuss general notions of deliberative oratory, such as the nature and appropriate style of this genre.²⁰ He also mentions Cicero’s letter to Brutus regarding Octavian to illustrate the bordering genre of giving advice to a ruler,²¹ and the declamatory theme of Cicero begging pardon from Marcus Antonius in exchange for burning his Philippic speeches.²² Although the Philippics were deliberative speeches, this aspect is not relevant for Quintilian’s point here (about exhorting an audience with an argument about preservation of their reputation). Cicero is also involved in Quintilian’s section on prosopopoeia in three different ways: first, as a person whose character necessitated a different type of speech written by a potential speechwriter from the characters of Caesar and Cato; second, as a speechwriter for Pompey and Titus Ampius;

¹ Quint. 5.11.1–44.
¹² Quint. 5.11.11–13: Cic. Mur.; Mil.; Cluent.
¹³ Quint. 5.11.42: Cic. har. resp.; Cat. 3.
²⁰ Quint. 3.8.1 (Cicero on dignitas as the essential feature of the utile: Cic. top. 94), 3.8.14 (Cicero on the deliberative orator’s need to know the strengths and mores of the state [vires civitatis et mores: Cic. de orat. 2.337], 3.8.65 (Cic. part. or 97 quoted on the appropriate style of deliberative being simple and dignified (simplex et gravis)).
²¹ Quint. 3.8.42 referencing Fr. epist. VII.b Watt.
²² Quint. 3.8.46; cf. Sen. suas. 6.14 on this theme and Juv. 10.125 for its popularity. For discussion of this declamation and the reception of Cicero’s death, see Homeyer 1964; Roller 1997; Wright 2001; Degl’Innocenti Pierini 2003, 23–30; Migliario 2007, 121–159; 2008; Sillett 2015, 242–252. See also Keeline in this volume (p. 131–33).
and, third, as an orator employing *prosopopoeia* with the example of his *Pro Caelio*. Again, there is no explicit use of deliberative speeches, and perhaps the speeches written for Pompey and Titus Ampius Balbus were more likely speeches to be used in a court setting because we know that Cicero had to work for Pompey and his right-hand man in the 50s BC when Pompey and his supporters were often dragged into court for political reasons. Finally, Quintilian uses Cicero to illustrate the overlaps between deliberative, forensic and epideictic oratory: in his discussion of the issues of deliberative speech including not only quality (*honestum* versus *utile*) but also conjecture, definition and legal issues – all traditionally considered under forensic oratory – Quintilian brings in Cicero's discussion of *tumultus* in *Philippic* 8 and of Servius Sulpicius' honorific statue in *Philippic* 9 to illustrate the use of definition and legal issue in deliberative speeches. Just as Quintilian includes a reference to Demosthenes in this passage, he also combines Demosthenes and Cicero as examples of orators whose deliberative and forensic speeches exhibited the same oratorical brilliance. This was probably due to the facts that Demosthenes was one of the few Greek orators from whom deliberative speeches survived, that Cicero had made Demosthenes his oratorical example and that this pairing of Demosthenes and Cicero was picked up by early imperial authors. While Quintilian here mentions deliberative speeches, he uses them to illustrate the similarity of this genre with forensic speeches rather than the unique qualities of deliberative speech. The reader of this long chapter on the genre comes away with some information about the aims and purposes of deliberative oratory, and a sense of Cicero as an important authority on a wealth of oratorical and rhetorical aspects, but not with any clear examples from the rich corpus of Ciceronian speeches to illustrate the specifics of speeches delivered in the senate or in front of the people.

---

23 Quint. 3.8.49–50, 3.8.54.
24 For more discussion of Cicero’s speechwriting, see van der Blom 2016, 119–120, 137.
26 Quint. 3.8.65, specifying Dem. *Phil.* but not any specific speeches of Cicero. I have not been able to find other authors making the same comparison between Demosthenes’ and Cicero’s speeches.
27 Wooten 1983 on the Demosthenic model to Cicero’s *Philippics*; van der Blom 2010, 257–59 on Demosthenes presented as Cicero’s role model. Bishop 2015, 284–94 and Bishop 2019, 173–217 discusses all three aspects (for Demosthenes’ deliberative speeches the only Greek examples circulating in Cicero’s day, see p. 192). See also Fantham 1982, 255–56 who discusses some of the stories about Demosthenes in Quintilian and their possible origin.
4 Quintilian’s use of Cicero’s deliberative speeches across the *Institutio oratoria*

If Cicero’s deliberative speeches were not central to Quintilian’s discussion of this genre in Book 3, one wonders whether Quintilian shows more interest in these speeches elsewhere in his work. I shall now consider the number of Ciceroonian deliberative speeches in relation to the total number of Ciceroonian speeches mentioned in the *Institutio oratoria*, in which contexts they are used by Quintilian, and, finally, the ways in which Quintilian employs Ciceroonian deliberative speech and how this usage reflects wider concerns of changes to the parameters of deliberative speech between the times of Cicero and Quintilian.

Of circa 76 Ciceroonian speeches which we know circulated in antiquity, a little over half are forensic (41 – 54%) and a little under half are deliberative (33 – 43%). Quintilian mentions 53 speeches explicitly, of which 33 are forensic (62%) and 19 are deliberative (36%). In other words, circa two-thirds of the speeches explicitly mentioned by Quintilian are forensic but only about a third are deliberative, compared with the more equally weighted figures of speeches circulating in antiquity. These figures do not take into account the frequency by which each speech is mentioned but instead suggests the spread of speeches used by Quintilian. There could be a number of reasons for this weighting, including Quintilian’s general focus on the forensic mode in his work. However, in spite of this overall favour towards forensic speech, Quintilian does include a large number of Ciceroonian deliberative speeches, which highlights the need to better understand their function within his work.

A reading of all of Quintilian’s references to Cicero’s senate and *contio* speeches show that the vast majority of these references are mentions of specific passages or aspects of these speeches to illustrate the use of a particular rhetorical device (figures of thought and figures of speech are the most dominant).

One chapter (9.3 on figures of speech) is particularly dense with references to Ci-

---

28 2 speeches ~ 3% are epideictic if we count *In Pisonem* and *Pro Marcello* as epideictic; see the appendix for details, which builds on Crawford 1984 and 1994.

29 1 speech ~ 2% is epideictic (*In Pisonem*); see the appendix for details. Steel (p. 241), in this volume, also discusses Quintilian’s preference for Cicero’s forensic speeches over speeches in other genres.

30 Quintilian’s references to Cicero’s senate speeches for this purpose: 3.8.5; 4.1.68; 5.11.42; 5.13.38; 6.3.109; 7.3.18; 7.3.25; 8.4.10; 8.4.13; 8.6.15; 8.6.41; 9.2.7; 9.2.32; 9.2.45; 9.3.13; 9.3.19; 9.3.26; 9.3.29 – 30; 9.3.40; 9.3.43; 9.3.44; 9.3.45; 9.3.49; 9.3.50; 9.3.62; 9.3.71; 9.3.72; 12.10.61. References to Cicero's *contio* speeches for this purpose: 5.11.42; 5.13.38; 9.3.46; 9.3.77; 9.3.86.
cero’s speeches – both deliberative and forensic – as well as poetic texts by other authors as illustrations. In this chapter, as well as in the other passages referencing Cicero’s deliberative speeches, there is no sense that the genre of speech made a difference to the use of these rhetorical devices. This accords well with Quintilian’s general point about many overlaps in rhetorical figures and language between the genres of forensic, deliberative and epideictic speech. Quintilian’s choice of Cicero’s speeches is linked to his overall attitude towards Cicero as the greatest Roman orator. Moreover, his selection of both deliberative and forensic speeches provides Quintilian’s reader with the impression that Cicero’s speeches – irrespective of genre – are worth studying for their uses of rhetorical figures, and that they are worth studying for their brilliance. As we saw earlier, Quintilian emphasised that Cicero was as brilliant in his senate and contio speeches as he was in his forensic speeches.

Alongside this general impression of unimportance of genre in Quintilian’s attitude to Cicero’s speeches, a couple of passages employ Ciceronian contio speeches in a way which indicates that genre did matter after all. In a discussion of the elements of progymnasmata (2.4), the exercises practiced with a grammaticus before the more demanding suasoriae and controversiae were taken up with a rhetor, Quintilian focuses on ways in which to criticise laws (2.4.33):

> Legum laus ac vituperatio iam maiores ac prope summis operibus suffectorum vires desiderant: quae quidem suasoriam an controversiis magis accommodata sit exercitatio consuetudine et iure civitatum differt. Apud Graecos enim lator earum ad iudicem vocabatur, Romanis pro contio suadere ac dissuadere moris fuit; utroque autem modo paucâ de his et fere certâ dicuntur: nam et genera sunt tria sacri, publici, privati iuris.

Praise and denunciation of laws need greater powers, such as are almost equal to the highest tasks of the orator. Whether this exercise is more like a deliberative or a forensic declamation depends on the custom and law of the states concerned. Among the Greeks, the proposer of a law was called before a judge; in Rome, the practice was to speak for and against the proposal in an assembly of the people. In both cases, the points made are few and pretty well defined. For there are in fact just three kinds of law: sacred, public, and private.

Quintilian starts by saying that the exercise can relate to different genres depending on the custom and law of the state concerned because in Greece the proposer of a law was called before a judge and therefore the exercise belongs to the forensic genre. By contrast, in Rome it was common to speak for or against a proposal for law in the contio. The perfect tense (fuit) suggests that it is no longer the

---

31 Quint. 4.3.13; 12.1.19, recently discussed in Keeline 2018, 225–230 and La Bua 2019, 121–125.
32 Quint. 3.8.65 and above.
case in Quintilian’s day that laws are presented to and debated in front of a con-
tional audience, which makes the reader wonder whether the advice on criticism of law is still relevant. Another point is that such an introduction makes the reader expect Quintilian to use *contio* speeches to illustrate his points in this passage, because he is after all writing for a Roman audience. However, Quintilian mainly prefers general remarks, apparently partly based on Greek rhetoricians, over specific examples. Of the few references to such examples of criticism of laws, Quintilian mentions Cicero’s argument about the illegality of Clodius’ tribunician law but without mentioning Cicero or *De domo sua*. This speech was not delivered in a court of law, but the context of a hearing in front of the *pontifices* makes it very close to a forensic speech. Quintilian’s only reference to a *contio* speech in this passage is to illustrate an exception: Cicero’s *Pro lege Manilia* is mentioned as an example of a law not meant to be permanent. However, Quintilian immediately goes on to say that he offers no advice on the criticism of such laws because they are of a special and not a common quality. In this way, a passage about criticism of laws, which – in the Roman context – were placed in a *contio* setting, provides only one reference to a *contio* speech that has no general application to the topic of criticism.

Although the utility of this *progymnasma* was discussed by ancient rhetoricians and Quintilian’s discussion also seems a little inadequate, this passage nevertheless highlights three important points about deliberative speech in Quintilian: 1) that one of the functions of deliberative speech in the *contio* – the debate of proposals for law – was no longer relevant in Quintilian’s day; 2) that Quintilian nevertheless chooses to mention this republican practice of scrutinising proposals for law in the *contio*; and 3) that Cicero provides the few examples to illustrate the possible types of criticism of law. One could argue that Quintilian includes this particular type of *progymnasma* for the sole reason of comprehensiveness; it was a type in the works of his Greek predecessors and he tailors his discussion to cover both the Greek and Roman (republican) contexts for the sake of his audience. The comprehensiveness helps fulfil

---

34 Reinhardt/Winterbottom 2006, 112–118 provide references to and discussion of these influences on Quintilian.
35 Quint. 2.4.35.
36 And the speech is categorised as forensic in the Appendix below.
37 Quint. 2.4.40.
38 The utility of the *progymnasma* was discussed by Hermogenes and Aphthonius, as mentioned by Reinhardt/Winterbottom 2006, 112–113.
39 See Keeline 2018, 227 on Quintilian’s treatment of technical points of rhetoric as “a very skil-
led distillation and codification of well-known principles”.

one of Quintilian’s two purposes of his work, namely the overview of Greek and Roman rhetorical theory and practice. But the passage also supports Quintilian’s other purpose – the training of contemporary young men in oratory – by offering a view into one of the core functions of the deliberative genre: to debate choices. Combined, this passage provides insights into the use of deliberative speech and the changes in this use between Cicero’s republic and Quintilian’s monarchy.

The second passage offering insights into the genre-specific characteristics of deliberative speech, as depicted in Quintilian, comes from his discussion of the usefulness of rhetoric in Book 2. As part of his discussion of this age-old question, he includes a reference to Cicero’s speeches against Rullus’ agrarian laws in early 63 BC (Quint. 2.16.7):

Num igitur negabitur deformem Pyrrhi pacem Caecus ille Appius dicendi viribus diremisse? Aut non divina M. Tulli eloquentia et contra leges agrarias popularis fuit et Catilinae fregit audaciam et supplicationes, qui maximus honor victoribus bello ducibus datur, in toga meruit?

Then will anyone deny that Appius the Blind destroyed the disgraceful peace with Pyrrhus by the power of his oratory? Did not Cicero’s divine eloquence earn popular support when he spoke against the agrarian laws? Did it not crush Catiline’s criminal audacity?

Quintilian, of course, plays on Cicero’s declaration in the second speech against the agrarian law that he would be a *popularis consul*, and his own declaration that Cicero is *ille divinus orator*. But more importantly for our discussion here, Quintilian uses the example of Cicero’s *contio* speeches against the agrarian law to show the positive power of oratory and the decisive capacity of deliberative oratory to change minds, to win support, and, ultimately, do good. Although forensic oratory has that capacity as well, it does this mainly for individuals, whereas deliberative oratory can do this for communities and societies because it deals with questions of political choice.

Presenting his version of the concept of the *vir bonus dicendi peritus*, Quintilian suggests that the perfect orator can show his true talent only through speeches in the senate and in the *contio*, as opposed to in the law courts (12.1.25–26):

---

40 Cic. *leg. agr.* 2.9 (cf. 2.6–7).
41 Quint. 4.3.13.
42 See Stoner’s chapter in this volume for a discussion of Quintilian’s presentation of Cicero as *vir bonus dicendi peritus* in 12.1.
Cur non orator ille, qui nondum fuit sed potest esse, tam sit moribus quam dicendi virtute perfectus? Non enim forensem quandam instituimus operam nec mercennariam vocem neque, ut asperioribus verbis parcamus, non inutilem sane litium advocate, quem denique causidicum vulgo vocant, sed virum cum ingenii natura praestantem, tum vero tot pulcherrimas artis penitus mente complexum, datum tandem rebus humanis, qualem nulla antea vetustas cognoverit, singularem perfectumque undique, optima sentientem optimeque dicentem. 26. In hoc quota pars erit quod aut innocentis tuebitur aut improborum scelecta ut in pecuniariis quaestionibus veritatia contra calumniam aderit? Summus ille quidem in his quoque operibus fuerit, sed maioribus clarius elucebit, cum regenda senatus consilia et popularis error ad meliora ducendus.

Why should not the ideal orator, who has never existed but may exist some day, be perfect in character as well as in oratory? The man I am educating is no law-court hack or hired voice, nor even (let us avoid hard words) a serviceable case advocate, what is commonly called a *causidicus*, but a man of outstanding natural talent who has acquired a profound knowledge of many valuable arts, a man vouchsafed at long last to humanity, such as history has never known, unique, perfect in every way, noble in thought and noble in speech. 26. It will be a small fraction of this man’s achievement that he will protect the innocent, repress the crimes of the wicked, and defend truth against calumny in financial disputes. Of course he will be supreme in this field too, but it is in greater things that his glory will shine more brightly, when he has to guide the counsels of the senate or lead an erring people into better ways.

In spite of Quintilian’s long discussions of forensic speech, as opposed to the short chapters on epideictic and deliberative speech, and the weighting of Cicero’s forensic speeches over deliberative speeches when choosing illustrative examples, Quintilian positions the venues for deliberative oratory above the courtroom, because by guiding the senate or leading the people through speech, the orator will influence greater things and thereby create greater glory for himself. Quintilian is here not focusing on the differences in style between forensic and deliberative oratory but rather on the purpose, content and consequences of speech in these venues: whereas trials in the courts of law can deal with questions of justice and truth, Quintilian seems to suggest that these concern individuals only whereas debate in the senate and the *contio* is political and has implications for larger groups of people, even states. It is these “greater things” (*operibus maioribus*) which allow the perfect orator to shine.

By choosing the passage from Cicero’s *contio* speech against Rullus’ agrarian law as part of his overall defence of rhetoric and by advocating the senate and the *contio* as the venues in which a good orator’s glory will shine more brightly, Quintilian implicitly shows and explicitly argues that deliberative oratory is the most glorious of all genres and that it belongs in a society welcoming debate on political issues. Was this still relevant in Quintilian’s Rome?
5 Deliberative oratory and Cicero’s portrayal in Quintilian – concluding thoughts

Quintilian’s engagement with the deliberative genre across his work suggests that deliberative oratory was still relevant in imperial Rome, but also that the venues, in which discussion of political choices through deliberative debate took place, had changed. Apparently, the contio was no longer an important locus for this debate, as it had been in the republican period; instead, deliberation took place in private consilia, in the senate and through advice to the emperor. The venues, and therefore the audiences, had changed, seemingly excluding the common people from participation in the debate.

When Quintilian nevertheless includes mention of contional oratory, it is partly an attempt to offer background to his discussion of deliberative oratory and the history of oratory, and partly a way of enhancing the figure of the orator.43 However, he also uses the contio in opposition to the senate as the ultimate example of the need to tailor a speech to the audience: the populus needs a concitatius (“more vehement”) tone as opposed to the sublimius (“loftier”) tone in the senate.44 In these passages, there is no sense that the contio is no longer relevant or that Quintilian’s readership is unaware of this oratorical venue. This impression is strengthened by the fact that Quintilian tends to mention the contio as a space for public deliberation and public consumption of speech irrespective of historical context.45

Nevertheless, other passages do indicate a distance between Quintilian’s contemporary oratorical scene and the republican context for public speech. I have discussed the passage in which Quintilian remarks that laws were discussed in front of the people, where the past tense suggests that this was no longer the case in Quintilian’s day. Of course, law-making had changed because the senate had acquired the power to pass laws in the early principate and the emp-

43 The passage from book 12 on the glory obtained through contional oratory leads Quintilian to mention Virgil’s simile (Aen. 1.148 – 56) about the pius statesman at whose sight the turbulent crowds fall silent and listen to his speech. While Virgil uses this as a simile to Neptune’s calming of the waters – that is, comparing a god to an orator – Quintilian uses his reference to Virgil’s simile to implicitly compare an orator to a god. While a turbulent popular assembly is a useful parallel to turbulent waters, so the great orator calming the people in the assembly has an almost godlike quality. I thank Rosalie Stoner for suggesting this point to me.
44 Quint. 8.3.13 – 14; see also 11.1.45 for exactly the same point.
45 Quint. 2.17.28; 3.8.6 – 14; 3.8.64 – 69; 6.3.105; 10.3.28 – 30; 12.2.6 – 9; 12.10.69 – 70; 12.11.1.
peror’s edicts also functioned as law.⁴⁶ In fact, the imperial senate’s extension of powers to include passing of laws and sitting as a court could have spurred Quintilian to devote more specific discussion of deliberative speech in the senate. Instead, his work introduces the three genres of speech but only seriously prepares the reader for forensic speech because it comes first in an orator’s career and because the orator moving from forensic speeches to deliberative speeches will be able to extrapolate from the guidance on court case oratory except for the aspect of audience and tone. Quintilian’s perspective therefore assumes that the orator would indeed start as an advocate before moving on to advise friends, fellow senators and the emperor.

In this perspective, Cicero is also the perfect example. Apart from his brilliant oratory in all genres and his authority as a scholar of rhetoric, Cicero had of course followed the same career path as that which Quintilian expects of his reader: starting with advocacy in the civil courts, moving to criminal cases of higher public profile before entering the senate and only addressing the *populus* in the *contio* when he had already reached the praetorship. Although Quintilian does not emphasise the relevance of Cicero’s career pattern to his readership, Cicero is clearly exemplary in a number of ways. Indeed, the portrayal of Cicero in Quintilian picks up on both Cicero’s practice as an orator and his theories on rhetoric, exemplified through the most extensive range of examples from Cicero’s works found in imperial Latin literature. Quintilian knew Cicero’s works intimately and could use them intelligently, but his portrayal of Cicero was also deeply influenced by Cicero’s self-presentation, as argued by several scholars,⁴⁷ and by the early reception of Cicero.

Among the different usages of Cicero in Quintilian’s chapter on deliberative speech, several of them originate not in Cicero but in later reworkings such as the imperial declamatory topic of Cicero begging pardon from Antonius or the example of Cicero, Caesar and Cato as possible characters in a *prosopopoeia*, which must reflect declamatory exercises, too.⁴⁸ I would also suggest that Quintilian’s mention of Cicero’s letter to Brutus about the best way to persuade Octavian reflects the possibility that this situation had been used as a declamatory theme.⁴⁹ Indeed, the entire section on audience in the chapter on deliberative speech (3.8.36–47), in which we find Cicero’s letter and Cicero as declamatory

---

⁴⁸ Quint. 3.8.46, 3.8.49.
⁴⁹ Quint. 3.8.42.
theme, offers a whole host of declamatory, historical and dramatic reworkings of republican deliberative situations, which leads Quintilian directly on to the topic of *prosopopoeia*. For Quintilian’s educational purpose, it did not make sense to separate Cicero’s historical deliberative oratory from the useful reworkings of Cicero’s life and work in order to illustrate deliberative scenarios and declamatory possibilities. Quintilian’s employment of Cicero is as multi-faceted as the overall reception of Cicero (see Tab. 1).

This multi-faceted employment of Cicero within Quintilian’s discussion of deliberative speech shows that this genre, as exemplified by Cicero (and by “CICERO”, to pick up Kaster’s terminology),⁵⁰ used not just Cicero’s speeches but also his position and iconic status to think up new declamations in the training of deliberative speech.⁵¹ Such reworkings had probably always taken place and thus the training in deliberative speech may not have changed much from republic to empire; what had changed was that this training now had a major resource to tap into which it had not had before: Cicero, his work and self-presentation. In that sense, Quintilian’s portrayal of Cicero and his deliberative oratory is not just a reflection of the historical Cicero but also, or more importantly, a reflection of the variegated receptions and reworkings of Cicero in the one-and-a-half century between Cicero’s death and Quintilian’s *Institutio oratoria*.

---

⁵⁰ Kaster 1998.
⁵¹ Kaster 1998, 262 argues that Quintilian’s presentation of Cicero as the perfect, even divine, orator whose name exemplified not a person but eloquence itself (1.10.112) reflected a transformation in Cicero’s reception that had happened already in the Augustan period, as exemplified by the declamations recorded in Seneca’s *Controversiae* and *Suasoriae*. 
Tab. 1: Quintilian's mentions of Ciceronian speeches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ciceronian speeches known to have circulated (Crawford 1984 and 1994)²</th>
<th>Ciceronian speeches mentioned explicitly in Quintilian (based on index in Russell’s Loeb edition)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro Quinctio</em> (forensic)</td>
<td><em>Pro Quinctio</em> (forensic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro Vareno</em> (forensic)</td>
<td><em>Pro Vareno</em> (forensic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro Roscio Amerino</em> (forensic)</td>
<td><em>Pro Roscio Amerino</em> (forensic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro Roscio comoedo</em> (forensic)</td>
<td><em>Cum quaestor Lilybaeo decederet</em> (forensic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro Scamandro</em> (forensic)</td>
<td><em>Pro Scamandro</em> (forensic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro Tullio</em> (forensic)</td>
<td><em>Pro Tullio</em> (forensic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Divinatio in Caecilium + In Verrem I-II</em> (forensic)</td>
<td><em>Divinatio in Caecilium + In Verrem I-II</em> (forensic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro Fonteio</em> (forensic)</td>
<td><em>Pro Fonteio</em> (forensic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro Oppio</em> (forensic)</td>
<td><em>Pro Oppio</em> (forensic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro Caecina</em> (forensic)</td>
<td><em>Pro Caecina</em> (forensic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro Cluentio</em> (forensic)</td>
<td><em>Pro Cluentio</em> (forensic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro Manilio</em> (forensic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro Fundanio</em> (forensic)</td>
<td><em>Pro Fundanio</em> (forensic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro Cornelio I-II</em> (forensic)</td>
<td><em>Pro Cornelio</em> (forensic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro lege Manilia</em> (deliberative, <em>contio</em>)</td>
<td><em>Pro lege Manilia</em> (deliberative, <em>contio</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>De rege Alexandrino</em> (deliberative, senate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro Mucio</em> (forensic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro Q. Gallio</em> (forensic)</td>
<td><em>Pro Q. Gallio</em> (forensic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>In toga candida</em> (deliberative, senate)</td>
<td><em>In competitores</em> (deliberative, ?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>de proscriptorum liberis</em> (deliberative?)</td>
<td><em>de proscriptorum liberis</em> (deliberative?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>De Othone</em> (deliberative, <em>contio</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>De lege agraria</em> 1–3 (deliberative: senate 1, <em>contio</em> 2–3)</td>
<td><em>De lege agraria</em> 2 (deliberative, <em>contio</em>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Crawford 1984 includes both lost and unpublished speeches, of which I have included the lost speeches only, alongside the fragmentary speeches listed in Crawford 1994.
### Tab. 1: Quintilian’s mentions of Ciceronian speeches. *(Continued)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ciceronian speeches known to have circulated (Crawford 1984 and 1994)(^2), whether still extant today, in roughly chronological order</th>
<th>Ciceronian speeches mentioned explicitly in Quintilian (based on index in Russell’s Loeb edition)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro Rabirio perduellionis reo</em> (forensic)</td>
<td><em>Pro Rabirio perduellionis reo</em> (forensic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>In Catilinam</em> 1–4 (deliberative: senate 1, 4, contio 2, 3)</td>
<td><em>In Catilinam</em> 1–4 (deliberative: senate 1, 4, contio 2, 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro Murena</em> (forensic)</td>
<td><em>Pro Murena</em> (forensic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>In Clodium et Curionem</em> (deliberative, senate, really pamphlet)</td>
<td><em>In Clodium et Curionem</em> (deliberative, senate, really pamphlet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro Sulla</em> (forensic)</td>
<td><em>Pro Sulla</em> (forensic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro Archia</em> (forensic)</td>
<td><em>Pro Archia</em> (forensic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro Flacco</em> (forensic)</td>
<td><em>Pro Flacco</em> (forensic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Post reditum in Senatu</em> (deliberative, senate)</td>
<td><em>Post reditum in Senatu</em> (deliberative, senate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Post reditum ad populum</em> (deliberative, contio)</td>
<td><em>Post reditum ad populum</em> (deliberative, contio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>De domo sua</em> (forensic, in front of pontifices)</td>
<td><em>Pro domo</em> (forensic, in front of pontifices, close to senate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro Sestio</em> (forensic)</td>
<td><em>Pro Sestio</em> (forensic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>In Vatinium</em> (forensic: cross-examination)</td>
<td><em>In Vatinium</em> (forensic: cross-examination)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>De haruspicum responsis</em> (deliberative, senate)</td>
<td><em>De responsis Haruspicum</em> (deliberative, senate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro Caelio</em> (forensic)</td>
<td><em>Pro Caelio</em> (forensic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>De provinciis consularibus</em> (deliberative, senate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro Balbo</em> (forensic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>In Pisonem</em> (epideictic, senate)</td>
<td><em>In Pisonem</em> (epideictic, senate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro Vatinio / Pro Gabinio</em> (forensic)</td>
<td><em>Pro Gabinio et Vatinio</em> (forensic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro Plancio</em> (forensic)</td>
<td><em>Pro Plancio</em> (forensic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro Scauro</em> (forensic)</td>
<td><em>Pro Scauro</em> (forensic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro Rabirio Postumo</em> (forensic)</td>
<td><em>Pro Rabirio Postumo</em> (forensic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro Milone</em> (forensic)</td>
<td><em>Pro Milone</em> (forensic)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tab. 1: Quintilian’s mentions of Ciceronian speeches. *(Continued)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ciceronian speeches known to have circulated (Crawford 1984 and 1994)(^2), whether still extant today, in roughly chronological order</th>
<th>Ciceronian speeches mentioned explicitly in Quintilian (based on index in Russell’s Loeb edition)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>De aere alieno Milonis</em> (deliberative, senate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro Marcello</em> (deliberative/epideictic, senate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro Ligario</em> (forensic)</td>
<td><em>Pro Ligario</em> (forensic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro rege Deiotaro</em> (forensic)</td>
<td><em>Pro rege Deiotaro</em> (forensic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Philippics</em> (deliberative: senate 1, 3, 5, 7–14, <em>contio</em> 4, 6, <em>Phil.</em> 2 as if senate, but never delivered)</td>
<td><em>Philippic</em> 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, <em>Philippics</em> (3.8.46, 8.4.9, 8.6.70) (deliberative, senate 3, 8, 9, <em>contio</em> 4, <em>Phil.</em> 2 as if senate but never delivered).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicero’s speeches: all known (whether extant or not), including those of doubtful title 76 in total 41 forensic 33 deliberative 2 epideictic (here <em>Pro Marcello</em> is included although it is both epideictic and deliberative in order not to overestimate the number of deliberative speeches)</td>
<td>Cicero’s speeches mentioned in Quint. [61 speeches in total with <em>Philippics</em> counting as 14 because Quint. sometimes mentions <em>Philippics</em> in general] 53 speeches in total (only named <em>Philippics</em>) 33 forensic [27 deliberative with <em>Philippics</em> counting as 14] 19 deliberative (only named <em>Philippics</em>) 1 epideictic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Andrew J. Sillett

Quousque tandem: The Reception of a Catchphrase

1 Introduction

If ever a turn of phrase has captured the spirit of a man both in terms of his brilliance as an artist and of his importance as an historical actor, it is the rhetorical question with which Cicero opened his condemnation of Lucius Sergius Catilina in November of 63 BC: *quousque tandem abutere, Catilina, patientia nostra?*¹ This opening line has become synonymous with Cicero in the modern world, and has been appropriated and misappropriated by any number of figures attempting to enlist the force of classical antiquity’s most celebrated orator to buttress an attack on a figure they hold to be overbearing, dangerous and tyrannical. As recently as November 2014, the United States senate was presented, to no little bemusement, with an attack on the President delivered by the junior Senator for Texas Ted Cruz, which began: “When, President Obama, do you mean to cease abusing our patience? How long is that madness of yours still to mock us? When is there to be an end to that unbridled audacity of yours, swaggering about as it does now?”²

This aim of this short paper is to place Ted Cruz’s use of this apophthegm in its classical context. Of the many, many sentences penned by Cicero, how did this one come to supersede the others as his most famous quotation? I shall

---

**Note:** As well as rendering much deserved thanks to the editors of this volume and the anonymous reviewers for their comments and encouragement, I would like to offer particular thanks to three groups of people. First, to Leiden University’s Christoph Pieper, Bram van der Welden and Leanne Jansen, whose work on Ciceronian reception has informed my own approach in more ways than they may know. Secondly, to two former students of Oxford’s Jesus College, Ed Bisham and Jenyth Evans – whose *patientia* was much exercised in conversations on this topic. Thirdly, to British Airways, whose skilful handling of an emergency landing on the way home from the conference at which this paper was first delivered allowed it to appear in this written form.

1 *Cic. Cat.* 1.1. For an ancient interpretation of this line, see: Quint. 9.2.8.
2 This speech, delivered on the 26th November 2014, was a response to President Obama’s planned Executive Order on Immigration. Prior to this, Ted Cruz had gained attention by supplementing an attack on the President with another famous quotation, reciting Dr Seuss’ *Green Eggs and Ham* as part of a 21-hour marathon speech attacking the Affordable Care Act (“Obamacare”) in 2013.
argue that this is no recent phenomenon, and that the special attention received by this phrase was apparent even in antiquity.

I will begin this study with a brief investigation of the extent to which these words gained notoriety during Cicero’s own lifetime (relying both on Cicero’s own speeches and on what can be recovered of those delivered by his opponents). With this foundation having been laid, I will move on to discuss the varied uses to which it was put after Cicero’s death.

Although there is already a far from insignificant bibliography relating to a few of these instances of Ciceronian reception, there is as yet no systematic study of how these individual moments of intertextuality relate to and build upon each other.³ It is my belief that by studying these items together we can shed a light on the complexity of Cicero’s Nachleben and trace how different facets of his reception (hero, villain, politician, wordsmith) either waxed and waned or, perhaps more profitably, how they blended into and reinforced one another, and how they changed over time.

2 Contemporary Resonances

As Mary Beard noted in an article from a 2013 collection of popular articles on the resonances of the Greek and Roman world in contemporary culture, public figures from Congolese dictators to French philosophers have found themselves at one time or another pursued by the ringing denunciation quousque tandem abutere patientia nostra?⁴ Far from being just a shorthand for Cicero’s four Catilinarian speeches and for the entirety of Cicero’s campaign against Catiline, these words have come to be attached to any attack on a figure perceived to have outraged the norms and customs of decent society.

This practice began rather earlier than has often been appreciated. Some time in the early summer of 61 BC Cicero wrote a letter to Atticus describing the aftermath of his decision to give evidence against Clodius in the latter’s trial de incestu for invading the rites of the Bona Dea.⁵ Clodius, still piqued by Cicero’s decision to shatter the alibi he had planned on using in his trial, did not take kindly to being assailed by him once again, this time in the Curia as Cicero denounced the corruption of the jury which had acquitted Clodius, and to

⁴ Beard 2013, 85–86.
hold forth more generally on the guilt and miscreancy of the man himself. Cicero relates to Atticus the altercatio which followed. The verbal joust is worth repeating in full, and the section relevant to the interests of this paper has been underlined (quousque hunc regem feremus?):


Our little Beauty gets on his feet and accuses me of having been at Baiae — not true, but anyhow, “Well”, I reply, “is that like saying I intruded on the Mysteries?” “What business has an Arpinum man with the warm springs?” “Tell that to your counsel”, I retorted; “he was keen enough to get certain of them that belonged to an Arpinum man” (you know Marius’ place of course). “How long”, cried he, “are we going to put up with this king?” “You talk about kings”, I answered, “when Rex didn’t have a word to say about you?” (he had hoped to have the squandering of Rex’s money). “So you’ve bought a house”, said he. I rejoined, “One might think he was saying that I had bought a jury”. “They didn’t credit you on oath”. “On the contrary, 25 jurymen gave me credit and 31 gave you none — they got their money in advance!” The roars of applause were too much for him and he collapsed into silence (Trans. Shackleton Bailey 1999).

This may be a fairly simple joke, one which echoes back Cicero’s own rhetoric to criticize his recent elevation to the summit of Roman political life and his concomitant influence on affairs which his enemies felt bordered on the tyrannical. The joke is an effective one, and good evidence that it did not take long for the rhetorical question with which Cicero began his first Catilinarian to gain all of its own.⁷

---

6 Cic. Att. 1.16.10. Cicero’s neat rejoinder remarks on the fact that Clodius was no authority on the subject of kings since he had recently been snubbed in the will of a man named Rex — a pun Julius Caesar would later make his own: Suet. Iul. 79.2. For this text as an oratorical fragment, see Malaspina 1997.

7 Indeed, as Dominic Berry has suggested to me per litteras, since the publication of the first Catilinarian can only be securely dated to 60 BC, then this letter is the earliest surviving attestation of Cicero’s use of that speech’s famous opening line. Clodius’ ability to quote this memorable opening line to a senatorial audience does not, of course, prove one way or the other whether Cicero had published his Catilinarian speeches at this point. For the vexed question of the Catilinarians’ publication, see Kennedy 1972, 176–178. More recently, see McDermott
This example is exceptionally clear, but it is not the only quotation delivered by one of Cicero’s contemporaries during his lifetime. In 54 BC, Cicero’s younger brother Quintus began a period of service as a legate assisting Julius Caesar in his Gallic campaign. Although he distinguished himself in his first year, weathering a siege while in winter quarters among the Nervii, and receiving warm words in Caesar’s commentary for that year, things took a turn for the worse the next summer.⁸

In 53 BC, Quintus, no doubt on the basis of his meritorious service the previous year, was entrusted with overseeing the camp at Aduatuca while Caesar attacked the territory of the Eburones. Although under strict instructions to keep the soldiers safely inside the fortifications, Caesar relates in his commentary for that year that the troops under Quintus’ command did not have too much trouble convincing him to let them out of their confinement to forage for supplies (Caes. Gall. 6.36):

Cicero, qui omnes superiores dies praecipuit Caesaris cum summa diligentia milites in castris continisset ac ne calonem quidem extra munitionem egredi passus esset, septimo die diffidens de numero dierum Caesarem fidem servaturum, quod longius progressum audiebat, neque ulla de reditu eius fama adferretur, simul eorum permutus vocibus, qui illius patientiam paene obsessionem appellabant, si quidem ex castris egredi non liceret, nullum eiusmodi casum exspectans, quo novem oppositis legionibus maximoque equitatu dispersis ac paene deletis hostibus in milibus passuum tribus offendi posset, quinque cohortes frumentatum in proximas segetes mittit, quas inter et castra unus omnino collis intererat.

For all the previous days Cicero, in obedience to Caesar’s instructions, had most carefully confined his troops to camp, allowing not even a single camp-follower to pass beyond the entrenchment. On the seventh day he did not feel sure that Caesar would keep his word as touching the number of days, as he heard that he had advanced farther, and no report about his return was brought in. At the same time, he was influenced by the remarks of those who called his patience almost a siege, since no leave to pass out of camp was given; and he did not anticipate any turn of fortune such as, with nine legions and a very large force of cavalry to confront a scattered and almost obliterated enemy, could cause disaster within the distance of three miles. He therefore sent five cohorts to get corn in the nearest fields, between which and the camp but a single hill interposed (Trans. Edwards 1917).

---

⁸ For Quintus’ bravery in 55 BC, see: Caes. Gall. 5.38–52. For the motivations of both Ciceros for sending Quintus to serve with Julius Caesar, see Wiseman 1966.
The aftermath of Quintus’ decision to yield to the soldier’s demand was devastating. As soon as the troops were freed from the safety of their fortifications, they were fallen upon by marauding Sugambri, and were only saved from destruction by Caesar’s swift and fortuitous return to camp.

Although the reference to the first Catilinarian here is not anything like as clear as Clodius’ jibe to Marcus Cicero, it is not difficult to discern Julius Caesar’s hint at the precise phrase with which the soldiers needled Quintus into action: *illius patientiam paene obsessionem appellabant* (“they called his patience almost a siege”). It is no great leap of the imagination to reconstruct the *oratio recta* of the soldiers’ taunts, assailing Quintus Tullius Cicero with the words of his more famous brother: *quousque tandem abutere, Cicero, patientia nostra?*

As the fame of the opening words of his first Catilinarian became ever more cemented in Roman popular consciousness, it should be no surprise to find Cicero himself returning to them in his later oratory, and where better to do so than in his Philippics? Where better than in a series of speeches in which Cicero returned to frontline politics to confront a villain and a threat to the Republic, one whose infamy was often interpreted by Cicero as that of the true inheritor of Catiline’s dagger?⁹

At the beginning of the third *Philippic*, a speech which (in spite of its modern title¹⁰) was the opening salvo Cicero fired in his war against Mark Antony, we find a self-conscious return to the chilly November of his consulship (*Phil. 3.3*):

> Quo enim usque tantum bellum, tam crudele, tam nefarium privatis consiliis propulsatur?

> So, how long will a war of such magnitude, a cruel and wicked war, be beaten back by private initiatives? (Trans. Shackleton Bailey 2010)

The echo is admittedly faint here, lacking as it does any reference to the verb *abutere* or the noun *patientia*, and with the *tandem* only present in the similar-sounding appearance of the word *tantum* after the opening *quousque*. The context of the third *Philippic* nevertheless aids this line of interpretation. The central thesis of the second *Philippic*, the manifesto which precedes this speech in its published form, is that since Cicero was the man who put down Catiline’s revo-

---


¹⁰ The first *Philippic* being a rather emollient plea for Antony to turn back from his journey towards despotism, and the second *Philippic* being a pamphlet published considerably after its dramatic date. On the corpus and the titles of the Philippics, see Manuwald 2007.
olution, he is the ideal figure to lead the fight against Mark Antony. How better to underline this argument than to call to mind the opening line of the attack which pushed him, for a while at least, to the front of Rome’s political elite?

3 Sallust’s Inversions

The death of Cicero, just shy of a year after he delivered the third Philippic, marks a turning point in the reception of this phrase. No longer could it be deployed in support of Cicero’s current political position, nor could it be turned against him as part of an attack on his standing within the state. It did not, however, render the phrase either obscure or obsolete. Leaping forward a few decades or so from Cicero’s death, we find the first post-mortem proof of the line’s growing canonical status. In Seneca the Elder’s discussion of a Suasoria on the subject of Cicero’s fictional final reckoning with Mark Antony, he turns to the subject of Cicero’s bibulous son (Sen. suas. 7.14):

Erat autem, etiam ubi pietas non exigeret, scordalus. Hybreae, deseritissimi viri, filio male apud se causam agenti ait: ἡμεῖς οὐν πατέρων; et, cum in quadam postulatione Hybreas patris sui totum locum ad litteram omnibus agnoscentibus diceret, “age – inquit – non putas me didicisse patris mei: quousque tandem abutere, Catilina, patientia nostra?”

Marcus, however, was quarrelsome even when piety did not demand it. To the son of the eloquent Hybreas, who was making a mess of a case he was conducting before him, he said: “Do we, then, claim to be better than our fathers?” And when in some application or other Hybreas spoke a whole passage from his father’s writings to the letter and everyone recognised it, Marcus said: “Come now, do you think I haven’t got off by heart my father’s: How much longer, Catiline, will you abuse our patience?” (Trans. Winterbottom 1974).

In a manner somewhat reminiscent of Clodius’ redeployment of the line, Marcus Junior uses the quotation as part of a joke: portraying an audience bored by a speaker’s repeated plagiarism as the Roman senate witnessing Catiline’s stubborn refusal to hide his face after Cicero’s denunciations. The internal logic of the bon mot, however, is useful to the student of Ciceronian reception: it does not just take as read the idea that the opening words of the first Catilinarian would be immediately recognizable to a general audience as any old famous piece of oratory, it depends upon them recognizing it as Cicero’s own.

---

11 Catiline bookends the second Philippic, appearing as he does in both the first and penultimate chapters: Cic. Phil. 2.1, 2.118.
Given, then, that the salience of this phrase outlived its author, it would be strange indeed if it were to be absent from an historical monograph written in the aftermath of Cicero’s death and dedicated to the subject of his famous oratorical triumph over Catiline. Although Sallust’s *Catiline* finds a way to shock the reader on almost every page, it does not surprise on this front. In the middle of the work’s very first speech, we encounter the familiar rallying cry (Sall. *Cat.* 20.9):

> "Quae quousque tandem patiemini, o fortissumis viris? nonne emori per virtutem praestat quam vitam miseram atque inhonesta, ubi alienae superbiae ludibrio fueris, per dedecus amittere?"

> “How much longer still will you put up with this, o bravest men? Is it not better to die valiantly, than ignominiously to lose a wretched, inglorious life in which you end up being an object of derision in the eyes of some haughty person?” (Trans. Rolfe 2013)

This is a neat piece of *variatio* upon the original Ciceronian line: the phrase itself loses its place as a speech’s opening note;¹² the notorious first couple of words have been bumped back one place behind the object, which has been thrown forward to the front of the sentence and become a relative pronoun; the vocative has taken the object’s place at the sentence’s end and has been replaced with another Ciceronian formulation from the first *Catilinarian;¹³* while the sense of the original *patientia* is taken over by the main verb of the sentence (a cognate form which also appears frequently in the *Catilinarians).*¹⁴

These minor and artful modifications pale into insignificance, however, next to the biggest alteration of all: the fact that Cicero’s exordium has been transferred into the mouth of his foe. Much as Clodius had mocked Cicero by stealing these words from him in 61 BC, so Sallust transfers them to Catiline in his history. It is far from easy to know how to interpret this transposition, and it has been the object of some (but not much) scholarly debate. Sir Ronald Syme provides a good starting point for the debate. Discussing the passage in his *Sallust*, he recognizes Catiline’s appropriation of the line, but does not think much of its importance. As he idiosyncratically puts it: “if that is malice, it is not very noxious”.¹⁵

---

12 Other plays on the phrase retain it in its opening position: we can see this in Livy below, but it is also apparent in Tacitus’ two uses of the phrase and its usage in Apuleius’ two uses of the phrase and its usage in Apuleius: Tac. *Ann.* 1.13.28; Apul. *Met.* 3.27.
13 Cic. *Cat.* 1.21 (referring to his own supporters outside the temple where he has convened the Senate): *Honestissimi atque optimi viri, ceterique fortissimi cives.*
14 *Patior* appears in its various forms nine times in the course of the four *Catilinarians.*
15 Syme 2002, 106.
Renehan provides the antithesis to this view, arguing that, noxious or not, the parody shows a disrespectful attitude to Cicero on Sallust’s part: he finds an analogous situation in which Sallust acted similarly with Cato or Caesar unthinkable. Summing up this stance (in what is presumably his own parody of Syme’s style): “Here the Roman Thucydides laughed”.16

The assessment that this is primarily an opportunity for Sallust to demonstrate his sense of humour is one shared by Robin Seager.17

Writing in the same year as Seager, Doreen Innes provides a rebuttal to Renehan’s thesis. On her reading, Sallust is not attempting to parody Cicero by putting his words in Catiline’s mouth, but rather he is highlighting the latter’s wickedness. Just as Catiline misuses and perverts the meaning of words like virtus fidesque at the start of his speech, his appropriation of the words of the first Catilinarian shows that he can even take the words which sealed his fate and forge them into an exhortation to his caterva of scoundrels. This is, then, really a subtle tribute to Cicero and the original valour of his speech.18 One might push this idea further and argue that Catiline’s ability to talk like Cicero is evidence of the fact that he had all the qualities necessary to be an outstanding citizen, but chose to misuse them. His Ciceronian rhetoric, on this reading, serves as a reminder of the path not taken.19

A more radical approach is taken by D. A. Malcolm, who interprets the appearance of these words in Catiline’s speech as a nod to Catiline himself being the originator of this famous phrase.20 In this provocative reading, Cicero’s rhetorical genius lay in throwing Catiline’s own words back in his face. By extension, Sallust is merely returning the phrase to its rightful inventor. Intriguing suggestion though this may be, it is unfortunately impossible to produce any evidence to back it up, and so it must remain just a suggestion. Moreover, we should be suspicious that this interpretation appears nowhere in ancient scholarship on the first Catilinarian. If it was widely understood that this was the key to interpreting this famous line, then it is difficult to believe that Quintilian, who

---

16 Renehan 1976, 100.
17 Seager 1977, 383. Although there is little material directly concerning Sallust, for a treatment of wit in Roman historiography, see Plass 1988.
18 Innes 1977, 468. She goes on to compare this with Sallust’s other parody of the line at Sall. hist. 1.77.15, with Philippus being set up as a proto-Cicero against Lepidus, who is being subtly compared to Catiline through this allusion.
19 I owe this last point to Rhiannon Ash.
discusses it twice, would have missed so important a point in his own studies of these words.²¹

This survey of the divergent (and even opposite) responses that have been generated by Sallust’s redeployment of Cicero’s phrase is a fine demonstration of just how potent these words both were and are. There is no easy answer to the question of what Sallust thought he was doing by placing Cicero’s words in Catiline’s mouth, and we may simply have to accept that this text can simultaneously mock and praise Cicero at the same time.²² The prejudices the reader brings to Catiline’s speech will ultimately be the deciding factor in working out what it means for him to take over the opening words of the first Catilinarian.

Sallust’s relationship with this phrase is not, however, confined to this single moment in his first monograph. Near the start of his Histories we find it rearing its head again, this time in the voice of Lucius Marcius Philippus, consul of 91 BC, who set himself in opposition to the anti-Sullan martial manoeuvrings of Marcus Aemilius Lepidus, father of the Triumvir of the same name. As Philippus assails the assembled senators for allowing Lepidus to gather strength through their inertia, he asks them (Sall. hist. 1.77.5):

“Vos autem, patres conscripti, quousque cunctando rem publicam intutam patiemini et verbis arma temptabitis?”

“But you, Members of the senate, for how long will you suffer the nation to be defenceless by your hesitation, will you combat arms with words?” (Trans. Ramsey 2015)

This reproduction of Cicero’s phrase is indebted both to its original appearance at the head of the first Catilinarian and to Sallust’s own reformulation of it his Catiline.²³ The simplest interpretation of Sallust’s decision to repeat the borrowing here is that he wishes to highlight the similarities between the revolts of two swaggering patricians against the serried forces of Sulla’s orphaned nobility.

Another possibility suggests itself, however, and that would be to suppose that a much more recent comparison is being essayed. Close parallels though there may be between Lepidus’ revolt and that of Catiline, one does not have to strain to see a further Antonian parallel in Sallust’s portrayal of a renegade Roman magistrate in command of an army in northern Italy being buffeted by

²¹ Quintilian directly quotes the line twice (4.1.69, 9.2.7–8) and never even so much as hints that the words were originally spoken by Catiline. It is, of course, possible that the true origin of the line was lost in the imperial period. This, however, prompts the question where Sallust got his information from, and how it passed by Quintilian.
²³ McGushin 1992, ad loc.
the oratorical onslaught whipped up in Rome by an aging consular keen to stir the senate into action against his foe, and personally fond of doing so with reference to the opening line of the first Catilinarian.

Sallust is, of course, well-known as one of Cicero’s most attentive readers, and it is hardly surprising to find him taking part in the process of redeploying a well-known piece of Ciceronian oratory in order to draw parallels between different moments in Roman history. What is remarkable, though, is just how little time had passed between Cicero violently becoming part of the furniture of the Roman past and the back catalogue of his oratorical greatest hits becoming the raw material of Roman history. Even more remarkable is that of all the speeches and treatises that Cicero produced in his lifetime, a single line from a single speech became, for Sallust and his readers, at least, the perfect encapsulation of Cicero’s life, career and political outlook. The intensity of Sallust’s relationship with Cicero was, however, far from typical.² It remains to be seen how far this was true for other writers of the imperial period. To Sallust’s successors we must now turn.

4 Ab Urbe Condita

As it happens, we do not have to look very far to find the next Roman author interested in exploiting the opening of the first Catilinarian to drive their work along. The spectre of Cicero is raised time and again in the text of Livy’s history. Stephen Oakley makes a strong case for reading the entirety of chapters 14 – 21 of the sixth book of Livy’s history on the rise and fall of Marcus Manlius Capitolinus as inextricably bound up with the rise and fall Lucius Sergius Catilina, another popularis patrician whose fall was as precipitous as his rise.²⁵

Livy’s attempts to create a parallel between these two men can be seen in the late-night conspiratorial meetings they hold in aristocratic houses and the role played by injured dignitas in spurring on their plots. The fact, however, that Livy is not simply drawing a parallel with Catiline, but rather with a Catiline who harks back to both Cicero and Sallust, is made clear in the speech to the plebs urbana that Livy composes for Manlius (Liv. 6.18.5):

²⁴ The belief that Cicero and Sallust sat at loggerheads with each other was popular enough to form the basis of an entire declamatory tradition, recently discussed by Keeline 2018, 147–195; La Bua 2019, 102–106.
²⁵ Oakley 1997, 481–484. For Manlius Capitolinus, see Liv. 5.47; 6.11; 6.14–20; Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 13.7.3–8.2; 14.4; Plut. Cam. 27, 36; Dio Cass. fr. 25.10, 26.1–3; Diod. Sic. 14.116.5–7. This similarity was also noted by Wiseman 1979, 46–47.
His simul inflatus exacerbatrusque iam per se accensos incitabat plebis animos: “Quousque tandem ignorabitis vires vestras, quas natura ne beluas quidem ignorare voluit?”

Self-satisfied and at the same time embittered by such thoughts, he set to work on rousing the already inflamed passions of the plebs: “So how long are you going to remain ignorant of your strength?” he asked them. ‘That is something that nature has decided even wild animals should not be unaware of!” (Trans. Yardley 2013).

The connection itself is relatively easy to spot but understanding how this link should be interpreted is a more difficult task.²⁶ One of the finer points Livy accomplishes with this reference is to flag up the duality of Manlius Capitolinus. While the combination of the popularis thrust of his speech and the background of conspiratorial activity that preceded it allows Livy to align Manlius with Catiline, he complicates and possibly undermines this simple picture by having him echo Cicero’s famous words.

On one level, this reference to a line which had become common currency before Livy first picked up his pen is simply another indication that the historian wants his readers to see the Manlian affair as a fourth-century Catilinarian crisis.²⁷ If we look closer, however, we see Livy doing something rather more complicated. After all, on one level it is perfectly fitting that Manlius Capitolinus should sound like Cicero in his attempt to crush Catiline’s attempt to burn down the city of Rome. As Capitolinus himself reminds his audience in a speech delivered just a few chapters earlier (Liv. 6.16.2):

Arreptus a viatore “Iuppiter – inquit – optime maxime Iunoque regina ac Minerva ceterique di deaeque, qui Capitolium arcemque incolitis, sicine vestrum militem ac praesidem sinitis vexari ab inimicis? haec dextra, qua Gallos fudi ad elubris vestris, iam in vinclis et catenis erit?”

Seized by the attendant, Manlius declared: “Best and Greatest Jupiter, Queen Juno and Minerva, and all the other gods and goddesses that reside in the Capitol and citadel, are you allowing your soldier and guardian to be persecuted by his enemies like this? This is the right hand with which I chased the Gauls off from your shrines – is it now going to be in bonds and chains?” (Trans. Yardley 2013).

²⁶ This has been commented upon by: Skard 1956, 108; Seager 1977, 383; Wiseman 1979, 47; Malcolm 1979, 219; Nousek 2010, 158–159; Berry 2020, 199. For a dismissal of this point on the grounds that the use of only the first two words of the phrase is not enough to signal Cicero, see: Renehan 1976, 100.

²⁷ The theory that the phrase quousque tandem was first used by Catiline himself and then repeated by Cicero, an idea found in Malcolm 1979, would certainly support this view.
If we focus on this section of Manlius’ speech, a section which precedes his quotation of the first Catilinarian, then it becomes difficult to avoid seeing Livy’s character as far from a simple villain. As well as a figure put to death for conspiring against Rome, Manlius was a hero who had saved the city from destruction during the Gallic occupation described in the previous book of Livy’s history. Manlius, then, has equal claim to both the role of Catilinarian villain and that of Ciceronian hero. He is equally at home conspiring toward the destruction of the res publica and bewailing his fate at the hands of an ungrateful city that he personally saved from destruction.

It may not be surprising at this point to see that Livy achieves this effect with reference to the opening line of the first Catilinarian. The level of sophistication inherent in the uses of these words also deserves recognition. Livy does not simply deploy this line in order to set up a facile comparison between, say, an eloquent character from Rome’s past and her most celebrated orator. Sallust’s previous interaction with these words has barnacled the line with a deeper meaning which Livy is able exploit in his history. Cicero’s well-known quotation is kept in reserve by Livy until a moment presents itself when he can exploit the latent potential of its Ciceronian and Sallustian heritage in order to expose the possibility that Roman heroism and Roman villainy can reside within the same breast.

5 Further Imperial Receptions

We have so far seen that Cicero’s Catilinarian catchphrase quickly began to take on a life of its own. It ceased to be a simple short-hand signifier of Cicero’s first Catilinarian oration (as it was used by both himself and Clodius during his lifetime), and it was not just a common way of making reference to Cicero’s oratorical prowess or broader rhetorical corpus (as it was used by his son in the anecdote preserved by Seneca the Elder). Instead we have seen a desire among two historians of the early imperial period to exploit the phrase’s origin in the murkiness of the Catilinarian crisis and so use it to highlight the moral ambivalence of its author.

This is not to say that the sophisticated treatments of the phrase by Livy and Sallust removed it from the world of everyday quotation. A letter from Pliny the Younger to Octavius, dated to late 97 AD and expressing a desire to see some of the verse his friend has been composing, begins as follows:
Hominem te patientem vel potius durum ac paene crudelem, qui tam insignes libros tam diu teneas! Quousque et tibi et nobis invidebis, tibi maxima laude, nobis voluptate?

What an easy-going fellow you are, or rather a hard-hearted, virtually cruel one, since you cling to your outstanding works for so long! For how long will you bear a grudge against yourself and against me? (Trans. Walsh 2006)

Although lacking some elements of the original, the confluence of quousque, patientia and the first-person plural pronoun makes it hard to avoid the feeling that Pliny is playfully comparing the tolerance he is exercising in the face of his friend’s refusal to share any drafts of his poetry with Cicero’s exhausted patience in the face of Catiline’s shameless appearance in the temple of Jupiter Stator more than 150 years earlier.

The passage of time, however, did not lead to a situation where all references to this phrase were essentially employed as light-hearted hyperbole or showy displays of learning. The first book of Tacitus’ Annales proffers two examples of Cicero’s catchphrase being deployed with no little sophistication. As news of Augustus’ death in 14 AD spread through the empire, Tacitus reports that the troops stationed on the Rhine and in the province of Pannonia decided to use the uncertainty of the times to advance the case for a comprehensive pay review. The presence of the new emperor’s son Drusus bearing assurances of fair treatment did little to cool the ardour of the Pannonian legions, who, after some fraught negotiations, settled upon the plan of securing the emperor’s son as a hostage to their demands. The sudden onset of a lunar eclipse, however, led to a large number of the mutineers losing their nerve and offered Drusus an opportunity to turn his fortunes around (Tac. ann. 1.28.4–6):

Utendum inclinatione ea Caesar et quae casus obtulerat in sapientiam vertenda ratus circumiri tentoria iubet; accitur centurio Clemens et si alii bonis artibus grati in vulgus. Hi vigiliis, stationibus, custodiis portarum se inserunt, spem offerunt, metum intendunt. “quousque filium imperatoris obsidebimus?”.

Feeling he should capitalize on the turn of events and make prudent use of what chance had offered him, Drusus ordered the rounds made of the tents, and the centurion Clemens was summoned, along with any others whose qualities made them favourites of the mob. These men infiltrated the watches, the guard posts and the sentries at the gates, offering them hope and working on their fears. ‘How long are we going to keep the emperor’s son under siege?’ they would say (Trans. Yardley 2008).

28 Plin. ep. 2.10.1–2.
29 Whitton 2013, ad loc.
The similarity between this passage and the opening of Cicero’s first *Catilinarian* is, admittedly, slight, limited as it is to the famous opening word. It is, however, a vanishingly rare word in Tacitus, and it is hard to believe that the author of the *Dialogus* would be unaware of the heritage of opening a piece of direct speech with this particular question word. How better, after all, to convey the sense of an enterprising member of Drusus’ staff deciding that his youthful training in rhetoric will be the key to turning the tide of this crisis?

The best supporting evidence for the idea that we should read Cicero into the centurion’s speech, however, is the fact that the only other instance of Tacitus using the word *quousque* is to be found only a few chapters before this, in a far more openly Ciceronian manner. Tacitus’ account of the accession of Tiberius to sole rule over the empire emphasises the contrast between his personal unwillingness to step into his late stepfather’s shoes and the senate’s insistence that he do so without hesitation. As the individual senators despair of achieving their desired result through obsequious flattery alone, Tacitus presents some of the senior consulars adopting a more confrontational manner, thus incurring the Princeps-to-be’s displeasure (Tac. *ann.* 1.13.4):

> Etiam Q. Haterius et Mamercus Scaurus suspicacem animum perstrinxere, Haterius cum dixisset “quousque patieris, Caesar, non adesse caput rei publicae?”
>
> Quintus Haterius and Mamercus Scaurus also provoked his suspicious nature, Haterius by saying ‘How long, Caesar, are you going to let the republic be without a head?’ (Trans. Yardley 2008).

In addition to the prominent placement of the *quousque* question, Tacitus provides us with a second marker of this question’s Ciceronian origin in his use of *patieris*, a verbal link back to the original *patientia* favoured by Sallust in both of his references to the first *Catilinarian*.

This cross-reference with the first *Catilinarian* is an opposite one, and one which provides an early hint as to how Tacitus will present both the institution of the senate and its individual senators as his work progresses. By creating an unmistakable verbal echo of Cicero’s speech in Haterius’ question, Tacitus highlights the chasm that yawns between the vibrant, vital institution the senate was in Cicero’s heyday, and the craven, sycophantic body it had developed into in the imperial period. The opening couple of words in Haterius’ question designate him as the Cicer of the dawning Tiberian age, a man who can represent the firm-minded independence of that august body; what follows merely confirms what we should expect – that his priority is transferring as much power as possible away from the senate and towards the new emperor.
Tacitus’ quotation of the first *Catilinarian* presents a different perspective from that found in Sallust and Livy. While those historians used these words to emphasise the moral ambiguity of their speakers, Tacitus employs them in a manner which lionizes Cicero at the expense of his counterpart. The specific choice to do this via the first *Catilinarian* is not, however, simply a shorthand way of bringing Cicero into play. The parallel of the opening days of the Catilinarian crisis exposes the nature of the debate taking place in 14 AD. Augustus’ exit from the stage and Tiberius’ unwilling arrival presents a moment of crisis for Rome every bit as existential as Catiline’s alleged plotting. Tacitus’ insertion of Cicero’s *quousque* both emphasises the gravity of the situation being narrated and highlights the fact that the reader can no longer expect the senate to furnish Rome with a redeemer.

### 6 Conclusion

Although the starting point of a paper on the reception of the opening line of Cicero’s first *Catilinarian* is obvious enough, establishing where to finish it is rather more of a challenge. The volume of which this forms a part is a contribution to the recent flurry of activity that has blown up around Ciceronian reception. I would like, however, to look back to an article on the subject that preceded this spate of activity and set its direction of travel.³⁰ Bob Kaster’s 1998 article “Becoming CICERO” lays out the thought-provoking thesis that the story of Cicero’s reception is one of kitsch-ification.³¹ As the memory of the real Cicero receded into the past, a burlesque caricature of him came to dominate the mind of antiquity, a figure Kaster christens “CICERO”. I would like to end this piece with one last, unmistakable nod in the direction of Cicero’s catchphrase which captures Kaster’s theorized simplification of Cicero/CICERO.

In the course of the epic span of eleven books, Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses* tells the tale of a young man, Lucius, who is surprised to find that his interference with a group of witches has left him transformed into an ass and forced to undergo a series of impish adventures in order to regain his original form. Early on in his journey, Lucius gains a taste of the indignities which will be visited upon his new body (Apul. *met.* 3.27):

---

³⁰ See recently: Keeline 2018, LaBua 2019, Sillett 2015, and the forthcoming publications from Christoph Pieper’s “Mediated Cicero” project based at the University of Leiden.
³¹ Kaster 1998.
Denique adgnitos alutari praesidio pronus spei, quantum extensi sp rioribus pedibus adniti poteram insurgo valide, et cervice prolixa nimiumque porrectis labiis, quanto maxime nisu poteram corollas adpetebam. Quod me pessima scilicet sorte conantem servulus meus, cui semper equi cura mandata fuerat, repente conspiciens, indignatus exurgit, et “Quousque tandem – inquit – cantherium patiemur istum paulo ante cibariis iumentorum, nunc etiam simulacris deorum infestum? Quin iam ego istum sacrilegum debilem claudumque reddam”.

So in an ecstasy of hope on identifying this assurance of salvation, I stretched out my forelegs and with all the strength I could muster, I rose energetically on my hind legs. I craned my neck forward, and pushed out my lips to their full extent, making every possible effort to reach the garlands. My attempt was frustrated by what seemed to be the worst of luck: my own dear servant, who always had the task of looking after my horse, suddenly saw what was going on, and jumped up in a rage. “For how long’ – he cried – are we to endure this clapped-out beast? A minute ago his target was the animals’ rations, and now he is attacking even the statues of deities! See if I don’t maim and lame this sacrilegious brute!” (Trans. Walsh 1994)

This quotation of the first Catilinarian is as clear as one could wish for here: the quousque is followed by the tandem and, as we have seen numerous times, the patientia is present in a form of the verb patior. Where the previous examples that have been studied above, however, show a degree of sophistication in their engagement with the circumstances of the line’s original delivery, Apuleius’ quotation suggests no understanding of the quotation beyond the basic fact that it is a famous phrase.³²

It is far from inconceivable, of course, that the best explanation for the difference in quality between Apuleius’ quotation and those discussed above can be found in their respective genres – a work of historiography is far more likely to squeeze a great deal of meaning out of a piece of Cicero than a Roman novel is. It is, however, hard to avoid the conclusion that this picture fits very well with Kaster’s thesis of a gradual decline in the subtlety of Cicero’s reception in classical antiquity.

How far, then, should this chapter proceed? There is, of course, much more to be written on the reception of Cicero’s famous phrase in Late Antiquity, in the Medieval period and down to the present day.³³ But I will not abuse your patience any further on these pages.

³² On Apuleius’ use of this Ciceronian phrase, see Tatum 2006; La Bua 2013.
³³ Berry 2020, 210–213 (cf. 61–64).
Barbara Del Giovane

Da *iocosus a consularis scurra*.
Rappresentazioni del Cicerone umorista

1 Introduzione

Questo contributo si concentra su un aspetto della personalità di Cicerone che colpisce i lettori e gli studiosi moderni così come già suscitava l’interesse degli antichi. In un recente volume di Mary Beard sul riso nell’antica Roma, Cicerone è definito «the most infamous funster, punster, and jokester of classical antiquity».¹ È dunque al ritratto di Cicerone come umorista, per usare un primo termine per così dire generico, che sarà dedicato questo saggio.

Come è noto, se è il secondo libro del *De oratore* a restituirci un’ampia trattazione teorica sull’umorismo necessario all’eloquenza forense,² è soprattutto nelle orazioni e nell’Epistolario che si rintracciano numerosi *specimina* dello spirito di Cicerone, in pieno accordo con la tradizione dei *Facete dicta* ciceroniani, presumibilmente editi a opera del servo e segretario Tirone e con il possibile titolo *De ioci*.³ Non mancano trattazioni sull’ironia e sull’individuazione dei moti di spirito nelle sue opere,⁴ ma se abbandoniamo il campo degli scritti di Cicerone e ci rivolgiamo al materiale letterario su Cicerone, uomo e personaggio, è possibile svolgere un percorso originale che si snoda tra i non pochi autori che rendono un tributo alla vena ironica e al gusto delle facezie proprio di Cicerone.⁵ È un percorso, tuttavia, non privo di ambiguità. La più evidente è costituita dal rischio che l’umorismo di Cicerone non rispetti sempre il con clamato ideale di *urbanitas*, avvicinandosi piuttosto a quella scurrilità buf-

¹ Beard 2014, 100.
² Sulla trattazione *de ridiculis* nel II libro del *De oratore*, rimando a Monaco 1964 e alla monumentale opera di Leeman/Pinkster/Rabbage 1989, ad loc.
⁵ Sulle facezie ciceroniane e su Cicerone «as a master of witticism», cf. la recente ed efficace trattazione di La Bua 2019, 244–256.
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fonesca e sconveniente da cui lo stesso Cicerone teorico de risu mette più volte in guardia.⁶

2 Quintiliano e Cicerone de risu: il disagio dell’ammirazione

Nel sesto libro dell’Institutio oratoria, Quintiliano dedica ampio spazio alla trattazione del riso, quale strumento quasi terapeutico, che alleggerisce gli animi dalla tensione scaturita dai processi e che risulta utile per combattere nausea e stanchezza (6.3.1: Huic diversa virtus quae risum iudicis movendo et illos tristes solvit adfectus et animum ab intentione rerum frequenter avertit et aliquando etiam reficit et a satietate vel a fatigatione renovat, «opposta è la capacità grazie alla quale, suscitando il riso del giudice, si dissolvono i sentimenti tristi di cui ho parlato, spesso si distoglie l’animo dall’attenta considerazione dei fatti e talvolta lo si ravviva e lo si rinnova dalla noia e dalla fatica»).⁷ Per spiegare la difficoltà della materia vengono presi in considerazione i due oratori ritenuti più grandi, cioè Demostene e Cicerone. Al primo, secondo un giudizio già ciceroniano⁸ e qui esteso «ai più» (plerique [...], credunt), sarebbe mancata la capacità (facultas) di essere spiritoso, mentre al secondo la misura (modus) nell’esserlo.⁹ Quintiliano è pienamente persuaso del comune giudizio su Demostene e conclude brevemente

⁶ «His speeches abound with the coarsest personal abuse. Yes, it is difficult to reconcile theory with practice», Viljama 1994, 85; già Wilkins 1892, 346.
⁸ Cic. orat. 90.6: Quoniam quicquid est salsum aut salubri non omnes faceti: [...] Demosthenes minus habetur; quo quidem mihi nihil videtur urbanius sed non tam dicax fuit quam facetus; est autem illud acrioris ingenii, hoc maioris artis («infatti tutto ciò che vi è di spiritoso e di schietto nello stile è proprio degli Attici. Costoro però non sono tutti spiritosi; [...] Demostene è ritenuto meno spiritoso. Per mio conto non c’è nulla di più fine dello spirito di Demostene; in lui però c’è più arguzia che mordacità: questa è frutto di un’indole più aggressiva, quella di un’arte più raffinata», le traduzioni dell’Orator sono di Norcio 1970).
⁹ Quint. 6.3.1–2: Quanta sit autem in ea difficultas vel duo maximi oratores, alter Graecae, alter Latinae eloquentia princeps, docent: nam plerique Demostheni facultatem defuisse huius rei credunt, Ciceroni modum («quante difficoltà comporti lo insegnano persino i due oratori più grandi, uno principe dell’eloquenza greca, l’altro principe dell’eloquenza romana; i più credono infatti che a Demostene ne sia mancata l’attitudine, a Cicerone la misura», le traduzioni di Quint. 6 sono di Corsi [in Corsi/Calcante 2018]).
che la scarsa presenza di motti faceti nei suoi discorsi si possa spiegare con una scarsa attitudine naturale a comporre battute scherzose.¹⁰ Nei confronti di Cicerone, invece, la questione appare ben più complessa. Quintiliano si trova immediatamente costretto a assumere un atteggiamento apologetico a difesa, in questo caso, di un comportamento che presta il fianco a un’accusa chiarissima e di segno opposto a quella rivolta a Demostene. Quella mancanza di modus nel risum movere già annunciata prima, viene riformulata come «eccessiva passione per il ridicolo», che per Cicerone avrebbe investito sia la sfera pubblica sia quella privata:

Noster vero non solum extra iudicia sed in ipsis etiam orationibus habitus est nimius risus adfectator. Mihi quidem, sive id recte iudico sive amore inmodico praecepi in eloquentia viri labor, mira quaedam in eo videtur fuisse urbanitas. Nam et in sermone cotidiano multa et in altercationibus et interrogandis testibus plura quam quisquam dixit facete, et illa ipsa quae sunt in Verrem dicta frigidius alis adsignavit et testimoni loco posuit. ut, quo sunt magis vulgarea, eo sit credibilius illa non ab oratore ficta sed passim esse iactata.¹¹

Cicerone invece è stato ritenuto troppo amante del ridicolo, non solo fuori dai tribunali, ma anche nelle stesse orazioni. In verità – che io giudichi rettamente o che mi inganni per troppa ammirazione verso quel grande oratore – secondo me in lui ci fu uno straordinario senso dello spirito. Ricco di facezie era il suo parlare quotidiano, e più di chiunque altro ne infarcì i dibattiti e interrogatori di testimoni; le stesse battute meno efficaci rivolte contro Verre le mise in bocca ad altri e le passò come testimonianze, in modo che, quanto più sono banali, tanto più risulti credibile che non le abbia inventate l’oratore, ma siano state pronunciate dalla gente.

Habitus est implica chiamamente che qui si stia riportando un’opinione diffusa da cui non ci si sente affatto rappresentati, e infatti poco più avanti, puntualmente, Quintiliano sente di dover chiarire la sua posizione. Riconosce il rischio che il suo giudizio su Cicerone possa essere falsato da un amore eccessivo,¹² ma sgombra poi il campo da ogni possibile dubbio: per lui, quella di Cicerone non fu altro che una mira urbanitas, cioè un’«arguzia sorprendente»,¹³ dimostrata nel parlare quotidiano, vale a dire nel linguaggio delle lettere (in sermone cotidiano), nelle dispute tra avvocati (in altercationibus) e negli interrogatori dei testimoni.

¹⁰ Quint. 6.3.2: Nec videri potest noluisse Demosthenes, cuius paucha admodum dicta nec sane ceteris eius virtutibus respondentia palam ostendunt non displicuisses illi iocos sed non contigisses («e non può sembrare che Demostene non abbia voluto far ricorso al riso: le sue pochissime arguzie, benché non all’altezza di tutte le sue altre qualità oratorie, dimostrano chiamamente come scherzare non gli dispiacesse, ma non gli venisse naturale»).
¹¹ Quint. 6.3.3–4.
¹² Per le lodi di Cicerone da parte di Quintiliano, basti citare 10.1.108–112.
¹³ La Bua 2019, 244–245.
(interrogandis testibus), nel linguaggio cioè delle orazioni forensi. Parlare di *urbanitas* significa riconoscere qui la piena corrispondenza tra l’umorismo ciceroniano in pratica e l’umorismo prescritto da Cicerone in teoria, dato che *urbanitas/urbanus* sono termini che, come in primo luogo emerge dalle pagine ciceroniane,\(^{14}\) più di ogni altro incastonano il significato profondo dell’ironia socialmente accettabile e in linea con i principi del *decorum*. Seguendo lo schema di un’orazione processuale in difesa dell’*urbanitas* ciceroniana, Quintiliano individua l’elemento forte dell’accusa, per poi proporre la propria personale linea difensiva. Se per i detrattori Cicerone aveva un problema di eccesso nel ricercare il riso – *nimius* è l’aggettivo usato per indicare la troppa passione del riso, e poco prima è la mancanza di *modus* a essere additata – allora è nel numero elevato delle battute attribuite a Cicerone che per Quintiliano risiede il problema. Ecco che la colpa sarà di chi ha raccolto in ben tre libri, con lo scopo di renderli immortali, i motivi faceti di Cicerone: Tirone, o chi per lui, chiamato in causa per non aver mostrato nessuna cura nel selezionare i *dicta* ciceroniani nella sua raccolta:

Utinamque libertus eius Tiro, aut alius, quisquis fuit, qui tris hac de re libros edidit, parcius dicatorum numero indulssent et plus iudicii in eligendis quam in congregendis studii adhibuissent: minus obiectus calumniiantibus foret, qui tamen nunc quoque, ut in omni eius ingenio, facillus quod reici quam quod adici possit invent.\(^{15}\)

E magari il suo libero Tirone (o chi comunque ne pubblicò i tre libri relativi al riso) avesse concesso meno spazio alla massa delle sue spiritosaggini, usando più giudizio nel selezionarle che passione nell’accumularle! Certo meno occasioni di critica avrebbero i calunniatori, che tuttavia anche qui troveranno più facilmente da togliere che da aggiungere, come in ogni manifestazione del suo ingegno.

---

\(^{14}\) Bastino qui le illuminanti parole di Austin 1960\(^3\), nel commentare Cael. 6.25: «An adequate translation of *urbanitas* is impossible. It is not only an abstract idea, but an attitude of mind; it represents all that seemed to a Roman gentleman to constitute »good form« in manners, *ton*, the opposite of the boorish clumsiness of those *rustici* who had not the advantage of living in the *urbs*, it was something instinctively and naturally Roman»; si veda Valenti 1976 per un’analisi semantica dell’*urbanitas* in Cicerone.

\(^{15}\) Quint. 6.3.5. Anche Macrobio, nei *Saturnalia* 2.1.12, fa riferimento ai motivi di Cicerone raccolti dal suo libero: *Cicero autem quantum in ea re valuerit quis ignorat qui vel liberti eius libros quos is de iociis patroni composuit (quos quidam ipsius putant esse) legere curavit?* («quanto a Cicerone, chi ignora la sua abilità a tal proposito? basta leggere i libri in cui il suo libero raccolse i motivi arguti del suo signore; alcuni ne attribuiscono la stesura a lui stesso», le traduzioni di Macrobio sono di Marinone 1967). Un riferimento anche in *Schol. Bob.* 140.16 ST: *Tullius Tiro libertus eiusdem inter iocos Ciceronis adnumerat*, cf. supra, p. 301 n. 3.
Come Quintiliano aveva abilmente fatto intendere appena prima di citare Tirone, Cicerone possedeva una sua precisa strategia stilistica. Quasi a dimostrare un’elaborata esegesi del modus operandi comico di Cicerone, Quintiliano ammette che nelle Verrine potessero comparire battute più fiacche (§ 4, illa ipsa, quae sunt in Verrem dicta frigidius). L’avverbio frigide, come l’aggettivo frigidus, tecnico per i motteggi di spirito, è in primo luogo di uso ciceroniano,16 impiegato verosimilmente come una traduzione del greco ψυχρὸς, che Aristotele usa per connotare le espressioni linguistiche troppo ricercate17 e che risultano quindi fredde. Tuttavia tali battute meno riuscite erano messe da Cicerone in bocca ad altri personaggi (§ 4 aliis adsignavit), venendo quindi usate alla stregua di testimonianze (et testimonii loco posuit). In questo modo, per Quintiliano risulta verosimile negare la paternità ciceroniana delle battute che risultano più triviali, considerandole piuttosto come il frutto di voci altre, sparse nella narrazione (quo sunt magis vulgaria, eo sit credibilius, illa non ab oratore ficta, sed passim esse iactata). Quintiliano trova dunque il modo di difendere il suo modello stilistico e oratorio dall’accusa di aver scritto frigida dicta. Tuttavia la sua non è una strategia di difesa originale, ma si rifà a un precedente più che autorevole. Non sorprende che sia proprio Cicerone a fornire a Quintiliano la linea difensiva, quando nelle Verrine spiega ai giudici che le atrocità commesse da Verre avevano spinto certi uomini a buttarsi sugli scherzi, a divenire cioè ridiculi:

Hinc illi homines erant qui etiam ridiculi inveniebantur ex dolore; quorum alii, id quod saepe audistis, negabant mirandum esse ius tam nequam esse verrinum; alii etiam frigidiores erant, sed quia stomachabantur ridiculi videbantur esse, cum Sacerdotem exsecrabant qui verrem tam nequam reliquisset. Quae ego non commemorarem, – neque enim perfacete dicta neque porro hac severitate digna sunt, – nisi vos illud vellem recordari, istius nequittiam et iniquitatem tum in ore vulgi atque in communibus proverbiis esse versatam.18

16 Si veda il De oratore, ad esempio 2.256: Sed cum plura sinto ambigui genera, de quibus est doctrina quaedam subtilior, attendere et eucupari verba oportebit; in quo, ut ea, quae sinto frigidiora, vitemus, – est enim cavendum, ne arcessitum dictum putetur – permulta tamen acute dicemus («ma poiché i tipi di doppi sensi sono parecchi, tanto che in proposito si è formata una teoria più specifica, bisognerà prestare attenzione a cercare bene le parole; a patto di evitare le freddure, per non dare l’impressione che il motto sia stiracchiato alla posta, riusciremo a dire moltissimi moi spiritosi»;) 2.260: Haec aut frigida sunt aut tum salsa, cum alid est exspectatun («queste battute sono in genere fredde, a meno che non vadano contro le attese», le traduzioni del De oratore sono di Martina/Ogrin/Torzi/Cettuzzi [in Narducci 1994]).
17 Cf. il commento di Gastaldi 2014 alle pagine aristoteliche sulle espressioni «fredde» (553–554).
18 Cic. Verr. 2.1.121.
È così che c'erano di quelli che per l'indignazione si scoprivano addirittura spiritosi; e di questi alcuni, come è giunto spesso alle vostre orecchie, dicevano che non c'era da meravigliarsi se la giustizia di Verre era così cattiva come il brodo di verro; altri erano ancora più insulsi – ma la loro indignazione li faceva apparire spiritosi – e maledicevano il Sacerdote perché aveva lasciato in vita un verro così tristo. Tutte battute, queste, che io non ricorderei – non sono infatti molto spiritose né d'altra parte si confanno alla serietà di questo tribunale – se non volessi che voi richiamaste alla memoria che la malvagità e l'iniquità dell'imputato erano allora sulla bocca del popolino ed erano divenute proverbiali.¹

Cicerone riferisce battute che giocano su doppi sensi verbali, e che appaiono in contrasto con l'ideale di umorismo urbano e raffinato propugnato, ben rappresentato dall'avverbio perfacete.² Battute insulse pronunciate da uomini definiti non a caso frigidi, da cui prontamente Cicerone si dissocia, e il cui unico scopo nel riferirle è far capire come la malvagità di Verre fosse letteralmente sulla bocca di tutti, divenendo proverbiale. Nell'attribuire le battute sconvenienti al vulgus, Cicerone si mette quindi al riparo dalle possibili accuse di buffoneria; d'altra parte, è lo stesso Cicerone ad ammettere la propria fama di uomo di spirito, come si legge nella Pro Plancio,²¹ e a riflettere sul fenomeno delle battute falsamente attribuite al suo nome.²²

Per Quintiliano, dunque, riappropriarsi di questa strategia difensiva è necessario e funzionale a enfatizzare la colpa di Tirone. Il segretario di Cicerone ai suoi occhi fu evidentemente poco scrupoloso, incapace di seguire l'operato del suo padrone nel confezionare la raccolta, esponendolo quindi alle critiche. L'azione descritta da Quintiliano di «concedere spazio alla massa delle battute»

20 Krostenko 2001, 202–232 e passim illustra efficacemente la gamma del potenziale semantico «urbano» del termine facetus e dei suoi derivati.
21 In Planc. 35 troviamo un auto-ritratto di Cicerone come amante dei giochi di spirito: Ego autem, si quid est quod mihi scitum esse videatur et homine ingenuo dignum atque docto, non aspernor, stomachor cum aliorum non me digna in me conferuntur («d'altra parte io, se si tratta di una battuta che a mio parere è garbata e degna di un uomo libero e colto, non la rifiuto; mi stizzisco se mi attribuiscono ciò che appartiene ad altri ed è indegno di me» trad. di Bellardi 1975).
22 Cf. il passo sopra citato della Pro Plancio; in fam. 7.32.1–2, inviata a Volumnio, Cicerone prende atto che ormai per tutta Roma gli vengono attribuiti motti non suoi, persino quelli dell'oratore Sestio, celebre per un gusto retorico non raffinato: 7.32.1: Ais enim, ut ego discesserim, omnia omnium dicta, in ipsis etiam Sestiana, in me conferri; in fam. 9.16.3, destinata a Papirio Peto, Cicerone riferisce di motti a suo nome che avevano per bersaglio Cesare: Effugere autem si velim non nullorum acute aut facete dictorum opinionem, fama ingeni mihi est abicienda; come si legge dopo, Cicerone è sicuro che il gusto raffinato di Cesare non si lasci ingannare e che sia quindi in grado di riconoscere le battute sue originali.
(dictorum numero indulgere), che venivano letteralmente ammucchiate (in congerendis), è relativa proprio al fatto che Tirone aveva inserito nella sua raccolta anche i dicta che Cicerone non aveva effettivamente ideato, ma che si era soltanto limitato a citare come testimonianza altrui utile per la propria causa. Comprendiamo dunque che, nella sua trattazione de risu, Quintiliano si trova a dover difendere l’ironia ciceroniana, che tuttavia si era già trovata in condizione di essere difesa dallo stesso Cicerone.

Quintiliano mette dunque a punto una strategia difensiva che in qualche modo discolpa Cicerone dall’accusa di violazione del modus per quanto riguarda l’impiego di motivi di spirito. Tuttavia, più avanti nella trattazione, i dicta ciceronianiani citati da Quintiliano continuano a riflettere una duplicità di giudizio sullo spirito di Cicerone, gettando nuovamente ombra sulla capacità di esprimere un’ironia conforme al decoro. In particolare, otto tra i detti di Cicerone citati nell’Institutio oratoria vengono inseriti nella sezione sui ridicula dicta non appropriati all’oratore (§ 46), tra i quali Quintiliano introduce per primi quelli che implicano doppi sensi (in primis ex amphibolia), anche altrove considerati raramente accettabili, poi quelli che veicolano allusioni oscure, conformi allo stile dell’Atellana (neque illa obscura quae Atellanio more captant), e i detti impiegati dal popolino, simili a parolacce per l’ambiguità che li contraddistingue: nec qualia vulgo iactantur av ilissimo quoque, conversa in maledictum fere ambiguitate. Ecco che, in addendum a questa casistica da evitare, si aggiungono anche «i detti simili a quelli che talvolta sono sfuggiti a Cicerone» (ne illa quidem quae Ciceroni aliquando exciderunt). Quintiliano specifica che tali detti furono pronunciati non in agendo, concedendo in un certo senso la caduta in battute.

23 Il rispetto del modus, la condanna degli eccessi rientrano a pieno titolo nel programma paideutico delle scuole di retorica e rappresentano un tema cruciale, che inevitabilmente sta a cuore a Quintiliano: basti 11.1.91: Indecorum est super haec omne nimium, ideoque etiam quod natura rei satis aptum est, nisi modo quoque temperatur, gratiam perdit («oltre a ciò, ogni eccesso è sconveniente, e perciò anche quello che è intrinsecamente abbastanza consono alla circostanza, se non viene anche temperato dalla misura, perde la sua grazia» trad. Calcante 2007).

24 Quint. 6.3/46 – 49; 51; 68 – 69; 73; 75 – 77; 84; 86; 96; 98; 8.3.54.

25 Come spiega Lausberg 1998, 466 § 1070, «The (lexical and syntactic) amphibolia [...] is a special kind of obscuritas, since it not only leads into the dark, but leaves a choice between two meanings – Ingenious play between an obvious and an underlying meaning (Quint. 2.20 – 21) also belongs here».

26 Quintiliano altrove afferma che il doppio senso di rado ha un esito felice, accettabile solo se suffragato dalla pertinenza dei fatti stessi: 6.3/48: Non quia excludenda sint omnino verba duos sensus significantia, sed quia raro belle respondent, nisi cum prorsus rebus ipsis adiuvantur («ho dato questi precetti, non perché vadano assolutamente escluse parole con un doppio significato, ma perché esse raramente costituiscono una risposta elegante, a meno che siano pienamente suffragate dai fatti stessi»).
sconvenienti, ma con l’attenuante che erano pronunciate sempre al di fuori del contesto forense, dove, come aveva già specificato precedentemente, Cicerone si limitava a formulare battute in conformità con l’ideale dell’urbanitas. La prima battuta citata è quella rivolta a un candidato figlio di un cuoco, che in sua presenza aveva chiesto il voto a un altro individuo: § 47 ego quoque tibi favebo «anche io ti favorirò», laddove l’ironia consiste nell’uguale pronuncia dell’avverbio quoque e di coque, vocativo di coquus. Nel trattare ancora i doppi sensi, Quintiliano propone un secondo motto di Cicerone, che è però indifendibile, giacché risulta «quasi scurrile» (paene et ipsum scurrile): è il dictum rivolto al console Isaurico, miror quid sit quod pater homo constantissimus, te nobis varium reliquit (§ 48), dove il doppio senso inaccettabile risiederebbe nell’aggettivo varius, che indicherebbe sia il colore della pelle screziato dopo le percosse dategli dal padre,²⁷ sia un temperamento incostante, opposto a quella coerenza che sarebbe invece cifra distintiva del padre di Isaurico.

È opportuno evidenziare come l’aggettivo scurrilis trasmetta un’idea di ironia particolarmente negativa, che è naturalmente legata alla figura dello scurra, il buffone. È prima di tutto Cicerone a individuare in ruoli comici quali lo scurra o il mimus una sorta di pericoloso anti-modello,²⁸ che incarna la tipologia di umorismo da cui l’oratore deve prendere le distanze anche quando vorrebbe esprimere qualcosa di molto spiritoso.²⁹ Numerosi sono i momenti in cui si ammonisce a non scadere nell’ironia scurrile,³⁰ ad esempio associata al rischio

---

²⁷ A supporto di questa interpretazione si cita solitamente Pl. Pseud. 145: Ita ego vestra latera loris faciam ut valide varia sint.

²⁸ Cf. Guérin 2019, 136 per una sintetica messa a quanto sulle figure che per Cicerone veicolano un umorismo scomodo.

²⁹ Cic. de orat. 2.239: In quo non modo illud praecipitur, ne quid insulse, sed etiam, si quid perridicule possis, vitandum est oratori utrumque, ne aut scurrilis iocus sit aut mimicus («a riguardo non solo è norma non dire insulsaggini, ma anche se si può dire qualcosa di molto spiritoso l’oratore deve evitare due pericoli: di portare lo scherzo al livello di quelli dei buffoni o dei mimi»).

³⁰ Cic. de orat. 2.244, dove, insieme alla dicacitas scurrile e ai mimi, vengono citati gli ethologi, cioè figure che imitano i caratteri con i gesti (il termine, oltre che in de orat. 2.242, ricorre anche in CIL 6.10129): Sed ut in illo superiore genere vel narrationis vel imitationis vitanda est mimorum et ethologicalorum similitudo, sic in hoc scurrilis oratori dicacitas magno opere fugienda es («ma come nel genere precedente, comprendente l’aneddoto e la caricatura, l’oratore deve evitare di abbasarsi al livello dei mimi e degli imitatori, così in questo deve scrupolosamente schivare la comicità grossolana»); 2.245: Ergo haec, quae cadere possunt in quos nolis, quamvis sint bella, sunt tamen ipso genere scurrilia («dunque tutte quelle battute che possono andare a colpire chi non si vorrebbe, anche se spiritose, sono tuttavia, per la loro stessa natura, grossolane»); per una brillante trattazione di questi passi, cf. Corbell 1996, 27–30. Nella Pro Quinctio 11, il banditore Nevio viene descritto come uno scurra privo di facezia (nam neque parum facetus
di offendere persone non coinvolte nella dinamica del motto, come nel caso dell’oratore L. Marcio Filippo, che, facendo una battuta sulla piccola statura del suo testimone, finì per attirare le risate sulla piccola statura del giudice.31 Nel De oratore 2.24732 leggiamo la spiegazione teorica più articolata sulle differenze tra l’ironia confacente all’oratore e quella scurrile. In particolare, si spiega come l’oratore si debba distinguere dal buffone grazie a specifiche attitudini e competenze riassumibili nella capacità di rispettare i concetti di convenienza, misura e tempestività. Espressioni e termini come temporis ratio, moderatio, temperantia e raritas, in relazione ai dicta, coagulano una lezione di stile nell’esprimere l’ironia che tuttavia Cicerone, nell’accusa dei suoi detrattori di non aver rispettato il modus, sembra aver tradito. Come chiosa Cicerone nel passo in questione, se l’oratore impiega i motti di spirito per un motivo preciso, cioè quando ritiene di trarne vantaggio, e non certo per apparire semplicemente ridiculus, lo scura\na lo fa invece continuamente e senza una ragione predefinita, laddove l’espressione che svela la ratio dietro il motteggio è cum causa, quella che esprime l’assennatezza dello scura\na è sine causa. Anche nell’Orator lo scura\na, insieme al mimus, si contrappongono all’oratore, il primo per un uso del ridicolo troppo frequente, il secondo per un tipo di umorismo che vira verso un’eccessiva oscenità, caratteristiche che in via definitiva contravvengono all’ideale del decorum.33

32 Cic. de orat. 2.247: Temporis igitur ratio et ipsius dicacitatis moderatio et temperantia et raritas dictorum distinguunt oratorem a scurr, et quod nos cum causa dicimus, non ut ridiculi videamur, sed ut proficiamus aliquid, illi totum diem et sine causa («diremo allora che la valutazione delle circostanze, l’autodisciplina e la moderazione nell’uso del motto e un uso parco di esso, sono i tratti che distinguono l’oratore dal buffone. E inoltre il fatto che noi usiamo il motto di spirito a ragion veduta, per un preciso motivo, non per riuscire divertenti, mentre i buf\nnoni lo fanno di continuo e senza motivo»).
33 Cic. orat. 88: Illud admonemus tamen ridiculo sic usurum oratorem ut nec nimis frequenti ne scurrile sit, nec sub obsceno ne mimicum [...] haec enim ad illud indecorum referuntur («noi lo consigliamo a non servirsi del ridicolo in modo troppo frequente, per non apparire un buffone,
La forza paradigmatica dell’umorismo scurrile è per Cicerone tanto più chiara se consideriamo anche il contesto delle lettere, privo di una programmatica funzione teorica ed educativa. In due delle lettere a Papirio Peto, che costituiscono sia una riflessione teorica sul faceto sia una sorta di sperimentazione pratica, l’umorismo scurrile viene reciprocamente rinfacciato con lo scopo di canzonare la rispettiva tendenza a un’ironia eccessiva, associata a figure sceratte nella teorizzazione dell’ironia. Cicerone riferisce di sopportare tranquillamente di essere apostrofato dall’amico quale *scurrus veles* «buffone attaccabrighe», proprio perché Peto, se difendiamo la lezione *sannionum*, in una precedente lettera era stato da lui definito *sannio* «buffone», per il fatto di aver inscenato un mimo. *Sannio* è parola ciceroniana, impiegata proprio nella trattazione sulle facezie del *De oratore* in un passo esemplare sulla teorizzazione del faceto urbano. A suffragare infatti la celebre sentenza *non esse omnia ridicula faceta*, Cicerone incalza chiedendosi se ci sia qualcosa di tanto ridicolo quanto un buffone, *sannio* appunto: *de orat.* 2.251: *Quid enim potest esse tam ridiculum quam sannio est?*

Quintiliano, sull’inevitabile scorta di Cicerone e delle sue riflessioni teoriche, mette più volte in guardia dall’esprimere uno spirito che sia vicino a quello dello *scurra*, citato come *exemplum vitandum* ancora insieme ai mimi e agli

...
stolti\textsuperscript{38} e a cui, al § 82, si attribuisce l’\textit{in se dicere}, cioè lo scherzare su se stessi, azione, questa, non appropriata a un oratore.\textsuperscript{39}

Tornando alle battute ciceroniane citate da Quintiliano come esempi da evitare, quella contro Pletorio (§ 51),\textsuperscript{40} accusatore di Fonteio difeso da Cicerone, mostra invece un doppio uso delle parole \textit{ludus e magister}, che per Quintiliano si configura come un \textit{aenigma}, termine che implica un giudizio inesorabilmente negativo, poiché rimanda a un’interpretazione oscura e difficile, contraria al principio di chiarezza proclamato dallo stesso Cicerone. Proprio nel \textit{De oratore} 167, nel trattare le metafore, si riconosce l’importanza come \textit{ornamentum}, ma mette in guardia dal rischio di divenire oscuri, proponendo un parallelo con gli \textit{aenigmata}.\textsuperscript{41} Anche in questo caso, vi è un antecedente aristotelico, poiché nella \textit{Poetica} l’\textit{αἴνιγμα} è ritenuto l’estrema conseguenza di un cattivo uso delle metafore.\textsuperscript{42}

I giochi di parole basati sulla manipolazione dei nomi e delle lettere che li compongono, così come quelli legati ai doppi sensi dei nomi propri rientrano per

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{38} Quint. 6.3.8: \textit{Cum videatur autem res levis, et quae a scurris, mimis, insipientibus denique saepe moveatur, tamen habet vim nescio an imperiosissimam et cui repugnari minime potest} («benché sembri poi reazione di poco conto e che spesso viene suscitata dai buffoni, dai mimi e persino dagli stolti, il riso ha tuttavia una forza – oserei dire – davvero incontrollabile a cui è praticamente impossibile opporsi»); cf. anche 6.3.29. Quint. 6.3.29: \textit{Oratori minime convenit distortus vultus gestusque, quae in mimis rideri solent. Dicacitas etiam scurrilis et scaenica huic personae alienissima est} («all’oratore non si addicono affatto le smorfie e i gesti strani, che di solito fanno ridere nei mimi. Alla sua figura è del tutto estranea anche la mordacità scurrile, da palcoscenico»); come emerge chiaramente da quest’ultimo passo, l’oscenità veicolata dal parallelo con il mimo ha a che fare con la \textit{actio}, è cioè legata a una gestualità eccessiva, appunto associata ai mimi. \textit{Lo scurrà} è invece chiamato in causa per criticare l’ironia dell’oratore sul piano dei verba.
\item \textsuperscript{39} Quint. 6.3.82: \textit{In se dicere non fere est nisi scurrarum et in oratore utique minime probabile: quod fieri totidem modis quot in alios potest} («scherzare su se stessi generalmente non è che da buffoni, e comunque non lo si approva in un oratore: lo si può fare in tanti modi quanti ce ne sono per farlo a danno degli altri»); al § 23, il secondo utilizzo del \textit{ridiculum} era proprio il \textit{risum petere ex nobis}.
\item \textsuperscript{40} Quint. 6.3.51: \textit{Pervenit res usque ad aenigma, quale est Ciceronis in Plaetorium Fontei accusatorem, [...] quamquam hic \textit{ludus} per tralationem dictum est, \textit{magistri} per ambiguitatem} («si giunge anche all’enigma, come accade con Cicerone contro Pletorio, accusatore di Fonteio [...] qui però \textit{ludus} è usato in senso traslato, e \textit{magistri} come doppio senso»).
\item \textsuperscript{41} Cic. de orat. 3.167: \textit{Est hoc magnum ornamentum orationis, in quo obscuritas fugienda est; etenim hoc fere genere fiunt ea, quae dicturum aenigmata} («questo è un efficace ornamento stilistico, a patto che si eviti la mancanza di chiarezza: per lo più da questo genere di figura derivano infatti quelli che si chiamano enigmi»).
\item \textsuperscript{42} Aristot. Poet. 1458a 24–30; nella \textit{Retorica} però si sostiene che, a partire da enigmi ben costruiti, è possibile formulare anche buone metafore (1405b 4–5).
\end{itemize}
Quintiliano tra gli artifici retorici frigida e quindi da evitare.\footnote{Quint. 6.3.53: \textit{Haec tam frigida quam est nominum fictio adiectis, detractis, mutatis litteris}; Corbeill 1996, 95–96.} Sono ancora due passi dalle \textit{Verrine}\footnote{Cic. \textit{Verr.} 4.43.95; 1.96.121.} che assurgono a cattivo esempio, per criticare l’umorismo sul nome Verres, che si prestava a doppi sensi e giochi di parole.\footnote{Quint. 6.3.55: \textit{Multa ex hoc \<genere\> Ciceron\, sed\ ut ab aliis dicta: modo futurum ut omnia rereret \[sc. cum diceretur Verres\], modo Herculi, quem expilaverat, molestiorem quam aprum Erymanthium fuisse, modo malum sacerdotem qui tam nequam verrem reliquisset, quia Sacerdoti Verres successerat} («lo stesso vale per le battute costruite sui nomi propri, Cicerone nell’accusare Verre gioca molto sul suo nome, ma attribuisce quegli scherzi ad altri: dice ora che Verre avrebbe spazzato tutto, ora che per Ercole, di cui aveva spogliato il tempio, era stato più dannoso del cinghiale dell’Erimanto, ora che era un cattivo sacerdote quello che aveva lasciato un verro così dissoluto, poiché Verre era succeduto a Sacerdote»); sui giochi di parole nelle \textit{Verrine}, cf. Corbeill 1996, 91–95.

In questo caso però Quintiliano ripropone la strategia difensiva ciceroniana già impiegata in precedenza, ricordando come questi giochi venissero attribuiti ad altri personaggi, e implicitamente scagionando Cicerone dall’accusa di averli ideati.

Se Cicerone e in particolare il \textit{De oratore} rappresentavano quindi il chiaro modello per la trattazione \textit{De risu}, si è anche illustrato come i \textit{dicta} \textit{Ciceronis} potessero prestarsi a contraddire il modello di ironia urbana prescritto dallo stesso Cicerone. I \textit{dicta} sconvenienti, scurri o addirittura oscuri citati da Quintiliano convivono con altri motti ironici, che vengono giudicati invece \textit{praeclara}\footnote{Kühnert 1962, 44–45; oltre alla raccolta di \textit{dicta} a cura di Domizio Afro, si allude anche alla possibilità di una collezione che risale a Domizio Marso, citato negli ultimi paragrafi della trattazione per il \textit{De urbanitate}, su cui cf. Ramage 1959.} o, come nel caso di un gioco di parole delle \textit{Verrine}, accettabili perché in accordo ai principi di convenienza e opportunità, qui rispettati grazie all’incorrere di una circostanza favorevole alla battuta (\textit{quaedam felicitas}).\footnote{Quint. 6.3.49: \textit{Sed illud ex eodem genere praeclaram.}} Per giustificare il contrasto tra l’ammirazione e una sorta di disagio di Quintiliano rispetto all’umorismo di Cicerone, si è ipotizzato l’uso, accanto al materiale letterario ciceroniano, di altre raccolte di detti, che, secondo l’analisi di Kühnert, dovevano presumibilmente ordinare i \textit{dicta} ciceroniani secondo generi particolari (come ad esempio i doppi sensi), considerati biasimevoli e non conformi ai canoni dell’umorismo retorico.\footnote{Quint. 6.3.56: \textit{Praebet tamen aliquidando occasionem quaedam felicitas hoc quoque bene utendi, \textit{ut pro Caecina Cicero in testem Sex. Clodium Phormionem} («talvolta però una circostanza favorevole offre l’occasione di usare proficuamente anche questo genere di expediente; ne sono esempio le parole che Cicerone pronuncia contro il testimone Sesto Clodio Formione nella difesa di Cecina»).}
Un’ultima riflessione scaturisce ancora una volta dal confronto con le epistole ciceroniane. Come nel caso dell’ironica rivendicazione della scurrilità nella lettera a Peto, Cicerone sembra deliberatamente prestare il fianco alle critiche che ritroviamo nella rappresentazione quintilianea. Nella già citata lettera a Volumnio, Cicerone ricorda al destinatario quali siano i criteri per riconoscere l’autenticità della sua ironia. L’elenco proposto cita caratteristiche come l’αμφιβολία, il doppio senso, primo dei vizi individuati da Quintiliano nei dicta ironici, e già considerato come vizio nelle scuole di retorica, o l’elegans ὑπερβολή, che, se pur nella connotazione di eleganza, richiama il difetto dell’eccesso comico.

3 Cicero mimicus

Le pagine di Quintiliano risultano centrali nella ricezione e trasmissione dell’immagine di Cicerone umorista e, proprio perché talvolta apologetiche nei confronti delle facezie ciceroniane, ci mettono in condizione di interrogarci su quali fossero le voci che avevano criticato o quanto meno discusso l’ironia e i giochi di spirito ciceroniani.

Una testimonianza che vale la pena di analizzare si legge nelle Controversie di Seneca padre, nelle parole del retore Cassio Severo, che traccia una vera e propria storia della tendenza a formulare sentenze usando parole con un doppio senso, definite poco prima sententiae Publilianae o, come si legge dopo, mimico genere sententiae. Secondo il retore Mosco, tale insania diffusissima soprattutto

49 Supra, p. 305; fam. 7.32.2: Sed quoniam tanta faex est in urbe ut nihil tam sit ἀκόθηρον quod non alicui venustum esse videatur, pugna, si me amas, nisi acuta ὑμηρβολία, nisi elegans ὑπερβολή, nisi παράγραμμα bellum, nisi ridiculimum παρὰ προσδοκίαν, nisi cetera quae sunt a me in secundo libro de oratore per Antoni personam disputata de ridiculis ἐντέχνα et arguta apparebunt, ut sacramentum comprehendas mea non esse («ma a Roma c’è una tale quantità di feccia che nulla è tanto »privo di grazia« da non avere chi lo trovi elegante. E allora combatti, se ti preme di me. A meno che non ci sia una pungente »anfibologia«, un’elegante »iperbole«, un grazioso »para-gramma« e un comico »aprosdìketon«; a meno che tutti gli altri mezzi per far ridere da me trattati per bocca di Antonio nel secondo libro De oratore non appaiano messi in opera »con arte« e finezza: dichiara con energia e sotto giuramento che non è opera mia»).

50 Infra, p. 311.

51 Sen. contr. 7.3.8–9; il testo di Seneca è quello stabilito da Winterbottom 1974.

52 La definizione di sententiae Publilianae si legge in Sen. contr. 7.4.8, dove si dice di Mureddio che a parte patris colorum et Publilianam sententiam dedit; la «sentenza publiliana» è citata appena dopo: Abdicationes, inquit, suas veneno diluit; et iterum: mortem, inquit, meam effudit. L’appellativo mimicus viene invece da contr. 75.15 dove si cita ancora una sentenza di Mureddio (Mureddius mimicus genere fatuum sententiam dixit). Quindi le sententiae Publilianae consistevano
tra i giovani sarebbe stata introdotta dal mimografo Publilio Siro. Severo, grande ammiratore di Publilio, correge l'interpretazione di Mosco e individua le origini del vizio di usare una «parola che veicoli più significati insieme» (vitium [...] quod ex captione unius verbi plura significantis nascitur) – il doppio senso, appunto – non tanto nella persona di Publilio, che le avrebbe usate nelle cosiddette sententiae Publilianae, ma nella persona di Pomponio, l'autore di Atellane. Anche Quintiliano, come affermato poco fa, riconosceva nell’atellanus mos un concentrato di oscurità minimamente adatto a caratterizzare i ridicula dicta degni di un oratore, trattato non a caso insieme all’amphibolia e alle cadute di gusto di Cicerone. Dopo Pomponio, nella ricostruzione di Severo, tale caratteristica retorica sarebbe passata per via di imitazione prima al mimografo Decimo Laberio e poi a Cicerone, che l’aveva impiegata numerose volte tanto nelle orazioni quanto nei normali discorsi, e che da vizio ne avrebbe fatto però una virtù:

Deinde auctorem huius viti, quod ex captione unius verbi plura significantis nascitur, aiebat Pomponium Atellanarum scriptore mf uisse, a quo primum ad Laberium transisse hoc studium imitando, deinde ad Ciceronem, qui illud ad virtutem transtulisset. Nam ut transeam innumerabilia quae Cicero in orationibus aut in sermone dixit ex <ea> nota, ut non referam a Laberio dicta, cum mimi eius, quidquid modo tolerabile habent, tale habeant, id quod Cicero in e.q.s.


53 Sen. contr. 7.3.8: Memini Moschum, <cum> loqueretur de hoc genere sententiarum, quo infecta iam erant adolescentulumorum omnium ingenia, queri de Publilio quasi ille [iam] hanc insaniam introductisset («mi ricordo che Mosco, parlando di questo tipo di concetti, dal quale erano già contagiati gli’ingegni di tutti i nostri adolescenti, se la prendeva con Publilio, quasi avesse introdotto lui questa specie di mania», le traduzioni di Seneca Padre sono di Zanon Dal Bo 1988).

54 Questa definizione ricorda uno dei casi di corrupta oratio descritti da Quintiliano in 8.3.57: Corrupta oratio [...] vocum simili aut ambiguarum puerili captatione consistent.
Diceva poi che questo vizio, che consiste nell’usare una parola in più significati insieme, era stato introdotto da Pomponio, l’autore d’Atellane, dal quale era passato, per via d’imitazione, prima a Laberio, poi a Cicerone, che ne fecero una qualità. Infatti, senza citare gl’innumerevoli esempi che ce n’ha lasciati Cicerone e nemmeno quelli di Laberio i cui mimi se hanno qualcosa di tollerabile l’hanno in questo, riferirò quanto Cicerone (disse) in e.q.s.

A questo proposito, viene citato l’episodio che vede Cicerone e Laberio scontrarsi in una sorta di gara di facezie a seguito della famosa competizione fra Publilio e Laberio al cospetto di Cesare, dove il secondo, come conseguenza dell’avere calcolato le scene come mimo, azione ritenuta disonorevole, fu costretto a rinunciare al rango di cavaliere. Publilio risultò il vincitore della competizione, e Laberio fu reintegrato da Cesare tra i cavalieri, che però gli impedirono di tornare a sedere tra le loro file a teatro. Da qui il motteggio di Cicerone (iocatus est) e la risposta di Laberio (Sen. contr. 7.3.9):

> Laberium divus Iulius ludis suis mimum produxit, deinde equestri illum ordini reddidit; iussit ire sessum in equestria; omnes ita se coarta verunt ut venientem non reciperent. Cicero male audiebat tamquam nec Pompeio certus amicus nec Caesari, sed utriusque adulator. Multos tunc in senatum legerat Caesar, et ut repereret exhaustum bello civili ordinem et ut eis qui bene de partibus meruerant gratiam referret. Cicero in utramque rem iocatus <est>; misit enim ad Laberium transeuntem: recepissem te nisi an gustes ederem. Laberius ad Ciceronem remisit: atqui soles duabus sellis sedere. Uterque elegantissime, sed neuter in hoc genere servat modum.

> Il divino Giulio fece recitar Laberio nei suoi giochi, poi lo restituì all’ordine equestre e l’invitò ad andar a sedere sui banchi dei cavalieri; ma tutti serrarono le file in modo da non lasciarli posto. Cicerone non godeva buona fama, come amico non sicuro sia di Pompeo sia di Cesare, ma adulator d’ambidue. In quel tempo Cesare aveva nominato molti nuovi senatori per rinsanguare un ordine che la guerra civile aveva stremato e anche per ricompensare i suoi più validi sostenitori. Cicerone fece dello spirito su ambidue questi motivi; lanciò infatti a Laberio che passava: «t’avrei fatto posto, se non sedessi così stretto». Laberio rilanciò a Cicerone: «eppure sei solito sedere su due sedie». Ambidue con molta eleganza; ma nessuno dei due in questo genere seppe conservare la misura.

I motti si presentano a tutti gli effetti come mimico genere sententiae, basandosi rispettivamente sul doppio senso dell’avverbio anguste e dell’espressione duabus sellis sedere. L’avverbio allude sia al gesto dei cavalieri di serrare le fila, sia al provvedimento di Cesare di nominare nuovi senatori, che riduceva lo spazio dei senatori già in carica, mentre l’espressione duabus sellis sedere, partendo

---

55 Per la gara mimica tra Publilio e Laberio, che vide sconfitto Laberio, cf. Macr. Sat. 2.7.1–11.
56 Il motteggio tra Cicerone e Laberio è narrato anche da Macr. Sat. 2.3.9–11; 7.3.8–9; cf. Giancotti 1967, 190.
dall’immagine concreta di Cicerone «seduto», vuole anche alludere al doppio-giochismo politico, per usare un termine oggi in voga, di Cicerone (poco prima si fa riferimento alla cattiva fama di Cicerone, ambiguo e non vero amico di Cesare né di Pompeo, ma piuttosto adulator di entrambi).

Il commento di Cassio Severo è che sia Cicerone sia Laberio avevano parlato elegantissime, cioè «in modo molto arguto», avverbio, questo, pienamente conforme a un umorismo urbanus, che assume un significato quasi tecnico per introdurre motti faceti e che in Seneca Padre è impiegato ad esempio nei riguardi di Montano Vozieno, che elegantissime prendeva in giro le futilità dei retori (contr. 9.6.10: *Itaque elegantissime deridebat Montanus Votienus in hac controversia ineptias rhetorum*). Se da una parte a Cicerone e Laberio viene quindi riconosciuta arguzia nei motti pronunciati, dall’altra si mette in rilievo un vizio comune a entrambi, quello cioè di aver oltrepassato il limite in questa tipologia di scherzi (*uterque elegantissime, sed neuter in hoc genere servat modum*). L’elegantia e la violazione del *modus* anticipa quanto letto in Quintiliano, che in prima istanza difende l’urbanitas di Cicerone, ponendo semmai un problema di numero eccessivo di motti, che comunque non dipende da Cicerone, ma da chi ha organizzato la raccolta dei dicta.

La cosa che più dovrebbe tuttavia stupirci è che Cicerone compaia prima nella genesi stilistica del doppio senso insieme ad autori di mimi e di atellane, e che venga poi di seguito ritratto in coppia, e cioè in piena affinità stilistico-umoristica, con un autore di mimi, la categoria dichiaratamente esercitata da Quintiliano per quanto riguarda il riso e, prima di lui, dallo stesso Cicerone.

In particolare, mi pare opportuno sottolineare che Cicerone e Laberio non siano semplicemente associati per uno stile affine, ma siano ritratti insieme in quella che potremmo definire un’esecuzione «mimica» dal vivo. Un passo dal *Satyricon* petroniano ci presenta nuovamente Cicerone in coppia con Publilio Siro. È il momento in cui Trimalchione chiede al maestro di retorica Agamennone che differenze ci siano tra Cicerone e Publilio Siro, rispondendo poi che per lui Cicerone detiene il primato nella *facundia*, Publilio nell’etica: (*Petron. 55: Donec Trimalchio «rogo — inquit — magister, quid putas inter Ciceronem et Publílium interesse? Ego alterum puto disertiorem fuísse, alterum honestiorem»*). La successiva citazione di versi che, se pur con qualche incertezza, sarebbero da at-

---

57 Ricordo di nuovo 6.3.8: *Cum videatur autem res levis, et quae a scurris, mimitis, insipientibus denique saepe moveatur, et 6.3.29: Oratori minime convenit distortus vultus gestusque, quae in mimitis rideri solent.*

58 Si confronti il già citato *de orat. 2.239: Ne aut scurrilis iocus sit aut mimicus.*

59 Sul passo di Seneca su Cicerone e Publilio Siro, segnalo il contributo di Barbieri 2020.
tribuire allo stesso Publilio,\textsuperscript{60} parrebbe una conferma della preferenza da parte di Trimalchione per l’\textit{exemplum} etico di Publilio, rispetto al \textit{disertus} Cicerone. La coppia Cicerone-Publilio Siro è stata spesso interpretata come assolutamente inappropriata e frutto di un’affermazione bislacca e stravagante di Trimalchione.\textsuperscript{61} Come però hanno messo in luce studi petroniani recenti,\textsuperscript{62} Trimalchione si comporta in maniera molto più sapiente e conveniente di quanto sia stato fino a ora osservato. L’associazione di Cicerone e Publilio, infatti, lungi dal costituire una sciocchezza «sparata» da Trimalchione, diviene comprensibile alla luce di un dibattito che doveva essere sorto nelle scuole di retorica intorno alla figura di Publilio e all’uso delle \textit{sententiae Publilianae}.\textsuperscript{63} Cicerone e la sua capacità di formulare \textit{dicta} comici con un gusto evidente per i doppi sensi erano evidentemente sentiti come affini all’uso delle \textit{Publilianae}, e tale affinità avrebbe reso Cicerone assimilabile al mimo-Publilio nell’interrogativo posto da Trimalchione a Agamennone, che non a caso è un personaggio che bene rappresenta il modello di intellettuale formatosi nelle scuole di declamazione. L’aneddoto su Publilio, Cicerone, Laberio e la tenzone comica tra quest’ultimi due ne sarebbe la conferma.

4 Plutarco e l’umorismo sconveniente di Cicerone, 1. Un problema di moderazione

Anche le vite parallele di Cicerone e Demostene di Plutarco offrono materiale imprescindibile per la ricostruzione del ritratto del Cicerone umorista.\textsuperscript{64} Nel

\textsuperscript{60} Tra gli autori che offrono contributi recenti, Lucarini 2013 considera i versi come originali di Publilio, Setaioli 2011, 113–129 giudica invece i versi come una composizione trimalchionesca.

\textsuperscript{61} A scopo esemplificativo, si leggano per tutti i giudizi di Schmeling 2013, 224: «the question about a comparison between Cicero and Publilius is silly» o di Gianotti 2013, 391: «il confronto inusuale e il giudizio successivo sono da imputare alla cultura trimalchionesca»; ma un primo segno di ammonimento rispetto al considerare assurda la coppia Cicerone-Publilio è già in Giancotti 1967, 240: «basta considerare queste testimonianze [sc. i passi di Seneca padre] per avvertire che a volte si esagera a proposito dell’assurdità del confronto tra Cicerone e Publilio».


\textsuperscript{63} Cfr. Berti 2007, 189, che fa riferimento al passo del \textit{Satyricon} e all’accostamento «in apparenta assurdo e frutto della cultura trimalchionesca».

\textsuperscript{64} Plutarco è una preziosa risorsa anche per la citazione dei \textit{Dicta Ciceronis: Cic.} 1.5–6; 5.6; 7.6–7; 9.3; 25; 26; 27.2–6; 38.3–8; 40.4; \textit{Caes.} 4.8; 58.2; \textit{Cato min.} 6.4; \textit{apophth. Cic.} 17.
parlare dell’umorismo di Cicerone, Plutarco si sente immediatamente di fornire un chiarimento preliminare, spiegando come il ricorso a battute pungenti contro nemici politici e oppositori in ambito processuale sia una delle caratteristiche dell’eloquenza.65 Tale giustificazione dal tono precettistico serve però a enfatizzare la distanza tra questo tipo di battute «lecite» nell’oratoria e l’atteggiamento di Cicerone, che per Plutarco si degrada invece al livello dell’«offendere chiunque per suscitare il riso», dove il verbo προορκοῦω significa in prima istanza «sbattere contro», veicolando dunque una carica semantica di aggressività fisica traslata sul piano verbale. D’altra parte, anche in precedenza, nella vita di Cicerone, Plutarco aveva parlato di una piacevole (ευτραπελία) disposizione all’arguzia, di scherzi e battute raffinati e appropriati all’oratore, cui faceva tuttavia torto un problema di moderazione (κατακόρως):

65 Plut. Cic. 27: Τὸ μὲν οὖν πρὸς ἐχθροὺς ἢ πρὸς ἀντιδίκους σκῶματα χρῆσθαι πικροτέροις δοκεῖ ρητορικάν εἶναι- τὸ δ’ οἷς ἔτυχε προορκοῦντες ἕνεκα τοῦ γελοίου πολὺ συνήχε μίας αὐτῷ («ora, quella di usare espressioni pungenti verso gli avversari politici e nei processi può sembrare una caratteristica tipica di un oratore; però, il suo vizio di offendere tutti quelli che gli capitavano per far ridere gli attirò molto odio», le traduzioni dalle vite di Demostene e Cicerone sono di Mugello [in Scardigli 2018]).

66 Plut. Cic. 5; in comp. Dem. Cic. 1, rispetto all’altero Demostene, Cicerone è descritto come un uomo «di buonumore e di spirito» (γέλωτος οἶκευός) e con la faccia sempre «sorridente e gioviale» (φιλοσκόπτης).

67 Cf. infra, p. 316 n. 79.

68 Cic. fam. 7.32.1: Deinde εὐτραπελία litterarum fecit ut interlegerem tuas esse; come è stato notato (da ultima Beard 2014, 105) qui ci sarebbe anche un gioco con il cognomen di Volumnio, Eutrapelus.

69 Plut. Cic. 38: Καὶ τοῦ παρασκόπτητειν τι καὶ λέγειν ἂει χαρίζει εἰς τοὺς συμμάχους οὐκ ἀπεχόμενος, ἀλλ’ αὐτὸς μὲν ἀγέλαστος ἂει περιών ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ καὶ σκυθρωπός, ἐτέρους δὲ
quando, nella seconda *Filippica*, dichiarò di non replicare all’accusa di Antonio che gli rinfacciava l’abitudine, evidentemente considerata fuori luogo, di scherzare (*de iocis usum esse*) negli accampamenti. La giustificazione ciceroniana che segue, volta a difendere la pratica faceta *in castris*, e che rende quindi l’affermazione precedente alla stregua di una *praeteritio*, fa appello all’inquietudine (*cura*) dei compagni e all’utilità di sollevare gli animi che si trovano in situazioni critiche.⁷ Se Cicerone conclude tale digressione umoristica assolvendosi come moderato, quello che rimane nel racconto plutarcheo ⁷³ è invece il ritratto di un Cicerone corrucciato, «che non ride» (*ἀγέλαστος*), ma che fa ridere gli altri, anche se gli altri, come si specifica, non ne avevano bisogno (*ἐτέροις δὲ παρέχων γέλωτα μηδὲν δεομένοις*). Con quest’ultima precisazione, Plutarco enfatizza l’interpretazione della problematicità dell’umorismo di Cicerone in una chiave etico-filosofica, che implica prima di tutto violazione del πρόπον, del *decorum*, laddove, come osservato nel *De oratore*, era proprio la constatazione dell’opportunità del momento, l’individuazione della ratio e dei possibili vantaggi nel formulare motti spiritosi, che distingueva l’oratore dallo *scurrus*. La sconvenienza del comportamento di Cicerone trovandosi inoltre una sua piena teorizzazione nella comparazione con Demostene. Plutarco tira prima in ballo battute che spesso finivano per diventare buffonate. Dall’ironia urbana, dunque, coagulata nell’aggettivo sostantivato *σκωπτικός*, Cicerone si fa letteralmente trascinare nel terreno dell’ironia volgare, espressa dal termine βωμολοχός.

παρέχων γέλωτα μηδὲν δεομένοις («non si tratteneva nemmeno dal beffeggiare e fare dell’ironia sugli alleati. Andava in giro per l’accampamento serio e corrucciato e faceva ridere gli altri, loro malgrado»).

⁷⁰ Gudeman 1920, 44–45.
⁷¹ Cic. *Phil.* 2.39–40: *Ne <de> iocis quidem respondebo quibus me in castris usum esse dixisti: erant quidem illa castra plena curae; verum tamen homines, quamvis in turbidis rebus sint, tamen, si modo homines sunt, interdum animis relaxantur. Quod autem idem maestitia meam reprehendit, idem iocum, magno argumento est me in utroque fuisse moderatum* («e non voglio risponderti nemmeno a proposito delle battute di spirito alle quali, stando alle tue parole, mi sarei lasciato andare mentre erto all’accampamento. In verità quell’accampamento era pieno di inquietudine, e tuttavia gli uomini, anche se si trovano nelle situazioni più critiche, cercano qualche volta, se soltanto sono uomini, un po’ di sollievo. Il fatto però che sia sempre la stessa persona a deplorare il mio atteggiamento sia triste sia scherzoso, dimostra ampiamente che io ho saputo conservare la misura in entrambi i casi») il testo delle *Filippiche* è quello stabilito da Clark 1918; trad. di Bellardi 1975–1978).

⁷² Le motivazioni addotte da Cicerone sono simili a quelle utilizzate all’inizio della trattazione *de risu* da Quintiliano, e che adatta però la necessità del riso alle tensioni forensi (6.3.1: *Illos tristes solvit affectus et animum ab intentione rerum frequenter avertit et aliquando etiam reficit et a satietate vel a fatigacione renovat*).

⁷³ Supra, n. 69.
Κιϰέρων δὲ πολλαχοῦ τῷ σκωπτιᾷ πρὸς τὸ βωμολόχον ἐκφερομένος, καὶ πράγματα σπουδῆς ἄξια γέλωτι καὶ παιδιά κατειρωνεύμονος ἐν ταῖς δίκαιαις εἰς τὸ χρειῶδες, ἤμεθείς τοῦ πρέποντος.⁷⁴

Al contrario, Cicerone spinge spesso la sua mania di prendere in giro fino all’indecenza, e affrontando argomenti seri, nei processi, col sorriso e battute di spirito, superava il limite della convenienza.

La parola βωμολόχος, che etimologicamente allude ai ladruncoli che commettevano furti sugli altari sacri (deriva infatti da βωμός e λόχος),⁷⁵ in Aristofane connota i furbì che ingannano beffardi e a cui viene conseguentemente associata la comicità triviale deglì strati sociali più abietti. Nell’ambito della critica letteraria, il termine indica la comicità volgare e poeti rivali.⁷⁶ Anche Platone nella Repubblica⁷⁷ la impiega ancora in connessione con il teatro comico, in riferimento a una comicità triviale e pericolosa, perché capace di provocare piacere e emulazione in chi normalmente dovrebbe avere timore di apparire come un buffone (φοβούμενος δόξαν βωμολοχίας). È Aristotele a connotare negativamente la βωμολοχία senza necessario riferimento al teatro comico.⁷⁸ Nell’Etica Eudemia⁷⁹ viene discussa l’eutrassia, virtù che, come appena osservato, Plutarco attribuisce a Cicerone, per indicare la sua tendenza all’arguzia, che tuttavia è guastata dalla mancanza di moderazione.⁸⁰ Per Aristotele la βωμολοχία è una delle componenti estreme dell’eutrassia, virtù mediana tra due eccessi,⁸¹ e, per esprimere la sua connessione semantica con la mancanza di misura, viene associata all’uomo ingordo,⁸² poiché, fuor di metafora, implica la fruizione-ingerimento di ogni forma comica facilmente onorata (εὐχέρως καὶ ἥδεως). È l’eutrassia che sa discernere tra le varie forme comiche secondo ragione», κατὰ τὸν λόγον, e tale principio è in piena sintonia con l’af-

---

⁷⁵ Cf. il frammento della Tiranide di Ferecrate 150 PCG.
⁷⁶ Rimando ai ricchi lavori di Kidd 2012 e Caciagli et al. 2016 per una trattazione sistematica dei termini βωμολοχία-βωμολόχος e un’ampia messe di esempi testuali.
⁷⁷ Plat. rep. 606c5–9; sul passo, cf. Trivigno 2019, 18–19.
⁷⁹ Aristot. EE 1234a3–23.
⁸⁰ Supra, p. 314.
⁸¹ Nella Retorica 1389b 11 è definita «insolenza ben educata», πεπαιδευμένη ηβρίς.
⁸² Aristot. EE. 1234a 5–9: “Ὅσπερ γὰρ περὶ τροφὴν ὁ σικχὸς τοῦ πατρόφου διαφέρει τῷ ὃ μὲν μηθὲν ἢ ὅλιγα καὶ χαλεπὰς προσέσθαι, ὃ δὲ πάντα εὐχέρῶς, οὕτω καὶ ὁ ἄγροικος ἔχει πρὸς τὸν φορτικόν καὶ βωμολόχον (infatti, come riguardo al nutrimento il delicato di stomaco differisce dall’ingordo per il fatto che l’uno non ingerisce nessun cibo, o comunque una piccola quantità e a stento, mentre l’altro accetta tutto facilmente, cosi il rozzo sta in rapporto con l’uomo volgare e buffone» trad. Caiani 1996).
fermazione di Cicerone secondo cui l’oratore si distingue dallo scurra per fare spirito cum causa. Se nell’Etica Nicomachea Aristotele insiste nel connotare il βωμολόχος all’insegnà dell’eccesso del γέλοιον, ricercato a tutti costi, nella Retorica leggiamo l’opposizione tra l’εἰρωνεία e la βωμολοχία, la prima degna di un uomo libero, che ride per se stesso, la seconda che si propone esclusivamente di far ridere gli altri, caratteristica messa in luce da Plutarco nei confronti di Cicerone. Questo breve excursus lessicale ci mostra come il termine βωμολοχία, nell’impiego che ne fa Plutarco, attivasse per Cicerone una semantica comica segnata dal vizio dell’eccesso ed alla mancanza di discernimento, se pur percepita come in continua oscillazione con l’ironia lecita e appropriata delle arguzie.

4 Plutarco e l’umorismo sconveniente di Cicerone, 2. Un console che fa troppo ridere

Il seguito del passo di Plutarco dalla comparazione con Demostene, pur implicando un lessico che veicola un umorismo di per sé confacente (παιδιᾷ, γέλωτι, κατειρωνεύμενος), teorizza in maniera esplicita per l’ironia ciceroniana una mancata ottemperanza al decorum, una trascuratezza nei confronti del πρέπον, che si concretizza nell’indirizzare gli scherzi e le risate contro fatti degni di serietà, trattati in sede processuale.

Plutarco fa di seguito riferimento al processo in difesa di Murena, dove Cicerone si era preso gioco di Catone – κυμβαδέω è il verbo qui usato –, suo avversario nel processo, della scuola stoica e dei noti paradossi:

Λέγεται δὲ καὶ Κάτωνος Μουρήναυ διώκοντος ὑπατευων ἀπολογείθαι καὶ πολλὰ διὰ τὸν Κάτωνα κυμβαδέων τὴν Στωικὴν αἰρέσιν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀτοπίαις τῶν παραδόξων λεγομένων δογμάτων· γέλωτος δὲ λαμπρὸν κατιόντος ἐκ τῶν περιεστώτων ἐις τοὺς δικαστὰς, ἦσυχη

83 Cic. de orat. 2.247: Et quod nos cum causa dicimus
84 Aristot. EN 1127b 33–1128b 9.
85 Aristot. Rh. 1419b 8–9: ἔστι δ’ ἢ εἰρωνεία τῆς βωμολοχίας ἐλευθερωτέρων.
86 Nel De officiis 1.104, il primo dei due contrapposti generi di scherzi stabiliti da Cicerone è descritto in primo luogo come illiberalis, cioè come indegno di un uomo libero (duplex omnino est iocandi genus, unum illiberale, petulans, flagitiosum, obscenum, alterum elegans, urbanum, ingeniosum, facetum).
87 Cf. supra p. 316.
διαμειδίασις ὁ Κάτων πρὸς τοὺς παρακαθημένους εἰπεῖν· ‘ὡς γελοῖον ὃ ἀνδρεῖς ἐχομεν ὑπατον’.89

Si racconta anche che, durante il consolato, quando difese Murena, accusato da Catone, Cicerone, per prendersi gioco di lui, abbia messo in ridicolo con molte battute tutta quanta la cerchia degli stoici per l’assurdità dei loro principi chiamati «paradossi». Provocò una grande risata, che dal pubblico si propagò fino ai giudici, ma Catone, con un tranquillo sorriso sulle labbra, disse a quelli che gli sedevano accanto: «però, che console faceto abbiamo, amici!».

In risposta alle risate sollevatesi, Plutarco cita una risposta di Catone Uticense, quando afferma in maniera serafica ‘ὡς γελοῖον ὃ ἀνδρεῖς ἐχομεν ὑπατον’. Tale affermazione ha posto l’interrogativo su quale parola latina corrispondesse al greco γελοίος. All’aggettivo γελοίος nella sua accezione di «ilare, faceto» potrebbero corrispondere facetus, lepidus e iocosus,90 che incarnano l’ideale di uno spirito raffinato ed elegante. In questa direzione vanno le traduzioni «faceto», «amusing», «droll», mentre più neutra è la resa «funny».91 Tuttavia, appena prima, Plutarco parla di risate che si sollevano in reazione alle battute di Cicerone, connotate dall’aggettivo λαμπρός, che significa «chiaro, limpido, evidente». In riferimento alle risate, l’aggettivo andrà dunque inteso come «chiaramente distinguibile, sonoro»,92 «fragoroso» tradurrei qui. La battuta di Cicerone è in grado di suscitare risate rumorose mi pare plausibile che la risposta di Catone volesse alludere a un umorismo non tanto faceto, ma che suscitasse quel riso eccessivo, implicito nell’aggettivo γελοίος, inteso appunto nel suo significato letterale di «che fa ridere» quindi «ridicolo». La traduzione «comedian» offerta da Krostenko93 mi pare che sia più adeguata a questa rappresentazione di Cicerone come un vero istrione da palcoscenico.

Il fatto che Catone definisca Cicerone γελοίος ὑπατος spinge a mio avviso a cercare per γελοίος un significato in ironico e stridente contrasto con ὑπατος, che, dato il suo significato di «alto, elevato», traduce in greco la carica latina di «console», che ricopre la più elevata delle cariche. Come già suggeriscono Leeman e Beard, un aggettivo adatto a tradurre il greco γελοίος potrebbe essere ridiculus;94 infatti da una parte ridiculus costituisce il preciso calco di γελοίος

90 Leeman 1963, 61, 398 n. 100; Krostenko 2001, 225.
91 Mugello (in Scardigli 2018); Dugan 2005, 108; Perrin 1919; Rabbie 2007, 207.
92 Cf. per esempio l’aggettivo impiegato in relazione alla voce, Demosth. De fal. leg. 19, 199; Aristot. HA 545a12, così come Plut. Mor. 768d (= Amat. 22): λαμπρὸν ἀνωλόλυκε «levò un grido di gioia».
93 Krostenko 2001, 224, che però propone lepidus come parola latina.
«che suscita il riso», dall’altra veicola, rispetto a un aggettivo come facetus, una sfumatura semantica negativa, che allude appunto a un umorismo meno raffinato, che ha lo scopo di suscitare risate sonore e in netto contrasto con la figura che il console, somma carica, è chiamato a rappresentare.

È chiaro che lo scontro tra Catone e Cicerone sia da intendere nei termini di una scaramuccia processuale, senza reale acriomonia. Catone era stimato da Cicerone e l’ironia di Cicerone, se si legge la Pro Murena, non è mai veramente offensiva o sconveniente nei confronti di Catone e la scuola stoica da lui rappresentata. Il passo di Plutarco potrebbe tuttavia riportare un aneddoto che si rifà al reale contesto processuale. Cicerone poteva aver esagerato nel provocare le risate dell’uditorio, formulando battute della cui sconvenienza non rimane traccia nella redazione finale del discorso. Come si osserverà a breve, anche la battuta che sarà risolutiva nello scagionare Flacco non è presente nella redazione finale dell’orazione. Catone, altrettanto ironicamente, poteva aver chiamato il console Cicerone ridiculus, rinfacciandogli di non rispettare un tipo di ironia consona alla carica politica svolta e aderendo a un motivo topico della propaganda politica anti-ciceroniana. Nella vita di Catone, Plutarco riporta lo stesso aneddoto proprio in un contesto in cui è elogiata la generosità e la magnanimità dell’Uticense. In questo caso, l’ironia dispiegata da Cicerone contro gli stoici è espressa dai verbi χλευάζω «schernisco, dileggio» di memoria aristofanea, e παρασκώπτω «beffeggiare», già attribuito da Plutarco a Cicerone nella circostanza dell’accampamento di Pompeo. Di fronte a Cicerone che, durante il processo, si prende gioco della scuola stoica con toni che sollevano risate fragorose e che evidentemente saranno smorzati nell’elaborazione finale del discorso, Catone mostra dunque una bonarietà serafica, ma non priva di

95 «Ridicule and mockery of Cato’s Stoic philosophy in the pro Murena prompts us to dwell over Cicero’s argutia and witticism in emotional and logical argumentation» (La Bua 2019, 244); sull’ironia strategica nella Pro Murena, lodata da Quintiliano, La Bua 2019, 242–244; cf. supra, p. 303.

96 Infra, p. 320.

97 Plut. Cat. min. 22: Τής δ’ δίκης λεγομένης ὁ Κικέρων, ὡς πατος ὃν τότε καὶ τῷ Μουρρήνιοι συνδικά, πολλὰ διὰ τὸν Κάτων τοὺς Στωίκους φιλοσόφους καὶ τῶν τὰ παράδοξα καλούμενα δόγματα χλευάζων καὶ παρασκώπτων, γέλωτα παρείχε τοὺς δικαστάς, τὸν οὖν Κάτων φασὶ διαμειδιάσαντα πρὸς τοὺς παρόντας εἰπεῖν ὡς ἀνδρὲς, ὡς γελοιόν ὑπατον ἔχομεν» («il giorno del processo Cicerone, che era difensore di Murena nonché console in carica, incominciò a deridere pesantemente, per colpire Catone, gli stoici e i loro »paradossi«, suscitando l’ilarità dei giudici. Catone, si dice, sorrisse rivolto agli astanti ed esclamò: »Signori, che console faceto abbianol!«», trad. Amerio/Orsì 1998).


99 Cf. supra, p. 315.
ironia, nel designare il console Cicerone come troppo propenso a far ridere.

D’altra parte, è Cicerone stesso ad ammettere, nel De finibus, che nella difesa di Murena aveva impiegato toni eccessivamente scherzosi, privi di sottigliezza.100 Cicerone si giustifica infatti con lo stesso Catone, spiegando che tale ironia era stata motivata dalla necessità di accontentare un uditorio ignorante (apud imperitos).101 È proprio in questa ricerca di un facile consenso, grazie a un’ironia evidentemente non sempre faceta, che risiederebbe la caduta di gusto di Cicerone. Se questa caduta in sede processuale non ci fosse stata, Plutarco non avrebbe avuto ragione di inserire tale aneddoto mentre si occupa di descrivere la magnanimità di Catone. Cicerone, durante il processo, esagerò nel deridere gli stoici, venendo meno agli occhi di Catone, come osserva Leeman,102 al principio di decorum. D’altra parte, Catone ironicamente fa notare quanto Cicerone avesse esagerato, ma, bonariamente, gli perdonava questa caduta di stile.

Sulla possibilità di scegliere ridiculus, va inoltre notato che è con questo aggettivo che Quintiliano traduce γελοιος, relativamente alla materia trattata: 6.3.22: Proprium autem materiae de quae nunc loquimur est ridiculum, ideoque haec tota disputatio a Graecis peri γελοιου inscribitur, «in ogni caso, specifico della materia che stiamo trattando è il ridiculo», e perciò tutta questa dissertazione è intitolata dai Greci peri geloioù».

Tuttavia, i Saturnalia di Macrobio, che, per la citazione e la trasmissione facete dicta di Cicerone, costituiscono una fonte importantissima, potrebbero suggerire un’ulteriore corrispondenza terminologica.103 L’ironia su Cicerone, console che fa ridere, è infatti ricordata nei Saturnalia, nelle parole di Simmaco, prima di citare i detti scherzosi degli antichi. Simmaco associa Cicerone a Plauto104 e identifica nell’orazione in difesa di Lucio Flacco un esempio supremo di arguzia, capace di avere un peso decisivo sulle sorti di un processo.105 In

100 Cic. fin. 4.74: Non ego tecum iam ita iocabor, ut isdem his de rebus, cum L. Murenam te accusante defenderem. Apud imperitos tum illa dicta sunt, aliquid etiam coronae datum; nunc agendum est subtilius («non mi metterò ora a scherzare con te come ho fatto a proposito di questo stesso concetto quando difendevo Lucio Murena di cui tu eri l’accusatore. Quelle furono parole rivolte a profani, un po’ erano anche dedicate alla cerchia degli assidui: ora bisogna svolgere una trattazione più sottile» trad. Marinone 1955).


103 Come osserva ancora Beard 2014, 103.

104 Infra, p. 321 e n. 112.

105 Macr. Sat. 2.1.13: Atque ego, ni longum esset, referrem, in quibus causis, cum nocentissimos reos tuaretur, victoriam ioci adeptus sit: ut ecce pro L. Flacco, quem repetundarum reum ioci oportunitate de manifestissimis criminibus exemit. Is iocus in oratione non extat: mihi ex libro Fusii
particolare, si fa riferimento a una battuta non presente nella versione finale del discorso, che, pronunciata al momento opportuno, avrebbe avuto il merito di far scagionare Flacco da accuse che risultavano fondate. Simmaco ricorda appena prima come Cicerone fosse solito essere chiamato dai suoi nemici *consularis scurra* «buffone di rango consolare», e afferma di leggere tale espressione anche in un discorso di Vatinio, personaggio politico prima attaccato e poi difeso da Cicerone. L’espressione *consularis scurra* esacerba quell’interpreta-
zione di Cicerone come buffone, ruolo comico che abbiamo già visto essere considerato, insieme al mimo, antitetico all’ideale urbano. È curioso notare come nella stessa *Pro Murena* Cicerone esorti Catone, che si era permesso di appellare un console come *Murena saltator*, cioè «ballerino», a non attingere le sue male parole nei trivi (*ex trivio*) o tra le urla degli *scurra* (*aut ex scurrarum aliquo convicio*). Potrebbe dunque darsi che Catone, con un meccanismo ritorsivo giocoso, avesse ironicamente riusato la parola *scurra* contro il console Cicerone, che lo aveva precedentemente accusato di parlare con le parole dei buffoni. Catone potrebbe aver anche usato l’aggettivo *scurrilis*, nell’espressione *consul scurrilis*, risultando anche più allusivo: non dando apertamente dello *scurra* a Cicerone, avrebbe tuttavia richiamato argutamente sia l’accusa fattagli poco prima da Cicerone, sia le battute sconvenienti. Nell’aneddoto riportato nelle *Vite Parallele*, Plutarco si sarebbe dunque potuto trovare ad tradurre le parole latine *scurrara*/*scurrilis*, che non possiedono un preciso corrispettivo greco: di qui l’uso di un termine più generico come *γελοῖος*. Per suffragare l’ipotesi che

---

106 Macr. *Sat.* 2.1.12: *Quis item nescit consularem eum scurram ab inimicis appellari solitum? Quod in oratione etiam sua Vatinius posuit* («chi ignora che gli avversari solevano chiamarlo buffone consolare? lo si legge pure nel discorso di Vatinio»).


108 Cic. *Mur.* 13: *saltatorem appellat L. Murenam Cato. Maledictum est, si vere obicitur, vehementis accusatoris, sin falso, maledici conviciatoris. Qua re cum ista sis auctoritate, non debes, M. Cato, adrippere maledictum ex trivio aut ex scurrarum aliquo convicio neque temere consulem populi Romani saltatorem vocare* («ballerino»: con questo nome Catone qualifica Lucio Murena. Ingiuria, codesta, di un violento accusatore, se vera, di un maledico caluniatore, se falsa. Ma tu, Marco Catone, tu che godi di tanta autorità, non dovresti raccattare nei trivi o dalle chiazzate dei buffoni le male parole, né chiamare con tanta leggerezza ballerino un console romano» trad. di Giussani [in Ferrara 2009]).
γελοῖος possa qui veicolare una semantica vicina all’ironia buffonesca, vale la pena notare che Plutarco, per indicare la figura del «buffone», usa il termine γελωτοποιός. Ad esempio, tale parola è usata per definire Gabba, il celebre buffone di Augusto,\(^{109}\) come anche Filippo, il buffone tra i protagonisti del Simposio di Senofonte, dove viene presentato già con questo termine.\(^{110}\)

Non mi sentirei tuttavia di scartare del tutto altre interpretazioni, dato che anche l’aggettivo ridiculus mi pare appropriato per le motivazioni sopra proposte. La scelta di scurrus/scurrilis beneficierebbe però del testo ciceroniano della Pro Murena, significativo dato che il passo di Plutarco si colloca proprio nell’ambiente del medesimo processo.

5 Conclusione: Da Macrobius a Petrarca, per una riabilitazione di Cicerone

Soffermandoci su Macrobius, nella prima giornata dei Saturnalia (2.1.7), i protagonisti del dialogo decidono di raccontarsi le battute scherzose dei personaggi antichi, qui nominate con la terminologia più convenzionale per il prodotto dell’arguzia urbana: iocus. Anche in questo caso la contrapposizione è tra il gioco ironico di persone colte (2.1.9: litterata laetitia et docta cavillatio) e i frizzi sconvenienti e osceni prodotti dai mimi\(^{111}\) e dai suonatori di flauto (planipedis et subulonis impudica et praetextata verba iacentis). A prendere la parola è Simmaco, per il quale la coppia di personaggi che meglio incarnano lo spirito della facezia elegante è quella composta da Cicerone e Plauto (2.1.10: ad iocorum venustatem ceteris praestitisse). L’associazione a Plauto non fa che confermare il legame imprescindibile tra l’elemento teatrale, in questo caso comico, e l’oratoria. Attraverso la copiosa messe di battute facette raccontate da Simmaco,\(^{112}\) Cicerone appare raffigurato nel pieno rispetto dell’ideale da esso stesso con-

\(^{109}\) Ringrazio Giovanni Zago per questa annotazione; cf. Plut. Mor. 726a (= quaest. conv. 8.6.1); 760a (= Amat. 16).

\(^{110}\) Plut. Mor. 629c (= quaest. conv. 2 praeaf.); 709e (= quaest. conv. 7.6.5); 710c (= quaest. conv. 7.7.1); in quest’ultimo passo, Plutarco polemizza con Senofonte per aver portato al cospetto di filosofi come Antistene o Socrate un buffone alla stregua di Filippo. Nel Simposio, Filippo trova particolare spazio al § 1, 11–16; γελωτοποιός è chiamato anche Tersite, in Mor. 18c (= aud. poet. 3).

\(^{111}\) La parola con cui vengono chiamati gli attori di mimi è planipes «dai piedi piatti», che non indossavano cioè calzature rialzate come il socco. Il termine è usato anche da Giovenale 8.191 e Gellio 1.11.12.

\(^{112}\) Macr. Sat. 2.3.1–15 e passim.
clamato nel De oratore, senza che si avverta più uno sconveniente ondeggiamen
to tra la dicacitas o la mordacitas urbana – questi sono i termini impiegati
da Macrobio – e la comicità ridicola che guarda al mimo o allo scurra. Dopo i
dicta Ciceronis, seguono a ruota i motivi di Augusto, citati da Avieno, che già
aveva provato a inserirsi bruscamente, cercando di interrompere il discorso di
Simmaco e affermando che Augusto a facezie non era stato forse inferiore
neppure a Cicerone (2.3.14: Caesar in huiusmodi dicacitate quoquam minor et
fortasse nec Tullio). L’incipit «Augusto amò le battute, però nel rispetto della
dignità e della decenza, evitando di fare il buffone» (2.4.1: Augustus, inquam,
Caesar affectavit iocos, salvo tamen maestatis pudorisque respectu nec ut cad-
eret in scurram), appena dopo l’esposizione dei motivi di Cicerone, sembrerebbe
esprimere una precisazione concessiva che veicolerebbe, in maniera più velata,
la critica all’umorismo di Cicerone, quando è percepito come troppo scurrile e
sconveniente. L’espressione ut caderet in scurra ricorda infatti il illa quidem
quaee Ciceroni aliquando exciderunt, e il paene et ipsum scurrile attribuiti,
suo malgrado, da Quintiliano a Cicerone.

Anche nella settima giornata dei Saturnalia, nel commento a una seconda,
più breve narrazione della già citata gara mimica tra Laberio e Cicerone, è
nuovamente possibile rilevare una traccia della potenzialità critica della natura
per così dire borderline del Cicerone umorista, e che trova qui una definizione
particolarmente illuminante. Prima dell’aneddoto, Eustatio, uno dei convitati al
simposio saturnalesco, intraprende esortato da Avieno una dettagliata spiega-
zione dello skomma,113 che molto deve a quanto leggiamo nelle Quaestiones
conviviales di Plutarco114 e che terminerà, 22 paragrafi dopo, con l’affermazione
che ogni genere di scomma andrebbe evitato durante i banchetti.115 Se lo
scomma viene spiegato prima come un attacco figurato (7.3.1: morsum figuratum),
e poi come un’offesa camuffata (7.3.6: contumelia celata), in opposizione alla
λοιδορία, che è invece un’offesa diretta, la risposta di Cicerone a Laberio di-
scussa sopra diviene un’esemplificazione dello scomma dal quale il sapiente

113 Macr. Sat. 7.3.1.
114 Anche il motto di Cicerone citato poco dopo (Sat. 7.3.7), in risposta a Ottaviano, è presente
nelle Quaestiones conviviales 2.1.4 (= Mor. 631c); l’affermazione skômmatos δε τῷ μὴ δυναμένω
μετ’ εὐλοβέας καὶ τέχνης κατὰ καιρὸν ἄπτεσθαι παντάπασιν ἀφεκτόν («deve evitare del tutto le
battute che non riesce a adattarle a seconda delle situazioni con cautela e arte»), anche se è
espressa nel contesto del banchetto, teorizza quanto Plutarco non riconosce all’ironia di Cice-
rone, che vuole far a tutti costi ridere persone che non ne hanno bisogno.
115 Macr. Sat. 7.3.23: Cum video, inquam, anceps esse omne scommatum genus, suadeo in
conviviis, in quibus laetitiae insidiatur ira, ab huiusmodi dictis facesas («come vedi, stavo di-
cendo, ogni skomma presenta due facce; ti consiglio quindi di astenertene nei conviti, ove la
letizia è insidiata dall’ira»).
dovrebbe astenersi.¹¹⁶ La battuta sul sedere anguste non si configura semplicemente come un’offesa figurata, ma è anche rivolta a un personaggio terzo – Cesare – rispetto a una delle due parti coinvolte nello scambio umoristico – Laberio. Essa è definita «gravida dell’offesa» (quod fetum contumeliae est), e proprio questo potenziale offensivo e ambiguo, giacché trascende il diretto interlocutore dello scambio, è ciò che delle battute di Cicerone, al di là dell’apprezzamento diffuso nei Saturnalia, viene qui percepito come problematico. Non si tratta più di una violazione del decorum e della misura o di un gusto retorico per il doppio senso che può divenire oscuro, o, come leggiamo già in Plutarco, di un attacco aggressivo quasi fisico,¹¹⁷ quanto piuttosto un elemento offensivo embrionale, per rimanere nella metafora suggerita da Macrobius, e obliquo.

Per completare questo affresco sul ritratto di Cicerone umorista, come promesso nel titolo, mi piace citare i Rerum memorandarum libri di Francesco Petrarca, la prima opera in cui dopo Macrobius riemergono i facete dicta ciceroniani.¹¹⁸ Nei due capitoli De facetiis ac salibus illustrium (2.39) e De mordacibus iocis (2.68) sono citati numerosi motti, così come le invettive poetiche anonime contro Cesare e Augusto, in cui Petrarca riconosce – secondo me a ragione – il retroterra ciceroniano.¹¹⁹ Nel commentare i motti, Petrarca ricalca entusiasta il lessico dell’arguzia urbana: Sed quis omnium iocator aut promptior aut mordacior Cicerone? [...] satís habuit mordacem iocum urbana responsione discutere [...] Solebat [...] nimis mordaciter iocari hiis verbis, per citare soltanto due degli apprezzamenti per le facezie di Cicerone. Ogni traccia di imbarazzante oscillazione verso la scurrilità è del tutto scomparsa, anche soltanto attraverso la citazione di

¹¹⁶ Macr. Sat. 7.3.8–9: In eundem Ciceronem Laberius cum ab eo ad consessum non reciperetur, dicentem, «reciperem te nisi anguste sederemus», ait minus ille mordaciter, «Atque solebas duabus sellis sedere», obiciens tanto viro lubricum fidei. Sed et quod Cicero dixit, «nisi anguste sedere-mus.», scomma fuit in Caesarem, qui in senatum passim tam multos admittebat ut eos quattu-ordecim gradus capere non possent. Tali ergo genere, quod fetum contumeliae est, abstinentum sapienti semper, ceteris in convivio est, «Il medesimo Cicerone non accoglieva Laberio a sedere dicendogli: ti farei sedere, se non fossi già allo stretto»; e quel commediante con mordacità: »eppure tu eri solito occupare due posti«, rinfacciando a si grand’uomo l’ingannevole mutevolezza della sua lealtà. Ma la battuta di Cicerone «se non fossi già allo stretto» era rivolta in forma di skomma contro Gaio Cesare, che faceva entrare in senato senza discriminazioni un numero di persone così grande che i quattordici gradini non potevano più contenere. Dunque da frasi di tal genere, che costituiscono un insulto in embrione, il sapiente deve astenersi sempre, gli altri nei conviti»).

¹¹⁷ Supra, p. 314.

¹¹⁸ Bowen 1998, che offre una soddisfacente panoramica sulle facezie di Cicerone nell’età rinascimentale a partire da Petrarca, tema che presupporrebbe altrettanto spazio quanto quello che ha occupato questo contributo.

¹¹⁹ Cf. Del Giovane 2018.
eventuali critiche altrui. Ciò che rimane, è il ritratto del Cicerone umorista come Cicerone l’aveva pensato: lontano dal pericolo di portare lo scherzo al livello dei buffoni e dei mimi: *de orat. 2.239: Ne aut scurrilis iocus sit aut mimicus.*
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Reperforming Cicero’s Voice: Constructions and Negotiations of his vox publica

1 Introduction

Cicero was fully aware of the huge potential of developing his own voice.¹ It is well known that speaking in public was one of the major ways for men in the Roman Republic with political ambition to prepare for their political career.² It was important to develop a voice that was not only physically distinguishable within the chorus of competitors,³ but also represented the political programme the orators stood for, as Robert Morstein-Marx has shown with regard to speeches in the contio.⁴ Our contribution will look at constructions of Cicero’s voice in relation to the public persona of the orator.⁵ In a first step, we briefly examine how Cicero himself staged his voice in his speeches. Second, we turn to the restaging and rewriting of Cicero’s voice in a declamatory context. Third, we ask what happens to Cicero’s voice when it is translated into Greek. In an appendix, we offer a comparative Renaissance example of revocalizing Cicero. Throughout our chapter, we will be looking at textualizations of Cicero’s voice. On the one hand, we will show how the “vox Ciceroniana” is based on soundbites and catchphrases deriving from Cicero’s speeches, which do not allude to specific intertexts, but more generally create a Ciceronian aura. On the other hand, we ask whether and how far this textualized voice can be used as a representation of Cicero himself, not only of his voice, but of the whole person-

---

¹ Cf. Steel 2001, 165; Cicero “is exceptional in the prominence which he gave to oratory in his career”.
² On gender-bias in rhetoric and rhetorical theory especially with respect to the voice see Connolly 2007a, 83–97. See also Casamento (p. 13–32) in this volume. On rhetoric and political careers see van der Blom 2016.
³ For this aspect, handbooks of rhetoric offered ample advice; see recently Schulz 2014.
⁴ Morstein-Marx 2004, 119–159 (Chapter 4, “The Voice of the People”). This symbolic aspect of the voice is not treated systematically in Wilczek/Campe 2009.
⁵ Our contribution is less concerned with purely stylistic questions such as compositio verborum, prose rhythm or verbal copia. Cf. for this aspect Dugan 2005 and Butler 2015, 161–195 for an innovative interpretation of Cicero’s aesthetic voice and its recording in later authors. Our approach is partly inspired by Butler’s concept of the “ancient phonograph” and similarly by Bettini 2018, who also approaches ancient texts as “registrazioni scritte delle [...] voci”, a phenomenon he calls “fonosfera antica”.
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ality. As we will argue, Cicero himself already initiated a process of detaching his voice from his physical presence and giving it its own agenda or even agency. This separation of person and voice was fruitful for later authors who restaged or even reinvented Cicero’s voice. They relied on the symbolic value he had attributed to his voice, but also changed the sound of his voice in their attempt to re-evaluate the historical period in which he had lived.

2 The agency of Cicero’s voice

From the very beginning of his public career, Cicero used his voice as a means to stage himself as an exceptionally talented, brave politician, as a spokesman of the interests of the Roman people. There are numerous passages in his oeuvre in which Cicero emphatically mentions his own voice as representative of his public persona. In these instances, the textualized representation of his voice stands for the full ethos of the orator Cicero. His voice could thereby be transformed into an agent of his authority both as an orator and a political persona. Already in the exordium of his first important judicial speech, the Pro Sexto Roscio Amerino, Cicero uses a clustered polyptoton of the verb dicere, twice explicitly connected with the concept of free speech (libere/liberius), to introduce himself as an advocate who (in contrast to all other Roman noblemen present at the case) dares to defend Roscius and even to speak openly about the political situation just after the Sullan proscriptions had come to an end.

---

6 On the process of reductio of Cicero to pure “voice” see Kaster 1998.
7 Cf. Morstein-Marx 2004, 158: “The importance of the shout in the contio rested precisely on its potential to be interpreted as a concrete demonstration of the Will of the People”.
8 Cic. Rosc. Am. 2–3: Quia, si qui istorum dixisset, quos videtis adesse, in quibus summa auctoritas est atque amplitudo, si verbum de re publica fecisset, id quod in hac causa fieri nescie est, multo plura dixisse, quam dixisset, putaretur; ego autem si omnia, quae dicenda sunt, libere dixero, nequaquam tamen similiter oratio mea exire atque atque in volgus emanare poterit. Deinde quod ceterorum neque dictum obscurum potest esse propter nobilitatem et amplitudinem neque temere dixisse, quam dixisset, putaretur; ego autem si omnia, quae dicenda sunt, libere dixero, nequaquam tamen similiter oratio mea exire atque in volgus emanare poterit. Deinde quod ceterorum neque dictum obscurum potest esse propter nobilitatem et amplitudinem neque temere dixisse, quam dixisset, putaretur; ego autem si omnia, quae dicenda sunt, libere dixero, nequaquam tamen similiter oratio mea exire atque in volgus emanare poterit. Deinde quod ceterorum neque dictum obscurum potest esse propter nobilitatem et amplitudinem neque temere dixisse, quam dixisset, putaretur; ego autem si omnia, quae dicenda sunt, libere dixero, nequaquam tamen similiter oratio mea exire atque in volgus emanare poterit.
But it is mostly in the speeches during his consulship that Cicero discovers the potential of his own voice as a symbol of his political persona and of resolute political activity in the service of the state.\(^9\) This begins on the very first day of his consulship, when in the senatorial speech against Rullus’ bringing in his agrarian law Cicero introduces his vox as a light of hope for the state and as representative of his own auctoritas: *Hoc motu atque hac perturbatione animorum atque rerum cum populo Romano vox et auctoritas consuli repente in tantis tenebris illuxerit* (“in the midst of this confusion and disturbance of men’s minds and affairs, when the voice and authority of a consul has suddenly brought light into utter darkness for the Roman people”, *leg. agr.* 1.24).\(^10\) The voice the Romans hear is the *vox consulis*, a voice filled with the authority of the office,\(^11\) and this consular voice is so metonymic for the consul himself (the listeners also see it, if one takes the light metaphor seriously) that it develops its own agency in the course of Cicero’s consul year. In November of the same year his voice has even gained the authority to exil Catiline (2.12: *Homo enim videlicet timidus aut etiam permodestus vocem consuli sf erre non potuit*, “the fellow was so timid or even sensitive, of course, that he could not bear to hear the voice of the consul; the minute he was ordered to go into exile, he obeyed”).\(^12\) Of course, the Latin vox can have two meanings and refer both to the actual voice and to the words which a voice utters. But even if in this quotation one might be inclined to translate “Catiline was not able to stand my words”,\(^13\) the choice of the term *vox* (instead of *verba, iussa, consilium vel sim.*) invites the reader to grasp the second meaning, “voice”, as well.\(^14\) The agency of the consular voice becomes even more obvious in a passage from

---

\(^9\) Cf. contrastingly Marchese 2014, 87–88 on Cicero’s first *Philippic*, where he depicts the silent senate as “proof of its transformation from forced enslavement to voluntary servitude”.


\(^11\) Manuwald 2018a, 174 *ad loc.* comments that “*vox et auctoritas* is seen as one”. For Cicero’s fashioning of his consular persona through his voice, see Batstone 1994 *passim*, *e.g.* 261 (“this voice of magisterial authority and ironic contempt”).

\(^12\) Transl. Macdonald 1976, slightly adapted.

\(^13\) Thus, *e.g.*, in the Loeb version of Macdonald 1976: “he could not bear to hear what the consul said” (our emphasis – not “how the consul spoke”).

\(^14\) Butler 2015, 152 shows that Cicero plays with the double meaning of *vox* in *Tusc.* 2.20; on the double meaning see also Butler 2015, 95–96.
the fourth *Catilinarian*: Cicero claims that his voice has acted according to its consular duties and therefore should obtain the highest position in the state (*Cat*. 4.19: *Ut mea vox quae debeat esse in re publica princeps officio functa consulari videretur, “so that my voice, which has to take the leading position in affairs of state, should fulfil the obligations of a consul”).¹

After 63 BC, the same authoritative voice helps to protect the *consularis* Cicero when it counters attacks on his political *constantia*, as is visible in a passage from the *Pro Sulla*:¹⁶ *Maxima voce ut omnes exaudire possint dico semperque dicam* (“with my fullest voice, so that all can hear, I say it now and I shall never stop saying it”, *Sul*. 33).¹⁷ The phrase refers to the actual *actio*, that is to say the pure stamina of Cicero’s voice that had to be heard on the crowded forum and amongst possible noise made by his political opponents.¹⁸ But the phrase might also carry a symbolic meaning of Cicero’s *vox maxima*, because it is still the authoritative consular voice.¹⁹

Most prominently Cicero reactivates the consular voice during his fight against Mark Antony.²⁰ In the *Philippics* Cicero takes up the agency of his

---

¹ Transl. Macdonald 1976, adapted. Dyck 2008, 234 *ad loc.* links this to *Q. fr*. 1.3.2, where Cicero’s *vox* is said to be able to kill (*occidere*) and to save (*praesidio esse*). Cf. Keeline 2018, 85–86 on Cicero’s voice in *Cat*. 4.19 as synecdoche of the orator himself.

¹⁶ The passage introduces a pathos-laden climax of the first part of the speech, “the most forceful expression of the consular ethos” (May 1988, 73).

¹⁷ Transl. Macdonald 1976, adapted.

¹⁸ Cf. on this aspect Morstein-Marx 2004, 119–120. See also the archaeological reconstruction of the acoustic conditions on the forum and the repercussions on our understanding of its oratorical topography by Holter, Muth, and Schwesinger 2019. We find an interesting reflection of Cicero’s shouting ability (with clearly negative evaluation that fits a general invective tradition) in Calenus’ invective speech against Cicero in Cassius Dio, book 46, who twice alludes to the loudness of Cicero’s performances: cf. 46.9.2 (*δημοσίᾳ δὲ βοᾷς ἄλλως, κεκραγὼς τούς μιαροὺς ἐκείνους λόγους*) and 46.17.4 (*μείζον γὰρ σοῦ βοήσματι*). See below for Cassius Dio’s staging of a “Ciceronian” voice.

¹⁹ After his banishment Cicero emphatically reintroduces it into the public discourse, as well, often in order to counter attacks from Clodius’ similarly powerful, but utterly corrupt voice (references to Clodius’ mischievous voice *e.g.* in *p. red. in sen*. 26, *p. red. ad Quir*. 10, *dom*. 69, *har. resp*. 33; Cicero’s authoritative voice *e.g.* in *dom*. 96, *har. resp*. 7). Moreover, Cicero connects it explicitly with free speech (see above for the *Pro Sexto Roscio Amerino*): cf. *Cic. Sest*. 14: *Quis non concederet ut eos, quorum sceleris furore violatus essem, vocis libertate perstringerem?*

²⁰ It returns, however, spectacularly already during Caesar’s dictatorship, in the *Pro Marcello*, held after a “long-lasting silence” (*diuturnum silentium*, *Marc*. 1) of his oratorial voice between 51 and 46. Cf. Marchese 2014, 80. By mentioning the silence which precedes the re-emerging of his voice, Cicero makes use of a strategy that he had successfully applied in the *Pro Sexto Roscio*
voice, which he had introduced in the *Catilinarians*, and develops it even further. In *Phil.* 1.10 his voice is detached from himself by its transformation into a witness that must be preserved for the sake of the state:

> Hunc igitur ut sequerer properavi quem praesentes non sunt secuti, non ut proficerem aliquid – nec enim sperabam id nec praestare poteram – sed ut, si quid mihi humanitas accidisset – multa autem impedire videntur praeter naturam etiam praeterque fatum – huius tamen diei vocem testem rei publicae relinquere meae perpetuae erga se voluntatis.

Consequently, I hastened in order to follow the lead of a man whom those present failed to follow, not in order to achieve anything – that was not in my hopes or power to guarantee – but so that I might leave my voice today as witness to the Republic of my abiding loyalty, in case anything befall me such as may happen to any of us – many dangers, moreover, appear to loom even beyond the course of nature and destiny.

The passage has a double meaning with regard to the codification of Cicero’s voice. On the one hand it can be related very concretely and materially to the *acta senatus*, *i.e.* the official notes of the gathering of the senate, which would consist of an immediate summary of Cicero’s *viva vox*. On the other hand, the passage can refer to his hope that his voice, encapsulated in the published version of the speech, will live on in the minds of the listeners.

Cicero’s wish to conserve his voice for future generations, its decontextualization by ways of circulating his written speeches, is expressed at the end of book 3 of *De officiis* (3.121):

> Sed, ut, si ipse venissem Athenas (quod quidem esset factum, nisi me e medio cursu clara voce patria revocasset), aliquando me quoque audires, sic, quoniam his voluminibus ad te profecta vox est mea, tribues iis temporis quantum poteris.

But as you would sometimes give ear to me also, if I had come to Athens (and I should be there now, if my country had not called me back with accents unmistakable, when I was half-way there), so you will please devote as much time as you can to these volumes, for in them my voice will travel to you; and you can devote to them as much time as you will.

---

*Amerino* where the silence of all other possible *patroni* contrasts sharply with Cicero’s speech (*Rosc. Am.*, 1–3).

21 Cf. Marchese 2014, 98: Cicero presents his textualized voice as a means of “maintaining a connection with the past”.


23 Thus Ramsey 2003, 107 ad loc.

24 Literature on this aspect is endless. Cf., e.g., Steel 2001, 162–189 (Chapter 4, “Portrait of the Orator as a Great Man. Cicero on Cicero”); Butler 2002; Dugan 2005.

25 Transl. Miller 1913.
According to Shane Butler, in antiquity and far beyond the written word would have been considered the container of the *vox ipsa*, *i.e.*, not only of the words, but also of the “phonic features” of the author.²⁶ We would add that it can also embody the symbolic value of the voice. In the passage above, Cicero radically detaches his voice from his body: he himself cannot come to Athens to meet his son (because an even more authoritative voice than his own, the *vox patriae*, has retained him in Rome); instead, he sends his written work as a *vox* that reaches Marcus *his voluminibus*, *i.e.*, inscribed in the books Cicero himself has written.²⁷ We contend that this formulation means more than the written words as a “substitute for his own voice, and, by extension, for himself, even in the role of father”.²⁸ On a metatextual level, it transforms Cicero’s physical persona into a textual one, thus paving the way for future generations to access the real Cicero through his writings. “Sounding like Cicero” could thus mean “being Cicero” in the sense of “being Cicero’s construction of his own public persona”, which is based on his *ethos* as politician, orator and philosopher.²⁹ In what follows we will consider whether future generations reacted to this invitation.

3 Reperforming Cicero’s voices in the schools of declamation

Because Cicero detached his own voice so much from his physical existence by transforming it into a symbol of a political engagement and *ethos*, later authors could make use of Cicero’s symbolic voice in order to refer to his public persona as well.³⁰ Thus, when the Augustan poet Cornelius Severus describes the dire

²⁶ Cf. Butler 2015, 13–14. Cf. also Porter 2010, 337–338 on Alcidamas’ *On Sophists*, which discusses whether the written word could eventually substitute the voice (as an *εἰδώλων*) or even serve as a “mirror of one’s self” (338).

²⁷ Giuseppe La Bua kindly reminds us that what Cicero does here is reminiscent of the topos of the “speaking book” (a motif characteristic, for instance, of Ovid’s exilic voice). For intertextual links between Ovid’s exile poetry and Cicero see Feeney 2014.


²⁹ Ours therefore is a less aesthetic (or aural) claim than the one by Butler 2015, 189, according to whom sounding like Cicero is the only way of finding a voice at all. Instead, we read the conservation of Cicero’s textualized voice as an authoritative claim, in a way that is similar to Cicero’s conservation of the idealized voices of his predecessors Crassus und Antonius in *De oratore* (for which see recently Kenty 2017).

³⁰ Antiquity considered the voice of an orator as closely related to (and therefore as a hint at) his character, as Schulz 2014, 86–87 and 360 has shown. The famous quote by Sen. *ep.* 114.1 (*talis hominibus fuit oratio qualis vita*), however, is probably more concerned with style. On
sight of Cicero’s mutilated body on the rostra after he had been killed on the instigation of the triumviri, he not only stresses how much of the political icon Cicero was still present in the minds of the Romans, but also confirms the special status of Cicero’s voice in the famous formulation of the publica vox that has been extinguished forever.\(^{31}\)

But it could at least partly be kept alive through emulative imitation of the vox et verba ipsius, as Seneca the Elder shows with reference to the ancient historians describing Cicero’s death.\(^{32}\) Such emulation of Cicero was of course very present in the schools of rhetoric. The written record of Cicero’s vox would be of enormous importance for the formation of subsequent generations of the leading class in Rome: it invited them to reperform the Ciceronian rhetorical vox within an educational project in which they needed to take part in order to become a member of the educated elite. Cicero’s voice now served as a kind of entrance pass to public discourse and public renown.

Thomas Keeline has recently reminded us of Quintilian’s description of the ideal classroom session: a teacher was “to appoint one boy as reader [...] so that they accustom themselves also to speaking in public”.\(^{33}\) In other words, a speech under discussion is “performed” as though the pupil were himself delivering the speech at that moment. A specific example is provided by Quintilian’s discussion of the correct pronuntiatio/actio of the opening paragraph of the Pro Milone (Quint. 11.3.47–49):

> Nonne ad singulas paene distinctiones quamvis in eadem facie tamen quasi vultus mutandus est? [...] iam secunda respiratio incræscat oportet et naturali quodam conatu, quo minus pavide dicimus quae secuntur, et quod magnitudo animi Milonis ostenditur.\(^{34}\)

style as “expression of the orator’s person” cf. Dugan 2005, 270–279. Closely connected is the ethos-formation via prosopopeia in ancient speeches (think of Cicero’s portrayal of Appius Claudius Caecus in the Pro Caelio, or that of the accused Milo in the Pro Milone, on which cf. May 1988, 133–138). One can imagine that Cicero also acted out such moments by changing his own voice in order to sound like “someone else” (cf. on “Cicero’s use of judicial theatre” Hall 2014; on the Pro Milone and Cicero’s use of role playing in that speech, esp. 89–93).


32 Cf. Pieper 2019, who argues that Seneca advocates imitation of Cicero in order to commemorate him most effectively.

33 Quint. 2.5.6–7, quoted by Keeline 2018, 22. See also La Bua 2019, 185 with references to further literature.

Is it not clear that, at almost every stop, the face (as it were) stays the same, but its expression has to change? [...] The second breath has now to be stronger, both because of the natural effort which makes us speak the following words less timidly, and because Milo’s courage is now to be shown.

The use of the present tense (vultus mutandus est; secunda respiratio increscat oportet; dicimus; magnitudo animi Milonis ostenditur) shows that the teacher is more concerned with the student’s “reperformance” of the text than with Cicero’s original way of delivery.

4 Rewriting Cicero’s voice

From reperforming Cicero on the basis of his own speeches, it is only a small step to performing Cicero on the basis of a text of one’s own making. Evidence for this practice is found in many products of the ancient rhetorical classroom, such as the Pridie quam in exilium iret, the Invectiva in Sallustium, and the Epistula ad Octavianum. In this way, declaimers not only “become Cicero” but even become “CICERO” (to borrow Kaster’s turn of phrase); they perform their version of the historical figure – shaped, of course, by previous reception – but also take on the aura of rhetorical excellence he represents. But how does one perform Cicero with a text that is not directly taken from his speeches?

One solution, of course, is to devise a text which captures the essence of Ciceroonian thought and diction. But what is that essence exactly? With a few obvious exceptions (quo usque tandem; o tempora o mores), we contend, there were no phrases that would be immediately picked up by ancient readers as references to specific passages in his rhetorical oeuvre. Instead, “talking Cicero” consists of using recurring syntactic patterns, such as the counterfactual clause to

---

35 For which also see Degl’Innocenti Pierini in this volume (p. 73).
36 Strictly, one should exclude the famous “Ciceronian” Suasoriae 6 and 7 and Controversiae 7.2 found in Seneca the Elder from this list, as the speaker is not Cicero himself but advising him (in the Suasoriae) or merely discussing his case (in the Controversiae). They should, however, be seen as part of the same tradition (cf. Keeline 2018, 148). One could include Cicero’s speech in Luc. 7.62–85 (for which see La Bua 2020) and Cicero’s speeches in Greek imperial historiography, for which see below. The tradition of performing Cicero in this way continues in later periods, such as in the Quinta Catilinaria and the Responsio Catilinae, for which see De Marco 1960.
37 Cf. the title of Kaster 1998.
38 For which see Sillett in this volume (p. 276–292).
start a speech, the colon-ending *esse videatur* and the clausula which it represents, and the use of rhetorical figures.

But even more than that, we would suggest, “talking Cicero” means taking over a core set of concepts which underpin his speeches, and the word-field connected to these concepts. The dichotomy between “good” and “bad” in the defence of the republic, for instance, comes with two distinct word-fields. On the one hand, we find the *boni* who provide *praesidia* and *salus* to the *patria* and her *cives* and try to *restaurare* and *conservare* the state with their *gravitas* and *constantia*. In the other word-field we find the *improbi*, *nefarii* and *inimici* with their *audacia*, *furor*, *imp(r)udentia*, *invidia* and their striving at *pernicioes*.

A text which brings to light the reception of the “soundbite” nature of Ciceronian diction is the Ciceronian reperformance found in a work which, like Quintilian’s, has clear educational aims. The fifth book of Martianus Capella’s *De nuptiis philologiae et Mercurii* starts with a description of *Rhetorica* personified, with her train of “famous men, amongst whom the two nearest her outshone the rest” (5.429). These two, Demosthenes and Cicero, are described as follows:

De uno tamen, quem Athenarum populus ac palliata agmina sequebantur, haec fama con
venerat, quo(d) acerrimus idem et procellis indignantis Oceani fremituque violentior. deni
que de illo versus huiusmodi ferebatur: δειν ὀς ἀνήρ: τάχα κεν καὶ ἀνάτιον αἰτίομυτο
[Hom. Il. 11.654]. Alter vero, quem consularis purpura et coniurationis extinctae laurea re
dimibat, mox ingressus curiam superum et in Iovis gratulatu se st se venisse conspectum,
clamare laetior coepit: “ο nos beatos, o rem publicam fortunatam, o praeclaram laudem consulatus mei”.

The one whom the people of Athens and the whole stream of Greeks followed had the reputation of being most forceful, more vigorous than the storms and raging of the angry ocean. He was described in verse such as this: “A man to fear, who might find fault even with the innocent”. But the other, who wore the purple of a consul and a laurel wreath for suppressing a conspiracy,

The reception of which phrase is discussed by La Bua 2019, 284–285.

The “Silver Age” associated Cicero’s with his “Asiatic” love for figures, cf. Winterbottom 1982, 261. This connection grew even stronger in Late Antiquity, when Cicero’s more mature treatises with their admonishments again use-of figures faded from view, and *De inventione* and *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (by then attributed to Cicero) were seen as fully representative of his views on rhetoric (cf. MacCormack 2013, 262–263 and van der Velden 2020).

See Achard 1981 for the discourse on the good/evil distinction in Cicero’s oeuvre, cf. the *Index latinorum verborum* (539–546) on the above mentioned word-fields.


This seems to be based on a misunderstanding of Cicero’s *cedant arma togae, concedat laur-
rea linguae*, see Stahl et al. 1977 ad loc.
The most salient feature of Demosthenes as presented here is that he is spoken about (fama; de illo ferebatur). Cicero, by contrast, is speaking. His words, “how blessed we are, how fortunate the State, how brilliant the fame of my consulship”, are a direct quotation from In Catilinam 2.10, but we would suggest that it is not this particular passage Martianus is imitating. The phrase, containing Cicero’s self-praise for his role in saving the republic during his consulship, is used almost as a kind of a succinct summary of Cicero’s rhetorical oeuvre as a whole.\(^4^4\) Martianus’ Cicero, like a broken record which is switched on, starts uttering his core content as soon as he is given a chance.

When scholars analyse pseudo-Ciceronian speeches in terms of their intertextual indebtedness to the master himself, they often break down sentences and show how individual parts can be retrieved in Cicero’s works. A sentence might be using, for example, one turn of phrase from the Philippics coupled with a combination of nouns also found in In Verrem, et cetera, almost as if it were a cento.\(^4^5\) As in the passage above, it seems unlikely, however, that declaimers would want their audience continuously to pick up on these specific references as modern scholars do. As Winterbottom remarks, straightforward and direct references would perhaps make the text a parody more than anything else.\(^4^6\) Instead, Ciceronian declaimers “act Cicero” not by specifically referring to passages from his works, but by adopting the above-mentioned conceptual grammar that underlies his oeuvre as a whole. An example is the opening of the pseudo-Ciceronian Pridie quam in exilium iret 1:

\[
\text{Si quando inimicorum impetum propulsare ac propellere cupistis, defendite nunc universi unum, qui, ne omnes ardore flammae occideritis, mei capitis periculo non dubitavi providere. Nam quem virtutis gloria cum summa laude ad caelum extulit, eundem inimicorum invidia indignissime oppressum deprecit ad supplicium.} \quad 47
\]

If at any moment you wished to repel and overthrow the enemy assault, you should now together defend one single man; I who in peril of death did not hesitate to prevent your

\(^{44}\) Seneca the Younger’s well-known remark that Cicero praised his consulship non sine causa sed sine fine (Dial. 10.5.1) shows how ancient reception was aware of Cicero’s propensity for self-congratulation. See Dugan 2014 for an attempt to understand Cicero’s praise for his consulship in a Freudian sense as a compulsive way of the dealing with the trauma of his exile.

\(^{45}\) This is, for example, the method used by Lamacchia’s 1968 commentary on the Epistula ad Octavianum, the apparatus of De Marco’s 1991 edition of Cicero’s Orationes spuriae, and of Novokhatko’s 2009 edition of the Invectivae by pseudo-Cicero and pseudo-Sallust.

\(^{46}\) Winterbottom 1982, 253 discusses the way in which pseudo-Quintilian’s Minor Declamations use restraint in using direct tags from Cicero’s work, cf., however, Keeline 2018, 188–195.

\(^{47}\) There are textual problems in this passage; we follow the text of De Marco 1991. Transl. van der Velden.
perishing by the heat of the flame. For he whom the glory of virtue along with the highest praise raised to the heavens; this selfsame man is now burdened down and shamelessly led to distress by the hatred of his enemies.

Its author clearly taps into the deeper structure of Cicero’s speeches, both thematically and verbally, without referring to specific passages from the Ciceronian legacy. We find, for example, the dichotomy between good and bad (inimicorum) and the many (universi) and the one (unum), and the concern for glory on account of one’s virtue (virtutis gloria), together with Ciceronian vocabulary connected with these themes.

As Gamberale also notices, this kind of textuality is similar to what one finds in centos, although not fully so. In centos, authors use the decontextualized potential of their source texts for a completely different purpose. The readers are often supposed to pick up on the original reference, and appreciate the new role which it has required in the context of the cento, as in the famous case of the monstrum horrendum, informe, ingens, cui lumen ademptum (Verg. Aen. 3.658) transferred to Ausonius’ description of the wedding night (Cento nuptialis 108). Here, by contrast, the references are non-specific and the context not wholly different from that of the original: the author of the fictitious speech attempts to “act” Cicero’s vox by writing a text that Cicero himself could have written.

The same is true for pseudo-Cicero’s Invectiva in Sallustium. Its author has clearly attempted to emulate Cicero’s “rhetorical” style, but we can also observe an imitation that goes beyond the words, and brings to mind core elements of Cicero’s political programme and self-representation. In the following pas-

---

48 Cf. Gamberale 1998, 59 on the author’s use of flamma and periculum capitis in this passage: “da Cicerone vengono [...] senza che si possa precisare una specifica fonte [italics ours], la definizione della congiura di Catilina come flamma, nonché il periculum capitis cui è stato esposto l’Arpinate; è infatti terminologia frequentemente usata dall’oratore nei molti passi in cui parla della congiura [italics ours]”.

49 A full appraisal of Cicero’s concern for glory, both in his political life and in his philosophical oeuvre, is provided by Leeman 1949.

50 The specifics on the Ciceronian background of semantics and syntax in this passage can be found in Gamberale 1998, 57–58.

51 A recent treatment of pseudo-writing conceptualized as writing a cento is found in Peirano 2012, 194–197.

52 Whose inauthenticity was never in much doubt, contrary to that of the text to which it is purporting to reply, Pseudo-Sallust’s Invectiva in Ciceronem, which Quintilian and Servius seem to consider genuine. See Novokhatko 2009, 111–149 for an overview of the history of the Echtheitsfrage regarding the two.

53 Cf. Novokhatko 2009, 177 n. 34.
sage, for instance, “Cicero” rebuts “Sallust’s” criticism of his cowardice (in Sall. 10):

Ego fugax, C. Sallusti? Furori tribuni plebis cessi: utilius duxi quamvis fortunam unus ex-
periri, quam universus populo Romano civilis essem dissensionis causa. Qui postea quam
ille suum annum in re publica perbacchatus est omniaque quae commoverat pace et
otio resederunt, hoc ordine revocante atque ipsa re publica manu retrahente me reverti.
Qui mihi dies, si cum omni reliqua vita confteratur, animo quidem meo superet, cum uni-
versi vos populusque Romanus frequens adventu meo gratulatus est.⁵⁴

Am I renegade then, Caius Sallust? It was I who yielded before the fury of the tribune of the
commons. I thought it more useful to experience whatever fortune came my way rather
than to be a cause of civil disagreement for the whole of the Roman people. And after
he had wasted away his year in office in debauchery, and after all that he had messed
up had settled down again into peace and tranquillity, I returned, summoned by this
very body; and the state herself led me by the hand. Were I to compare that day, when
all of you and the Roman people came out in crowds and congratulated me on my return,
with all the other days of my life, it would, when I consider it, be the best.

Again, even though there is no single Ciceronian passage the author seems to be
alluding to,⁵⁵ its author has clearly adopted a Ciceronian “mental scheme”. We
find, for instance, the idea of the one/many-dichotomy functioning on multiple
levels: Cicero suffered exile alone (unus) instead of allowing the universus popu-
lus Romanus to fall into civil strife; but was then greeted by all Romans (universi
vos) on his return. The description of Clodius as overcome by furor is in line with
the general description of Ciceronian “villains”: Verres, Catiline, Clodius himself
and Antony.⁵⁶ Perbacchatus est, by contrast, seems tied to a specific passage: the
only occurrence of perbaccho in the Ciceronian corpus is found in Phil. 2.10: at
quam multos dies in ea villa turpissime es perbacchatus! The fact that this refer-
ence concerns Antony – and not Clodius – is noteworthy: the allusion to it in
Pseudo-Sallust can be seen as an acknowledgement that Cicero’s presentation
of his enemies is to some extent “commonplace” and part of a “base structure”

⁵⁵ Although there are clear parts of Ciceronian passages reworked here, such as Cicero’s retell-
ing of his post-exilic reception in Brundisium and later Rome in Att. 4.1 (=73 SB), and his pre-
sentation of his exile as a self-sacrifice for the good of the Roman Republic (cf. La Bua 2019,
197 n. 64 for the idea that Cicero went into exile voluntarily, with further secondary literature
⁵⁶ It is associated with Verres in Verr. 2.4.48; 2.4.41; 2.5.73; 2.5.85; 2.5.106; 2.5.139; 2.5.161; 2.5.188;
Catiline in Cat. 1.1; 1.2; 1.15; 1.23; 1.31; et al.; Clodius in p. red. ad pop. 19; p. red. in sen. 12; 19;
dom. 12; 25; 63; et al., and finally Antony in Phil. 5.43; 6.4; 6.18; 10.21; et al. Cf. also Keeline
that transcends his individual speeches. The final sentence, with its high value on the importance of the praise of others for one’s virtuous deeds, is again a reworking of a very Ciceronian theme. Again, its author has clearly taken over the thematic base structure of Ciceronian rhetoric: he is performing a text which Cicero could have written, and thus seems to impersonate, together with Cicero’s voice, his self-created public image as well.

Similar to what intertextual references often are supposed to do, Ciceronian reperformances such as the latter on the one hand evoke specific parts of Cicero’s political and personal agenda. But on the other hand they enforce the process of decontextualizing Cicero’s voice: his utterances are disjointed from the historical context in which they were made and lumped together into an inventory of themes and corresponding idioms. To some extent, however, the seeds for this practice may be said to be sown by Cicero himself, as the overlap between his speeches frequently leads to a kind of decontextualization which blurs the specific historical contexts in which he makes them. The result often is a prototypical rather than a specific Cicero that emerges from these texts. From a historical personality Cicero develops into an exemplary figure; his voice gains an almost transtemporal value. In this way, it can still successfully represent a version of the character Cicero, even if the context in which it is reperformed has changed considerably.

5 Cicero’s Greek tongue

Whereas in imperial and late antique rhetorical training the attention for the historical context of Cicero’s speeches is limited, the imperial historiographers demonstrate a marked interest in recontextualizing Cicero’s voice. With regard to Latin historiography, we possess no evidence of Ciceronian speeches, which might be due to the loss of Livy and other Latin historians. Sallust, our only contemporary source dealing with Cicero’s career, presents a silent version of an otherwise

58 Within the confines of this chapter it was not possible to discuss the Epistula ad Octavianum. Van der Velden 2020 claims that its author may be overperforming Cicero’s voice by combining all strands of the Ciceronian oeuvre into one work, resulting in a text which not even Cicero himself would have written.
loquacious consul in his *Bellum Catilinae*.⁶⁰ Instead, it is in the works of the Greek historians Appian and Cassius Dio that Cicero’s voice again rose to great heights. We will see that in their works Cicero’s voice is embedded in republican discourse generally. Moreover, the roots of this discourse in fourth-century Athens are emphasized by recurrent references to the speeches of Demosthenes and his likes. Although catchphrases and intertextual connections play a role just as in the declamatory texts, the recognizability of Cicero’s voice is diminished in favour of an Attic and especially Demosthenic sound.

Before turning to this aspect, it is worth mentioning that one of the functions of Cicero’s voice in Greek historiography is to illustrate his desire for self-promotion and his arrogance. This can be seen most clearly in Plutarch’s *Comparison of Cicero and Demosthenes* 2.1:

> Ἡ δὲ Κικέρωνος ἐν τούς λόγους ἁμετρία τῆς περιαυτολογίας ἀκραίαν τινὰ κατηγορεῖ πρὸς δόξαν, ἀρρωστός ὡς τὰ ὅπλα ἔδει τῇ τρέβνῃ καὶ τῇ γλώττῃ τὴν θραυμακὴν ὑπείκειν δάφνην. ἱσχύειν μὲν γὰρ διὰ λόγου τὸν πολιτευόμενον ἀναγκαῖον, ἀγαπᾶν δὲ ἀγεννεῖ καὶ λυχνεύειν τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ λόγου δόξαν.⁶¹

Cicero’s immoderate boasting of himself in his speeches proves that he had an intemperate desire for fame, his cry being that arms must give place to the toga and the laurel of triumph to the tongue. It is necessary, indeed, that a political leader should prevail by reason of his eloquence, but ignoble for him to admire and crave the fame that springs from his eloquence.

Interestingly, instead of quoting from the speeches, in this passage Plutarch introduces Cicero’s poetic voice to illustrate his behaviour as an orator. While referring to the orator’s boastful rhetoric,⁶² he translates a line from Cicero’s poem *De consulatu suo*: *cedant arma togae, concedat laurea linguae*. The Greek translation, notwithstanding the linguistic differences, is recognizable both as a quotation of perhaps the most popular verse of Cicero’s poetry in antiquity (Plutarch’s bilingual audience must have had no trouble in understanding the Greek reference to a Latin text, which is here presumed to be familiar to the reader),⁶³ and as

---

⁶⁰ The only semi-historical creation of a Ciceronian speech in extant Latin literature is found in Lucan’s *Bellum Civile* 7.68–85; though interesting for its place and function in the epic, the speech is only a short 17 lines. Narducci 2002 is the classic study here.

⁶¹ Transl. adapt. from Perrin 1919.

⁶² See above (p. 321) on Martianus Capella.

⁶³ It has now been established quite firmly that the imperial elite in Greece and the eastern provinces had at least a working knowledge of Latin and at the most enjoyed Latin literary texts: Rochette 1997, Adams 2003. Plutarch probably belonged to the second category: see Stadt-
a catchphrase, which represents a crucial aspect of Cicero's self-fashioning as orator and statesman. Plutarch, however, turns it into an attack on Cicero's excessive habit of praising himself. We find similar criticism of Cicero's overweening self-absorption in Cassius Dio. The criticism is symptomatic: for the Greek historians, Cicero's voice was in first instance a shouting, boastful sound, egocentric and employed for the purpose of φιλονικία. In this sense, his sound perfectly suited the view, widespread among Greek imperial writers, of a Roman Republic that was destroyed by internal strife due to the incessant (oratorical) competition among her citizens. However, most important about this portrayal of Cicero is that the authoritative voice he established in his lifetime figures prominently in Greek imperial historiography, though it has now been made subservient to the interpretation of his personality (instead of acting as a positive confirmation of his status).

6 Cicero's Demosthenic voice

In order to illustrate how the contentious voice of Cicero and his colleagues ruined the Republic after Caesar's death, Cassius Dio and Appian composed their own version of a Ciceronian “Philippic speech” (it is not unthinkable that Dio was imitating and emulating Appian). Cicero's Philippics provided an excellent model for the historians to base their speeches on. In addition, Dio gives a rendering of the amnesty speech Cicero delivered on 17 March 44 BC – in fact his is the only version we have of it. We are thus dealing with two possible types of Ciceronian speeches: the type which has a published speech by Cicero as its immediate precedent, and thus remodels an existing template of his textualized

er 2014, chapter 9. On the particular phenomenon of transliterating Latin into Greek, see Adams 2003, 91–92, where he argues that Latin words and phrases should in fact be recognized as such. See n. 44.


66 See above (n. 22) for some passages from Dio Cass. 46.

67 App. BC 1. praef. 1, and 5; Dio Cass. 43.53.2–3, 44.2.3, 44.29.3 (Cicero on civil strife). For the idea that oratory was the reason for the fall of the Republic, see Kuhn-Chen 2002 and now Burden-Strevens 2020.

68 In 38.18–29, Dio incorporates a dialogue between Cicero and a Greek philosopher called Philiscus, which we do not consider a speech in the formal sense; if anyone is performing his oratorical talents here, it is Philiscus – not Cicero.

69 Dio Cass. 44.23–33. The sources for this speech, apart from Cic. Phil. 1.1, are Flor. 2.17; Vell. Pat. 2.58; Plut. Cic. 42; App. BC 2.19.142. Plutarch actually does give some clues as to the contents of the speech: Dio works out these preliminary remarks into a full set piece speech.
voice; and a type which is a fictional reconstruction of Cicero’s style and political programme (though still inspired by the original Ciceronian corpus).

Do Appian and Dio’s “Philippics”, then, being modelled on the textualized voice, automatically sound like Cicero? Partly they do; previous research has examined the dependence of both historiographers on Cicero as their historical and rhetorical source.⁷⁰ However, instead of examining how these Ciceronian reperformances are spin-offs of the original texts, we shall focus on the underlying Greek template that the imperial historians used for constructing their voice of Cicero. The seeds of a Greek interpretation of Cicero’s speeches are found in the orator’s own strategies of imitating Demosthenic style and motifs; these have been well established.⁷¹ Caroline Bishop has extensively studied their consequences: the Demosthenic model enhances not only Cicero’s own republican image but also creates a compelling link between the fall of the Roman Republic and the loss of Athenian democracy.⁷² The question naturally arises to what extent the imperial Greek historians actually (re)modelled Cicero’s speeches on those of his great Hellenic predecessor, who was also one of their own models.

The educated Roman of the second and third century was still well-versed in the reading of both the Attic orators and Cicero. As a result, the central questions addressed in the Greek “Philippics”, about the role of φιλία and έχθρα in counsel, and about what is beneficiary for the community (τὸ συμφέρον), remind the reader of the debates held between the Attic orators.⁷³ This association with Attic oratory is strengthened by the remarkable use, particularly in Dio’s speeches, of intertextual links, phrases and terms that can be traced back to individual Greek authors.⁷⁴ In the following, for reasons of space, we will limit ourselves to some examples from Cassius Dio’s use of Demosthenes.

As would be expected, the “Philippics” in particular give proof of a dual Ciceronian–Demosthenic frame. Content-wise they remain close to the original Philippics; intertextually they attest to many “Attic” pretexts. Appian and Dio both condense the 14 (or 12) Ciceronian Philippics into one speech. They situate the

---

⁷⁰ This approach is common: for Appian, see e.g. the commentary by Magnino 1984; for Dio, Burden-Strevens 2018; Gowing 1992, 232–239 deals with both.
⁷¹ At least regarding the Philippics: Stroh 1982 and Wooten 1983.
⁷⁴ A few examples, which are definitely not exhaustive: App. BC 3.53, χώρα διοροφ, from Dem. 2.1; Dio Cass. 45.274, βοῶν καὶ κεκραγ, from Dem. 8.132, 199; Dio Cass. 46.2.1, ἄνω καὶ κάτω ταράττων, from Dem. 18.111; Dio Cass. 46.3.4, πλείονος μὲν τροπάς τρεπόμενος τοῦ πορθμοῦ πρὸς ὃν ἔφυγεν, adapt. from Aeschin. 3.90; Dio Cass. 46.16.1, τραγῳδεῖ περιόνων, from Dem. 19.189.
speech in the first days of January 43, making it coincide historically with Phil. 5–6. Appian and Dio’s “Philippics” each have replaced the then absent Mark Antony with another object of scorn: Appian’s Cicero directs his anger at the otherwise little-known tribune Salvius, and Dio’s Cicero addresses Calenus, to whom there is a vague reference in Phil. 5.1, and who is the actual historical addressee of Phil. 8. The “Philippics” are a mishmash of themes, phrases and rhetorical commonplaces taken from the entire Ciceronian corpus. Both also closely relate to their model in that Appian’s as well as Dio’s Cicero hammers home the message that Antony is a public enemy for a specified number of illegal actions (e.g. seizing Gaul, bringing armed men into the city, mismanagement of the acta Caesaris, embezzling money). For example, even if there is a difference in the intensity of the invective (Dio repeats many invective topics from Phil. 2 against Antony, while Appian employs a more neutral tone), both authors have incorporated the story, cultivated by Cicero in the original speeches, that Antony slaughtered a large part of his legions.

There is a second layer to the speeches as well; one example should suffice here. As part of his invective of Antony, Dio’s Cicero defines his opponent as having sowed “the seed of all evils that have arisen after [the civil war]”, and “the common bane of not only us but of nearly the entire world” (οὗτος ὁ τὸ σπέρμα τῶν κακῶν τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα ἐκφύντων ἐμβαλὼν, οὗτος ὁ κοινὸς ἄλιτήριος οὐχ ἵμων μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης ὀλίγου πάσης γενομένος). The immediate source seems to be Phil. 2.55, where Cicero blamed Antony for the civil war between Caesar and Pompey: “Therefore, in the way that the origin of trees and plants is located in seeds, so you are the seed of this most horrid war” (ut igitur in seminibus est causa arborum et stirpium, sic huius luctuosissimi belli semen tu fuisti). The term “seed” (σπέρμα, semen) figures in both texts; however, the term

75 Cf. Manuwald 2007, 43, who discusses him as one of the “people involved”, without explaining his absence in Cicero’s own Philippics. The only non-consular politician known to have similarly defended Antony’s actions in the debates preceding that on 1 January 43 is L. Varius Cotyla: see Cic. Phil. 5.5–7, cf. Phil. 8.24, 28, 32, 33.

76 Appian’s speech shows two odd similarities with Phil. 8: the introduction of both speeches embeds them in the previous discussion, referring to a senate meeting held the previous day (Phil. 8.1, hesterno die vs. BC 3.51, ἔθες), and they end with a sneer towards Salvius/Cotyla, portraying them as servants of Antony (Phil. 8.32, imperatorem suum vs. BC 3.53, δυνατώτερος [γένηται]).

77 Cf. Gowing 1992, 235; Burden-Strevens 2018, 129–130 for an enumeration and comparison of these topics in Phil. 2 and Dio’s speech.

78 Phil. 3.4; 5.22; 12.12.

79 Dio Cass. 45.27.

80 Phil. 2.55.
ἀλιτήριος, “evil spirit”, in Dio’s text does not derive from Cicero. For this idea Dio has revisited Cicero’s original source for this metaphor, the Crown debate between Aeschines and Demosthenes.\(^{81}\) Dio also derived from these Greek models the metaphor of providing the seed (τὸ σπέρμα παράσχων vs. τὸ σπέρμα ἐμβάλων; instead of being the seed, as Cicero phrases it), and took over the image of the entire world being affected. Dio wrote the Demosthenic elements which Cicero had left out back into the speech, thus restoring the original intertext of the entire world being affected. Dio wrote the Demosthenic elements which Cicero had left out back into the speech, thus restoring the original intertext of the metaphor together with the Greek terminology. The historian took over the conceptual language from Cicero’s Philippics to increase the credibility of his “Philippic”; in terms of style, however, he relies rather on the original Greek model of the Philippics, and the result is that Cicero’s voice blends in with that of Demosthenes.

We can observe a similar strategy in Dio’s amnesty speech (44.23 – 33). It is a different example of “Ciceronian” oratory, since we have no original model to compare it with. Whatever its origins, the opening of his speech is based not on a Latin but on a Greek model: the exordium of Demosthenes’ On the Chersonese (Dio Cass. 44.23.1; Dem. 8.1):

’Αει μὲν ἔγωγεν οἷς μηδένα μηδὲν μὴτε πρὸς χάριν μὴτε πρὸς φιλονεικίαν λέγειν, ἄλλ᾽ ὁ βέλτιστον ἔκαστος εἶναι νομίζει, τοῦτ᾽ ἀποφάνεσθαι, δεινὸν γὰρ εἰ τοὺς μὲν στρατηγοῦντας τοὺς ἐπιταύνοντας πάντα ἀπὸ ὀρθῆς τῆς διανοίας ποιεῖν ἀξιώσομεν, κἂν ἄρα πως αφαλώσῃ, εὐθὺνας παρ᾽ αὐτῶν καὶ τῆς τύχης ἀπαιτήσομεν, ἐν δὲ δὴ τῶν βουλευόμεν, ἐν ψυχρότατοι τῆς ἡμετέρας αὐτῶν γνώμης ἑσμὲν, τὰ κοινὴ συμφέροντα τῶν ἑαυτῶν ἑνεκα πλε-νεξίων προησομένα.

No one ought ever, I think, to say anything either out of favour or out of spite, but every one ought to declare what he believes to be best. We demand that those serving as praetors or consuls shall do everything from upright motives, and if they make any errors, we demand an accounting from them even for their misfortune; how absurd, then, if in discussion, where we are complete masters of our own opinion, we shall sacrifice the general welfare to our private interests!\(^{82}\)

"Εδει μὲν, ὡς ἄνδρες Αθηναίοι, τοὺς λέγοντας ἀπαντάς μὴτε πρὸς ἔγχρων ποιεῖσθαι λόγων μηδένα μὴτε πρὸς χάριν, ἄλλ᾽ ὁ βέλτιστον ἔκαστος ἔγετο, τοῦτ᾽ ἀποφάνεσθαι, ἄλλως τε καὶ περὶ κοινῶν πραγμάτων καὶ μεγάλων ὑμῶν βουλευόμενων. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐνοὶ τὰ μὲν φιλονικία, τὰ δὲ ἦπινόδηποι αἰτίη προάγονται λέγειν, ὑμᾶς, ὡς ἄνδρες Αθηναίοι, τοὺς πολλοὺς δεὶ πάντα τάλλ᾽ ἀφελόντας, ἃ τῇ πόλει νομίζετε συμφέρειν, ταῦτα καὶ ψηφίζοσθαι καὶ πράττειν.

81 Aeschin. 3.131, 136, 157; Dem. 18.159: Οὐκ ἂν ὄνομήσαμι ἔγωγεν κοινὸν ἀλειτήριον τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα ἀπολωλότων ἀπάντων εἰπεῖν, ἄνθρωπων, τόπων, πόλεων: ὅ γὰρ τὸ σπέρμα παρασκόν, οὗτος τῶν φύτων ἀτις (“I will not flinch from declaring him the evil genius of all the men, all the districts, and all the cities that have perished. Let the man who sowed the seed bear the guilt of the harvest”. Transl. Vince/Vince 1939).

82 Transl. Cary 1916.
It should be the duty of all speakers, men of Athens, to give no expression to their hatred or their partiality, but to put forward just what each thinks the best counsel, especially when you are debating a question of urgent public importance. But since there are speakers who are impelled to address you, either as partisans or from some other motive, whatever it may be, you citizens who form the majority ought to dismiss all else from your minds, and vote and act in such a way as you think will best serve our city.83

Christopher Burden-Strevens has demonstrated that Dio’s most iconic imitations of Cicero occur at the openings of speeches or in the transitions to a new argument or part of the speech.84 As we see here, the pattern can also be recognized in Dio’s imitation of Demosthenes. The opening of Dio’s Cicero differs from the opening of On the Chersonese in that the impersonal verb ἔδει is rewritten as the more personal ἐγὼ ὁμαί, which might be an example of a Ciceronian “sound-bite” (his emphatic use of ego was a well-known topic for ridicule in antiquity, as Dio illustrates later through Calenus).85 Yet generally the Demosthenic parallel is strong. The opening sentences of both orations express the idea that in decision-making senators should not be hindered by personal ambitions; φιλονικία is set against what is συμφέρον for the polity. That this beginning is indeed recognizable Demosthenic can also be deduced from the ancient scholia on Demosthenes, which signal it as a prime example of captatio benevolentiae.86

The allusion can be easily explained by the situational parallel: Demosthenes found himself in the precarious position of having to reconcile two different parties in the senate: one strove for withdrawal and compromise, the other wished to wage war against Philip. Not too differently, Cicero was trying to create some kind of truce between the Caesarians and the Liberators, in his case to prevent the outburst of civil war. After this programmatic imitation of On the Chersonese, one might expect that Dio modelled the rest of his speech on Dem. 8 too, but that is not the case. The allusion to On the Chersonese is promptly followed by an aposiopesis, which again was famous among ancient scholars,87 that is quoted from the exordium of Demosthenes’ master speech On the Crown: Οὐ

83 Transl. Vince 1930.
84 Burden-Strevens 2018, 121; for a comprehensive illustration of this method, see now Burden-Strevens 2020, 72–93.
85 Dio Cass. 46.9.2–3. Cf. Phil. 2.72, 77, 8.15, 12.17; Cat. 4.2, Pis. 21. In the Philippics alone Cicero uses demonstrative ego 124 times. Cf. MacKendrick 1995 for the frequent use of ego in the speeches between 66–45 BC.
86 Schol. Dem. in or. 8.1, 5a–5b, ed. Dills 1992; the winning of the assembly’s goodwill would be achieved in particular by the reference to τὰ κοινά, the public cause.
87 Usher 1993 ad loc. gives useful commentary. Quint. 9.2.54 points out the similar use of this figure in Dem. 18.3 and an unknown passage in Cicero’s Pro Milone; cf. rhet. Her. 4.30 (second example).
βούλομαι δυσχερές εἰπεῖν οὐδὲν ἀρχόμενος τοῦ λόγου. Again, there are similarities to be seen between the public positions of Cicero and Demosthenes, but the rapid succession of two Demosthenic quotes seems to have a deeper meaning. With these two quotations from Demosthenes, Dio has established a specifically Greek version of Cicero’s voice, one in which Cicero sounds like Demosthenes and thus more like a Greek than a Roman orator.

It must be said that the speech encompasses themes that are not only associated with Attic but with republican oratory more generally. Theorizing about the importance of concord and humanity, it contains weighty reflection upon the origins of civic strife, and reviews Rome’s history by a range of Roman exempla. Only when in the peroratio Cicero claims to have always acted with the ὀμόνοια and ἔλευθερία of the state in mind, the reader at last, by way of these catchwords, hears the echo of Cicero’s political programme, in which he identifies his own name with pax, concordia, and libertas rei publicae.

Cicero’s vox publica is certainly present in Cassius Dio, but it has lost its distinctiveness. First, it does not surpass the petty voices of his fellow citizens – it is striving just as hard as all the others to be heard on the battlefield of republican politics. Admittedly, the Ciceronian character is clearly recognizable for its republican (optimatique) argumentation and the anti-Antonian invective, or for the structural correlations it creates between the original Philippics and their reperformance. Yet the translation of the Roman orator’s voice into Greek has huge consequences. To say it pointedly: Cicero can only be Cicero as far as his Greek models go. Roman concepts are moulded into a Greek framework. Within this process, Cicero’s Latin voice, elevated and symbolized by himself, is not the single model for reconstructions of his oratory and neither is it, we should add, for interpretations of his consular persona.

In sum, Cicero’s speeches in Greek historiography show both the fascination for and the limits of the reperformance of Cicero’s voice. In Dio’s History, it has become a typical oratorical voice, which within its historical context is liable to criticism, thus losing part of the exceptional authority that Cicero himself had wanted to convey to it. Furthermore, the dominant Demosthenic intertext decisively alters the ideological significance of Cicero’s voice. For one, it turns it into a timeless and universal rhetorical prototype, which fitted the global

88 Dem. 18.3. Dio’s version of it is differently formulated but contains the same words; see Dio Cass. 44.23.4: δυσχερές δ’ οὐδὲν ἀρχόμενος τῶν λόγων εἰπεῖν βούλομαι.
89 Gowing 1992, 232–233, with further bibliography, explains the use of Cicero as the advocate for amnesty. There is a reminiscence of Thuc. 4.62.3–4 in Dio Cass. 44.27, as Kyhnitzsch 1894 was the first to notice.
90 Mur. 78 strongly resembles Dio Cass. 44.33.2; cf. Phil. 5.40.
scope of the imperial writers. For another, Cicero’s own imitation of Demosthenes is extended beyond the literary level; in line with Bishop’s argument mentioned above, we could say that in its allusions to Demosthenes’ speeches Cicero’s oratory is made to symbolize the fall of a republican system.

Though the imperial writers apply a method not dissimilar to that used in the rhetorical schools and handbooks, incorporating core concepts and “sound-bites” that evoke an exemplary Ciceronian image, the Greek interpretation of Cicero’s vox publica more clearly shows its transhistorical meaning, which in this case at once confirms and diminishes Cicero’s authoritative reputation.

Appendix

We have argued so far that in antiquity Cicero’s voice was imitated, even to the extent of impersonating Cicero’s persona, but also radically reshaped and complemented with other intertextual sounds. In this appendix, we briefly turn to a famous and intriguing post-antique example. It stems from the late XIV century and from Italy, and was written by Pier Paolo Vergerio the Elder, who is often credited as one of the first Italian humanists who advocated rhetoric and oratory as the core discipline of a humanistic curriculum, and who therefore stands at the beginning of what Ronald Witt has called “the revival of oratory”. Vergerio wrote his letter under the guise and name of Cicero and addressed it to the father of humanism, Francesco Petrarch, by then already deceased for twenty years.

Vergerio’s letter is a late answer to Petrarch’s Epistola familiaris 24.3, written as a reaction to his finding of a manuscript of Cicero’s Letters to Atticus in Verona.
in 1345.\textsuperscript{94} On the one hand, Petrarch, who had always been a huge admirer of Cicero and would remain so throughout his life, was thrilled that he could read more Ciceronian material. On the other hand, he was also deeply troubled – not so much by the discovery of Cicero’s often futile political activity,\textsuperscript{95} but by Cicero’s “private” voice in the letters, which was so different from Cicero’s sententia publica he had known so far. In his indignant letter addressed directly to Cicero, Petrarch criticized Cicero for his inconsistent behaviour, \textit{i.e.}, for not having followed the strict rules he himself had formulated, and for his improper public engagement towards the end of his life. Even though in a second letter written to Cicero (\textit{fam. 24.4}) Petrarch addresses Cicero in a hymnic way as \textit{o Romani eloquii summe parens}, it is worth noting that Cicero’s unfamiliar epistolary voice did not trigger a stylistic but a moral reaction from Petrarch. Cicero’s codified voice still invited him to reconstruct the man behind it, even so strongly as to allow Petrarch to address this Cicero personally.

Vergerio’s answer, written in 1394, defends Cicero from all charges and makes a strong case for active engagement in public life as the only possible state of mind of an intellectual.\textsuperscript{96} Against Petrarch’s criticism that Cicero had “abandon[ed] the leisure fitted to your age and career and position” (\textit{etati et professioni et fortune tue conveniens otium reliquisti}), Vergerio’s Cicero answers by asserting that “a philosophy that lives in the cities and shuns solitude, always seemed mature and outstanding” (\textit{ea enim michi matura semper et prestans philosophia visa est, que in urbibus habitat et solitudinem fugit}).\textsuperscript{97} But the letter’s content does not interest us here as much as the orchestration of the (almost literal) resurrection of Cicero’s voice.\textsuperscript{98} Whereas Petrarch has gone halfway in res-

\textsuperscript{94} Literature on this letter is endless, which can now be read (with useful, albeit short annotations) in Fantham 2017, vol. 2, 434–437 (notes p. 677–679). Cf. recently McLaughlin 2015, 26–30 with further references.

\textsuperscript{95} Cf. Enenkel 1998, 19–27, who strictly rejects Baron’s interpretation, according to which Petrarch, after the finding of the letters, discovered that Cicero was no solitary philosopher and therefore was no fit role model for himself. Enenkel convincingly argues that Petrarch knew of Cicero’s political activity already before and that he continued to write in admiring terms about Cicero, \textit{e.g.} in his \textit{Memorandarum rerum libri} (finished around the time of the discovery of the \textit{Letters to Atticus}) or, much later, in his \textit{Seniles} 16.1. Similarly, Rener 1998, 50; \textit{contra} Witt 1990, 173.


\textsuperscript{97} Petrarch, \textit{fam. 24.3.2}. Transl. Fantham 2017.


\textsuperscript{99} “Cicero” explicitly speaks from the Elysian fields and also reflects on the fact that his voice is somewhat harsher than usual due to centuries of lack of practice – a joke that could even be
correcting the “real” Cicero by writing to him, Vergerio takes the idea one step further by writing his letters behind the mask of the Roman orator. As has been shown, Vergerio indeed is quite skilled in sounding like his model. Of course, for our modern eyes (and ears) he does not sound exactly like Cicero – we are still far from the dizzying classicistic excellence of style of the late 15th century. But apart from recurring to ancient sources in order to contextualize Cicero’s behaviour, he often also quotes Cicero directly. Even more often, Vergerio is a skilled user of Ciceronian catchphrases: omnes boni stand against the improbi, Cicero’s life is a constant struggle between otium and negotium (Vergerio uses the pointed formulation that Cicero’s otium consisted in always living in negotio), his service for the state is based on consilium and ratio, he speaks with oratio libera, and his final goal is the consensus bonorum.

While Vergerio thus tries to impersonate Cicero as well as he can, his letter is nevertheless no pseudo-Ciceronian work like the speech Pridie quam in exilium iret mentioned above. At the end of the letter, Vergerio makes it clear that he is not Cicero, but that he is merely playing “as if” by adding his own full name, related to Cicero’s own theoretical treatises in which oratorical excellence is defined as a combination of natura, ars and exercitatio.

100 Stierle 2003, 198 even goes one step further in his treatment of the second letter to Cicero, fam. 24:A, according to him, Petrarch, by identifying with Cicero, turns himself into the voice of the dead Cicero (“nachdem Petrarca sich einmal in Cicero hineingedacht und zu seiner Stimme gemacht hat”).


102 Cf. Renier 1998, 54 – 55. Robey 1983, 16, deduces from the many quotations from and allusions to Cicero that the letter is not very original; this seems incorrect. On the contrary, making use of Ciceronian material in order to fully appreciate Cicero’s life (instead of relying on other, often later sources) is truly ground-breaking; Leonardo Bruni would pick up the same method twenty years later in his influential Cicero novus (on which cf. Jansen 2020).

103 Cf. Qui igitur multa diximus [...] nec minus reipublice aut amicis aut iis qui operam nostram implorassem, consilio atque ratione profuimus (Smith 1934, 438.22 – 439.3; cf. Steel 2007); id vero otium et etas et professio et fortuna mea sibi exigeabant ut essem qui semper in negotio versarer (Smith 1934, 439.24 – 25; cf. de orat. 1.1 with the programmatic double focus on otium/negotium); quoniam semper abundant improbi, inimicos multos, emulos pures habeamus (Smith 1934, 440.3 – 4; on boni vs. improbi see references above); feci quidem quod boni fecerunt omnes [...] ac tum demum bellum secutus sum, cum pax, cuius auctor semper fueram stabiliendo, servari non potuit (Smith 1934, 440.10 – 13, for the second part cf. Phil. 7.7 – 8); semperque, ut animo, ita et oratione usus sum libera (Smith 1934, 441.11; cf. e.g. the beginning of Cic. Rosc. Am., mentioned above); quod facinus preclarum non tam prudentie mee [...] quam fortune populi Romani et consensui bonorum semper ascripsi (Smith 1934, 443.19 – 22; the formulation fortuna populi Romani occurs twenty times in Latin texts from antiquity, six times of which in Cicero and once in the Epistula ad Octavianum, then still considered a genuine work by Cicero).
Petrus Paulus Vergerius Iustinopolitanus, as a subscriptio, thus blending his own voice explicitly into the master’s voice, whose name had been the first word of the letter:

Cicero Francisco sal.

[...]

In campis elisiis ad latus orientalis, kalendis sextilis, anno uno de L postquam tu dederas.

Petrus Paulus Vergerius Iustinopolitanus.

Cicero greets Francesco

[...]

In the Eastern part of the Elysian fields, on the Kalendae of the Sextilis, 49 years after your letter. Pier Paolo Vergerio from Capodistria.¹⁰⁴

The letter’s frame, Cicero and Vergerio, visibly defines the close connection between the two.

Scholars have interpreted the text in different ways: Baron saw it as Vergerio’s expression of his believe in Florentine republicanism;¹⁰⁵ Robey and Witt articulate the communis opinio that the letter should better be understood as a temporary expression of Vergerio’s interest in Ciceronian oratory and style and as a document that advocates a vita activa-ideal. Enenkel adds the important aspect of lusus: the letter is also meant to be an intertextual amusement for the educated reader.¹⁰⁶ Although we agree that the text is also a learned and entertaining show piece for fellow intellectuals, we surmise that the frame especially suggests that it is no purely literary pastime. Vergerio tries to present a “more adequate” version of Cicero’s voice than the one Petrarsh had suggested in his letter. This is probably not in the least done for reasons of self-fashioning. The young Vergerio, still in search of a stable position that would allow him to make a living from his intellectual work, formulates a witty and at the same time serious programme that can be compared to ideas of fellow pupils of Coluccio Salutati, like Antonio Loschi and Leonardo Bruni.¹⁰⁷ He redefines Cicero’s voice in order to transform him into the prime exemplum for anyone with political ambitions; “speaking like Cicero” can be a first step towards “being like Cicero”, which means assuming

¹⁰⁴ Transl. Pieper.
¹⁰⁵ McManamon 1996, 58 principally agrees with this political interpretation.
¹⁰⁷ It is not by chance that Bruni dedicated two of his early own works, the two dialogues on questions of humanistic education, the Dialogi ad Petrum Paulum Histrum, to Vergerio. They are the first humanistic examples of a Ciceronian dialogue. See for a generic interpretation Häsner 2002; for an assessment of Bruni’s Ciceronian model see Bertolio 2009.
Cicero’s exemplary oratorical ethos. And “being like Cicero” means “being a good humanist”, one to whom public affairs can be entrusted safely. Vergerio thus emphatically rehabilitates Cicero’s voice as a political entity, a real presence in the life of would-be orators and politicians. Through the fiction of a letter written by Cicero and Vergerio together, the old agency of Cicero’s voice pops up again: its authority would eventually rise and become almost more powerful in the fifteenth century than it had ever been in antiquity.

---

109 Cf. Witt 1990, 176 ("Cicero as a model of conduct").
110 Thanks are due to the editors, Francesca Romana Berno and Giuseppe La Bua, for their careful guidance of the project, to Rosalie Stoner for her corrections and comments, and to the Dutch Research Council (NWO), which has funded this research with a VIDI grant (funding no. 276 – 30 – 013).
SECTION IV: Cicero in Politics
1 Introduction

“Cicéron selon moi est un des grans esprits qui aye jamais été. L’ame toûjours belle lorsqu’elle n’étoit pas foible”.¹ This apparently contradictory pensée is emblematic of the portrait of Marcus Tullius Cicero by Charles-Louis de Secondat, baron de la Brède et de Montesquieu. Since his early works he had displayed an ambivalent attitude towards Cicero, oscillating between admiration and criticism about the many-sided personality of the republican orator.

This mixture of praise and disapproval is part of a long-standing interpretative tradition,² which was affected by the changes concerning the authority of ancient examples during Enlightenment, especially in France. Cicero played an important role in rhetorical education and Ciceronian Latin came also to be the official language of the Church and intellectuals. Nevertheless, Montesquieu asserts that “on ne peut jamais quitter les Romains”.³

Although defining Montesquieu as part already of French Enlightenment may be controversial, it is undisputed that he lived in a period of increasing self-affirmation against philosophical, political and religious backgrounds, influencing his intellectual profile. However, he refused to abandon ancient authors, believing that they could still be source of valid political lessons:

J’ai eu toute ma vie un goût décidé pour les ouvrages des anciens. Ayant lu plusieurs critiques faites de nos jours contre les anciens, j’ai admiré plusieurs de ces critiques, mais j’ai admiré toujours les anciens.

¹ Mont. Pensées 1.773 (Dornier 2013): “Cicero, in my opinion, is one of the greatest minds that has ever been. The soul always beautiful when was not weak”. The quotations in French are freely translated by the author in footnotes. Reference editions are given in brackets after each quotation.
² However, it goes back to a tradition cultivated since the Augustan Age. See La Bua 2019, 100 – 182.
³ Mont. EL 11.13 (Murachco 2005): “we can never leave the Romans”.
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Montesquieu paradoxical passion for the Ancient World and praise of modern innovations shaped a very peculiar portrait of Cicero that includes, at least, three aspects: Cicero as historiographical source, as historical figure and as philosopher. Hoping to obtain a comprehensive portrait that may clarify relevant traits of Cicero’s modern image and his role in Montesquieu’s historical and political thought, this paper aims to examine several works written by the Baron de la Brède, in which Cicero’s life and ideas are discussed or his texts are used for argumentation.

2 Cicero as historiographical source

On the portrait of Cicero as a historiographical source in Montesquieu we are allowed to pinpoint which Ciceronian texts were available to the French philosopher. This is also preliminary to drawing a comprehensive picture of Cicero in Montesquieu’s work. An inventory of the sources on Rome’s republican history used by Montesquieu may be then a useful starting point. I will examine three significant works on Roman history.

In *Dissertation sur la politique des Romains dans la religion* (1716), Montesquieu focuses on the importance of religion in Roman politics. His historical approach demands several and distinct classical works. He mentions Livy, Suetonius, Macrobius, Valerius Maximus, Saint Augustin and Tacitus. In *Considérations sur les causes de la grandeur des Romains et de leur décadence* (1734), an intellectually mature Montesquieu aims to explore the plurality of causes of Roman political events. Such robust enterprise demanded a considerable increase on the number of sources and a qualitative shift on their use. In the chapters until Augustan Age, he quotes again Livy, Tacitus, Valerius Maximus, adding Polybius, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Plutarch, Aulus Gellius, Florus, Frontinus, Appian, Dion and Sallust. Finally, in *De l’esprit des lois* (1748), his *magnum opus*, the pivotal argument on plurality of causes that give birth to political events is expanded. On analyzing the diversity of political experiences, Montesquieu identifies the intervention of cultural, legal, geographical, climatic, monetary and commercial factors, which indicate that each political organization have a reason to be so and they hardly can be classified according to abstract types of government. He also applies this reading to ancient civilizations, including Greece and Rome. For this purpose, the author uses Republican sources, such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Plutarch, Florus, Cornelius Nepos, Sallust, Tacitus, Dion Cassius, Suetonius, Julius Cesar, Valerius Maximus, Aulus Gellius, Polybius and Appian.
What about Cicero? The Roman orator is one of the most referenced authors. In *Dissertation*, Montesquieu quotes *De legibus*, *De senectute*, *De divinatione* and *De natura deorum*. In *Romains*, a much larger text, he indicates *Tusculanae disputationes*, *De officis*, *Ad Atticum*, *Ad familiares* and *Ad Brutum*. But there is a qualitative difference between the uses of Cicero in both texts: the quotations in the latter are more harmonious with the issues discussed and, for this reason, explored with considerable depth. The first direct quotation is a long transcription of the letter 4.18 from Cicero to Atticus, used to show the corruption of customs.⁴ Although Montesquieu had already made his point, he did not have enough material to support his argumentation, which he found in a Ciceronian text. Cultural aspects like this often find its origin in Cicero. Illustratively, Montesquieu evokes him to show how the Romans considered trade and arts as occupations of slaves,⁵ or to reinforce foreigners’ habit of building temples to their former governors.⁶ Cicero is also used in the description of the profiles and deeds of great Republican figures, such as Sulla’s tyrannical actions,⁷ and Pompey, whom Cicero accuses of being slow in certain quarrels with Caesar, an opinion endorsed by Montesquieu.⁸

Finally, Cicero is of the greatest importance to the discussion of the decline of the Republic in the *Romains*. According to Montesquieu, political anarchy favored the ambitions of political leaders. This was the perspective by which he looked at the triumvirate of Pompey, Crassus, and Caesar, who established impunity for all public crimes and eliminated any mechanism to prevent the corruption of customs. Instead of being good lawmakers, they worked to make their fellow citizens’ situation worse.⁹ Still, some resisted. In a letter, Brutus states that he would kill his father just the same way he did. Nevertheless, such spirit of freedom was gradually lost: conspiracies would be reborn continually.¹⁰ In a conclusive tone, Montesquieu points out how it is possible to see the decline “dans les lettres de quelques grands hommes de ce temps-là”, quoting

---

⁵ Mont. *Romains* 76 (Montesquieu 1796), citing Cic. *off.* 1.42.
⁶ Mont. *Romains* 91 (Montesquieu 1796), citing Cic. *Att.* 5 [21.7]. Montesquieu sometimes cites inaccurately and loosely, which has been preserved in this and the following footnotes.
⁹ Mont. *Romains* 98 (Montesquieu 1796). Cela se voit bien dans les Lettres de Ciceron à Atticus.
Cicero as the author of most of them, a better source for knowing the despair of principal men than the speeches of historians.¹¹ However, Cicero is an occasional source in *De l’esprit*. When invoked to detail the legal-institutional structure of the Roman Republic, he enables Montesquieu to describe the proceedings of judgment,¹² the exile of defendants before trial¹³ and the lese-majesty crime according to Sulla’s law.¹⁴ Relying on Cicero, he could explain how censorship worked,¹⁵ pointing to the composition of the *populus* each five years;¹⁶ similarly, he described the origin of the *praetura*, focusing on its significance to the defense of liberty.¹⁷ Cicero is also mentioned in order to understand the variability of societies, governments and legal provisions, such as divorce,¹⁸ increase of usury in elections time¹⁹ and the Gabinia Law prohibitions.²⁰ These references impelled Montesquieu to develop investigations on the origins and content of the aforementioned law, which reveal how Ciceronian texts are not only informational material but also responsible for arousing legal and historical curiosity of interpreters. In other words, Cicero, like other ancients, is not merely a *topoi* reservoir for rhetorical strengthening. A good example is the discussion on testaments. Although wills were unwritten and without formalities,²¹ some jurists were uncertain if women could be heirs. Montesquieu evokes Cicero to outline possible interpretations on the matter, considering the original aims of the Gabinian Law,²² at the end endorsing his defense of the legitimacy of female heirs.²³ The great care in following different Ciceronian passages to support an argumentative line shows how they were starting points for reflections.²⁴

---

¹⁴ Mont. *EL* 16 (Murachco 2005), citing Cic. *Clu.* 3; *Pis.* 21; *Verr.* 2.5; *fam.* 3.2.
¹⁸ Mont. *EL* 16.16 (Murachco 2005), citing Cic. *Phil.* 2.[69] (references in brackets are passages quoted by Montesquieu, but not fully indicated).
²¹ Mont. *EL* 27 (Murachco 2005), citing Cic. *de orat.* 1.[228].
²² Mont. *EL* 27 (Murachco 2005), citing Cic. *fin.* 2.[55]; 3.58; *Verr.* 2.1.[107]; *Caecin.* [99].
There are also important connections between Cicero and liberty, a central issue to Montesquieu. Indeed, he admits a strong attachment to liberty in Rome, something firmly defended by Cicero. For both of them, “il n’y a point de mot qui ait reçu plus de différentes significations, et qui ait frappé les esprits de tant de manières, que celui de liberté”. It implies the refusal of privileges, laws made against particular citizens. Cicero wanted their abolition because he believed that “la force de la loi ne consiste qu’en ce qu’elle statue sur tout le monde”. Montesquieu disagrees. For him, a “veil on liberty” is admissible in certain moments. He forgets Cicero’s concerns with aequitas, but this disagreement reveals his independence from the authority of classical writers, adopting a critical sense. Nevertheless, this hermeneutic autonomy could also lead to follow Ciceronian opinions, as when qualifying the Agrarian laws as disastrous or the creation of tribunes as a contribution to the welfare of the Republic because people’s power is terrible without a chief. This also happens when he discusses the causes of decline of the Republic, already announced in Cicero’s criticism of Rome being, simultaneously, world dominator and universal trading agent, a dangerous and unbalanced combination. He also warned about the secret vote, rejected because “il faut que le petit peuple soit éclairé par les principaux, et contenu par la gravité de certains personnages”. Liberty was gradually weakened, but there was an alternative: tyrannicide.

This discussion on liberty reveals that the Romans had qualities still valid for modern men. For example, the Twelve Tables were “a model of precision”, to the point that “les enfants les apprenaient par cœur”, as in De legibus. However, in Montesquieu’s time was no longer possible to agree with all ancient laws and

25 Perhaps one of the intellectual fathers of liberalism, as discussed in Spector 1998; 2010; 2012.
26 See Santos 2018a.
27 Mont. EL 11.2 (Murachco 2005): “there is no word which has received more different meanings, and which has struck the minds in so many ways, than that of liberty”, citing Cic. Att. 6.1.15 without reference.
28 Mont. EL 12.19 (Murachco 2005): “the force of the law consists only in that it rules over everyone”, citing Cic. leg. 3.44.
29 For aequitas in classical Roman law, see Santos 2018b.
30 Mont. EL 26.15 (Murachco 2005).
31 Mont. EL 5.11 (Murachco 2005), citing Cic. leg. 3.[24].
32 Mont. EL 20.4 (Murachco 2005), citing a fragment from Cic. rep. 4.7, probably from Non. 24.15.
33 Mont. EL 26.16 (Murachco 2005), citing Cic. leg. 1.4.
34 Mont. EL 2.2 (Murachco 2005): “the common people must be enlightened by the most important ones, and contained by the seriousness of certain characters”.
35 Mont. EL 12.18 (Murachco 2005), citing Cic. inv. 2.[144].
36 Mont. EL 29.16 (Murachco 2005): “the children learnt them by heart”, citing Cic. leg. 1.[4].
practices, such as killing children with birth defects. The Baron de la Brède recog- 
nizes precisely that the modern man can and must use their critical skills to 
evaluate and judge other realities, including the products from the past.37 But 
even if they can act and know better, Roman examples remain important for po-

titical reflections. The experiences and customs narrated by Cicero38 and the Re-
publican episodes of fight for freedom could help French intellectuals to deal 
with a political Régime which was becoming Ancien.

Indeed, in Montesquieu, the classics are simultaneously messengers, rhetorical 


topo and inspirations. Therefore, Cicero is not a historiographical source in 
contemporary sense. Montesquieu wants to keep him as a real companion in his 
investigative journey, helping the author to build up solid arguments. An intima-
cy so far from scientific history is an element that corroborates the thesis that 
classifies Montesquieu as a pioneer of philosophy of history.39 In fact, not only 
he connects realistic interpretations with a political sphere “daughter of histo-
y”,40 but also tries to discover universal principles of history, which is interpret-
ed as a moving totality full of non-reducible causes41 and endowed with mean-
ings,42 according to a mixture of Newtonian influence with Aristotelian 
heritage.43 This was only possible since he was aware of his privileged position 
to learn and write history,44 knowing that historians were, above all, “examina-
teurs severes des actions de ceux qui ont paru sur la terre”, as the “magistrats 
d’Egypte qui apelloient en jugement l’ame des tous les morts”.45

Montesquieu does not mourn for ancient times. Rome is no longer a refer-
ce for moral or political discourse or a well of timeless examples,46 an effect

37 Mont. EL 23.23 (Murachco 2005), citing Cic. leg. 3.[19].
38 Mont. EL 19.27 (Murachco 2005), citing Cic. Phil. 2.69; Mont. Pensées 1.9 (Dornier 2013).
39 For Montesquieu as a philosopher of history or not, see Gibbon 1761, 108; Cassirer 1992, 282; 
Meinecke 1943; Carrithers 1986; Santos 2006. It is noteworthy the opinion of Rain, to whom Mon-
tesquieu introduces much more innovations than Voltaire’s Histoire de Charles XII, published 
three years after Romain. See Rain 1952, 198.
40 Ehrard 1965, 10.
41 Althusser 1992, 43; 54.
42 Meinecke 1943, 141.
43 Goyard-Fabre 1993, 2–12; 55–68.
44 Mont. Pensées 2.1183 (Dornier 2013): “Je suis dans des circonstances les plus propres du 
monde pour écrire l’histoire” (“I am in the most propitious circumstances in the world to 
write the history”).
45 Mont. Pensées 2.1260 (Dornier 2013): “Severe examiners of the actions of those who have ap-
peared on the earth”, as the “magistrates of Egypt who call the soul of all the dead to judg-
ment”.
46 Senarclens 2003, 11.
of the quarrel between the ancients and the moderns. As Montesquieu puts it: “Il faut connaître les choses anciennes non pas pour changer les nouvelles, mais afin de bien user des nouvelles”. Cicero enters the scene: he witnessed the last sighs of the Republic, but was also a writer aware of the signs of ruin, as appears in his letters, “un monument bien authentique de la corruption romaine”.

3 Cicero as historical and political figure

The discovery of Cicero as a historiographical source helps to interpret him as a political character. First, it is necessary to understand the predominant view on Cicero in the XVIII century.

An interesting example is provided by another French philosopher, Voltaire. He had been outraged at Cicero’s characterization in Crebillon’s play *Catilina*, in which the consul was stripped of glory in the conspiracy. Voltaire soon elaborated *Rome Sauvée, ou Catilina* to “show Cicero in glowing lights”. For him, Cicero’s name “est dans toutes les bouches, ses écrits dans toutes les mains”, all know when he was “à la tête de Rome”. In charge of public affairs, he still found time to learn Greek philosophy, becoming “le plus grand philosophe des Romains, aussi bien que le plus eloquent”. Voltaire’s passion for Cicero was so intense that he emulated the consul in private rehearsals, occasions in which “le personnage se confondait avec le poète”, as Condorcet remarked.

The young Montesquieu had a similar exaltation, but contrasted it with critical disapprobation. The starting point is his *Discours sur Cicéron*. The text begins with a strong statement: “Cicéron est, de tous les anciens, celui qui a eu le plus de mérite personnel, et à qui j’aimerois mieux ressembler”. He wants to be

---

48 Mont. *Pensées* 3.1795 (Dornier 2013): “One must know the old things not to change the new ones, but in order to use the new ones well”.  
50 Sharpe 2015, 329.  
51 Voltaire 1753, III-IV: “Is in everyone’s mouth, his writings in everyone’s hand”; “at the head of Rome”.  
52 Voltaire 1753, V-VI: “The greatest philosopher of the Romans, as well as the most eloquent”. See also the laudation in the preface to *Lettres de Memmius a Cicéron* (Moland 1879, 438).  
53 Condorcet 1795, 103–104: “The character merged with the poet”.  
54 See also Santos 2018c.  
55 Mont. *Discours sur Cicéron* 1 (Montesquieu 1892): “Cicero is, of all the ancients, the one who had the most personal merit, and whom I would like better to resemble”.

like Cicero especially because he “ait soutenu de plus beaux et de plus grands caractères”, obtaining a solid glory “par des routes moins battues”.

Ciceronian eloquence is lauded as grandiose, majestic, and heroic. Using it he triumphed over Catiline, stood up against Anthony and wept for the dying liberty. Furthermore, he drew the portrait of great men with lively feelings, which is why Montesquieu claims not to know to whom he would like to resemble more, “ou au héros, ou au panégyriste”. He disagrees with the “idée bien fausse” created by interpreters accustomed to measure their heroes against Q. Curtius Rufus’ Alexander, characterizing Cicero as a “homme foible et timide”. If he avoided the danger, it was because he knew it. His passions and fears were submitted to wisdom and reason. Montesquieu concludes: there is no greater example of strength and courage than the accusation against Anthony in the senate or the fact that all “les ennemis de la République furent les siens [...] tous les scélérats de Rome lui déclarèrent la guerre”.

However, sometimes “la force de son esprit sembla l’abandonner”. For instance, when Rome was being devastated by factions, Cicero retired to private to write: “sa philosophie fut moins forte que son amour pour la République”. Nevertheless, he kept an eye on the clashes between Caesar and Pompey, lamenting how citizens had not listened to his warnings about the former, what could have spared much suffering for the Republic. If he took long time to decide whom he would follow, he later acted against Caesar as a true “républicain”. Liberty was destroyed, so philosophy was a legitimate consolation, which yielded “ces beaux ouvrages qui seront admirés par toutes les sectes et dans toutes les révolutions de la philosophie”. And, as soon as liberty reappe-

56 Mont. Discours sur Cicéron 1 (Montesquieu 1892): “Had sustained the most beautiful and the greatest characteristics”.
57 Mont. Discours sur Cicéron 1 (Montesquieu 1892): “By less beaten paths”.
58 Mont. Discours sur Cicéron 2 (Montesquieu 1892): “Or to the hero, or to the panegyrist”.
59 Mont. Discours sur Cicéron 4 (Montesquieu 1892): “Very wrong idea”.
60 Montesquieu refers to Historiae Alexandri Magni.
61 Mont. Discours sur Cicéron 4 (Montesquieu 1892): “Weak and shy man”.
62 Mont. Discours sur Cicéron 5 (Montesquieu 1892): “The enemies of the Republic were his (...), all the scelerats of Rome declared war on him”.
63 Mont. Discours sur Cicéron 5 (Montesquieu 1892): “The strength of his spirit seemed to abandon him”.
64 Mont. Discours sur Cicéron 5 (Montesquieu 1892): “His philosophy was less strong than his love for the Republic”.
65 Montesquieu makes a free translation of Cic. Phil. 2.24.
66 Mont. Discours sur Cicéron 7 (Montesquieu 1892): “These beautiful works which will be admired by all sects and in all revolutions of philosophy”.
peared, he returned to politics. In fact, it was his name that Brutus, the liberator, called by:

Mais, lorsque les conjurés eurent commis cette grande action qui étonne encore aujourd’hui les tyrans, Cicéron sortit comme du tombeau, et ce soleil, que l’astre de Jules avait éclipsé, reprit une nouvelle lumière. Brutus, tout couvert de sang et de gloire, montrant au peuple le poignard et la liberté, s’écria : “Cicéron!” Et, soit qu’il l’appelât à son secours, soit qu’il voulût le féliciter de la liberté qu’il venoit de lui rendre, soit enfin que ce nouveau libérateur de la patrie se déclarât son rival, il fit de lui dans un seul mot le plus magnifique éloge qu’un mortel ait jamais reçu.⁶⁷

Anthony reacted. He took the power for himself and, proud of his own eloquence, no longer feared Cicero’s: spoke against him in the senate, “mais il fut bien étonné de trouver encore dans Rome un Romain”.⁶⁸ Despite the brilliance of his last speeches, Cicero was immolated in the “indigne réconciliation”⁶⁹ between Octavian and Anthony.

It is a sweet portrait. However, later, Montesquieu added a comment to Discours, informing that he did not published it because it had “l’air de panégyrique”.⁷⁰ Indeed, he was then under the effect of Ciceronian works that he had read to support Dissertation in 1716. But in 1734 his vision changed: in Romains, Cato had “the ethical laurel”.⁷¹ Why?

First, Montesquieu agrees with Cicero about Caesar’s tyrannical derangements,⁷² but believes that he could have acted differently, as he once confessed.⁷³ Later, Cicero is criticized because, in order to get rid of Anthony, he made “the wrong choice” to work for the elevation of Octavian: instead of making Caesar

⁶⁷ Mont. Discours sur Cicéron 7 (Montesquieu 1892): “However, when the conspirators had committed this great act, which still astonishes tyrants today, Cicero emerged as if from the tomb, and this sun, which the star of Julius had eclipsed, resumed a new light. Brutus, all covered in blood and glory, showing the people the dagger and the freedom, cried: ‘Cicero!’ And, either that he called him to his rescue, or that he wanted to congratulate him on the freedom which he had just restored, or finally that this new liberator of the country declared himself his rival, he made him in only one word the most magnificent praise a mortal has ever received”.

⁶⁸ Mont. Discours sur Cicéron 8 (Montesquieu 1892): “But he was astonished to find still in Rome a Roman”.

⁶⁹ Mont. Discours sur Cicéron 8 (Montesquieu 1892): “Unworthy reconciliation”.

⁷⁰ “The air of panegyric”.

⁷¹ Sharpe 2015, 333.

⁷² Mont. Romains 86 (Montesquieu 1796), citing Cic. fam. 9.15.

be forgotten, placed him before everyone’s eyes. Cato would have acted in a different way.

Je crois que, si Caton s’était réservé pour la république, il aurait donné aux choses tout un autre tour. Cicéron, avec des parties admirables pour un second rôle, étoit incapable du premier: el avoit un beau génie, mais une ame souvent commune. L’accessoire chez Cicéron, c’étoit la vertu; chez Caton, c’étoit da gloire. Cicéron se voyoit toujours le premier; Caton s’oubliait toujours. Celui-ci voulait sauver la république pour elle-même, celui-là pour s’en vanter.

Je pourrais continuer le parallèle, en disant que, quand Caton prévoyoit, Cicéron craignoit; que là où Caton espéroit, Cicéron se confioit; que le premier voyoit toujours les choses de sang froid, l’autre au travers de cent petites passions.

Cato is portrayed as a wise man who could have given a different future for the Republic. Cicero, in turn, is seen as impulsive and, though he did want to save Rome, was much more concerned with nourishing his vanity. He ended up giving the Republic an even more dangerous enemy: Octavian. Here he echoes the old anti-Ciceronian propaganda that Cicero was blind for the sake of glory, something that would not happen to Cato’s strict moral. Here lies his fallibility.

On the one hand, in *Discours*, Cicero’s political struggles and eloquence are expressions of a fading republican era, still firmly defended against its enemies, as the corrupt Verres, the subversive Clodius and Catiline, or the ambitious Caesar and Anthony, always as a brilliant lawyer or tireless magistrate. On the other hand, in *Romains*, his political role is limited and, in relevant events, absent. The tone is incisively critical. But Montesquieu is aware of not confusing facts with old rhetoric laudations, as well as of not being blindly seduced by ancient prejudices against Cicero. For this reason, he points out to a natural “vanité chez les Romains”, who urged friends to praise in their writings, such as Tribonius to Cicero or Cicero himself to Lucceius. This “amour immodéré pour estre célèbré”

---

74 Mont. *Romains* 91–92 (Montesquieu 1796).
75 Mont. *Romains* 92 (Montesquieu 1796): “I believe that if Cato had reserved himself for the republic, he would have given things a whole new turn. Cicero, with admirable talents for a supporting role, was incapable of the leading one: he had a fine genius, but a soul often common. The accessory in Cicero was virtue; in Cato was the glory. Cicero always saw himself first; Cato always forgot himself. The latter wanted to save the republic for itself, the former to praise himself about it. I could continue the parallel, saying that, when Cato foresees, Cicero feared; that where Cato hoped, Cicero confided; that the former always saw things in cold blood, the latter through a hundred little passions”.
77 Sharpe 2015, 333. See Stoner (p. 83–99) in this volume.
78 Cic. fam. 12.16.
was part of Roman education⁸⁰ and, although strange to modern men, uninterested in glory for posterity,⁸¹ it may be understandable why Cicero was perhaps so dominated by it.

In addition, Montesquieu did not pay much attention to the Catiline’s conspiracy in *Romains*. Only in a fragment he writes that the episode was not so clear and brilliant as Cicero registered: it was a “dessein mal conçu, mal digéré, difficile à commencer, impossible à finir, et qui etoit moins l’effet de l’ambition que de l’impuisance et du désespoir”. However, it deserves attention for the uniqueness of a general conspiracy for the destruction of Rome, a fame steamed only from the “scelerats qui la formerent”, as recorded by Cicero. Once again “nous trouvons dans les lettres de Cicéron un monument bien authentique de la corruption romaine”⁸² and its mediocre people.⁸³

In other words, despite being a hesitant and fallible political actor, Cicero is indispensable as a privileged witness of republican history. If some judgments can be made concerning his actions, according to an old tradition not entirely rejected by Montesquieu, it is because of the abundant information found in his works, especially the private perspective of his letters, which closely follows events while revealing Cicero’s feelings, doubts and subjectivity, something without comparison with other ancient figures. Montesquieu does not dare to forget him. He knows that to understand the role and the stature of other great men who lived in the late Republic, it is indispensable to understand their political, social and intellectual relations with the old consul. Directly or indirectly, as agent or witness, Montesquieu’s republican Rome is Cicero’s Rome.

### 4 Cicero as philosopher

Finally, as a philosopher, Cicero is also depicted as hesitant, but this is a signal of criticism of consolidated theoretical positions. The focus of Montesquieu is on the Ciceronian discussions on religion, which he interprets as very similar to the

---

⁷⁹ Cic. am. 5.12.
⁸⁰ Mont. *Pensées* 2.962 (Dornier 2013): “Vanity among the Romans”; “immoderate love to be celebrated”.
⁸¹ Mont. *Pensées* 2.1552 (Dornier 2013).
⁸² Mont. *Pensées* 3.1669 (Dornier 2013): “Plan poorly conceived, badly digested, difficult to start, impossible to finish, and that was less the effect of ambition than of helplessness and despair”; “scelerats who formed it”; “we find in the letters of Cicero a very authentic monument of Roman corruption”.
paths of XVIII century French intellectuals, increasingly suspicious of religion, and of his own thought.

4.1 Religion and politics

Montesquieu had a general interest in religion. In *Pensée 1946*, the author registers a reflection on the origins of the notion of God and the ingenuity of man in the process of conceiving it. According to him, when man conceived God as material, imagination naturally attributed a human figure to the divinity, since he found nothing more beautiful than himself. It is in similar terms that the Epicurean Velleius concludes in *De natura deorum* (1.1–2). The same Ciceronian text will support another consequence: as the senses tell us that there are only substances with human figure endowed with reason, men believed that reason is inseparable from God.\(^{84}\) The critical tone is explicit: the mirroring of man in divinity, an argument true even for the Christian conception of God.

Montesquieu also points out how pagans believed not only in gods, but as well in natural manifestations. This is what Cicero’s Stoic Balbus says: God partakes, by his nature, of all things (*deus pertinens per naturam cuiusque rei*).\(^{85}\) But they had a feature missing in Christianity: in their world reigned a “esprit de tolérance et de douceur”, all religions and theologies were equally good, and heresies, wars or religious disputes were unknown. In short, a very positive spirit, absent in modern Christianity.\(^{86}\) This picture proves Gay’s opinion, who believed that Montesquieu’s generation, like his own, “still knew a neutral zone where pagan and Christian could meet on relatively friendly terms”.\(^{87}\)

The recent discovery of *Notes sur Cicéron*, consisting of commentaries on Ciceronian philosophical works from a XVI century edition, has expanded knowledge about Montesquieu’s reflections on religion.\(^{88}\) Right on the first observations, he defends Cicero’s argument concerning the inadequacy of the vulgar opinion men have an innate idea of divinity or a natural knowledge of it.\(^{89}\) He then concludes that atheism existed among ancient philosophers: nothing “ne détruit plus la [preuve] de l’existence de Di[eu]... que [les] différentes opinions

---


\(^{86}\) Mont. *Pensées* 2.1606 (Dornier 2013): “Spirit of tolerance and sweetness”.

\(^{87}\) Gay 1967.

\(^{88}\) See details in Volpilhac-Augé 2013; Benítez 2012, 3.

\(^{89}\) Mont. *Notes* 40–41 (Benítez 2012), commenting Cic. *nat. deor.* 1.1–2; Benítez 2012, 19.
[des] p<hilosophes et des législat[eurs] sur la divinité”.90 Later, he moves on to criticize Roman religion. Credulity must be rejected, as in the dream preceding Caesar’s death:91 ancient historians actually added fantastic elements to a life already “toute rempil des miracles de la fortu[ne]”. Indeed, episodes of premonition or divination show how men do things in a way they already had interest in doing.92 The religious phenomena are only justification or exaggeration about events, interests, desires, actions. How can it be admitted the existence of more prolific ages in miracles than others? The centuries more ignorant are also “les plus credules”. On the one hand, we have “le bonheur de vivre [dans] un siecle fort éclairé”.93 On the other hand, this is not the end of obscurantisms and superstitions. The analyses of ancient religions in Notes once again reflects opinions on Christianity. As Benítez puts it, the commentaries on pagan customs allow Montesquieu a “settling of scores with the Christian religion”;94 explicit in comments like this:

J’aime a [m’en r]emettre a l’écriture [et aux] conciles; mais pour [pas pour] le reste les Thomas [les ]Justin et les autres [Pères] qu’on appelle les [lumières de l’église, (...) tous les an-
ciens] écrivains enfin [bons e]t mauvais sacré [et p]rophanes ont chez [moi] une egale au-
thorité celle de la raison.95

In other words, more than any authority established by tradition, reason is the only criterion for judgement. Montesquieu sees a similar primacy of reason in Cicero’s investigations on religion. In fact, the old consul was very rigorous when

---

90 Mont. Notes 44 (Benítez 2012): “Destroyed more the proof of the existence of God... than the different opinions of the philosophers and the legislators on the divinity”, commenting Cic. nat. deor. 1.14. The Notes are composed of commentaries from different passages of Ciceronian works on religion. The texts are sometimes very fragmentary, which required the insertion of interpolations signs and missing or abbreviated words by Benítez in his edition. Though this procedure, it was possible to reconstruct the original sentences. In my translation in footnote, like the one above, I introduced punctuation to ensure the correct understanding of the passages.

91 Mont. Notes 106 (Benítez 2012).

92 Mont. Notes 112 (Benítez 2012): “All filled with the miracles of fortune”, commenting Cic. div. 1.119.

93 Mont. Notes 101–103 (Benítez 2012): “Ahe most credulous”; “the happiness of living in a very enlightened century”.

94 Benítez 2012, 34.

95 Mont. Notes 108 (Benítez 2012): “I love to refer myself to the Scriptures and to the councils; but not for the rest. The Thomas, the Justins and the other Fathers, who are called the enlightened ones of the Church (...) all the ancient writers, finally, good and bad, sacred and profanes, have in me an equal authority: that of reason”, commenting Cic. div. 1.62.
facing arguments, suspecting ready answers and poets.\footnote{Mont. Notes 121–122 (Benítez 2012), commenting Cic. sen. 66.} If he lived in Modern Age, he would take the same critical posture concerning the precepts of Christianity: “[C]iceron guidé par les [lumières] de la raison naturelle [d]it qu’il n’etoit point [de la s]agesse de dieu [parler] aux hommes sans [se faire entendre]”, reason why he “n’eut [pas été] fort satisfait [des] prophéties et de l’Apocalypse”. One of his advantages was not to be under the yoke of Christian ideology: “son esprit n’etoit point nourry dans les mystères no dans les [ténèbres] ombres de la parabole”.\footnote{Mont. Notes 118 (Benítez 2012): “Cicero, guided by the lights of natural reason, said that it was not intrinsic to the wisdom of God to speak to men without making himself understood”; “was not very satisfied with the prophecies and the Apocalypse”; “his spirit was not nourished in the mysteries nor in the dark shadows of the parable”, commenting Cic. div. 1.131.} Therefore, he was also able to point out the political uses of religion throughout Roman history.

In Dissertation, Montesquieu affirms that the establishment of religion was as important to the first kings as to create laws and walls. The Roman legislators then “firent la religion pour l’État”, while legislators of other peoples did “l’État pour la religion”. For this reason, they could use the people’s “craindre pour le conduire à leur fantaisie”. Later, religion became a mechanism of discipline for the construction of civilization. The access to sacred texts was then restricted to official interpretations, the activities of priests and diviners were regulated by the senate, as prescribed by the book of pontiffs, “dont Cicéron nous a conservé quelques fragments”.\footnote{Mont. Dissertation 195 (Montesquieu 1796): “Made the religion for the State”; “the State for the religion”; “fear to lead them according to their will”; “of which Cicero preserved for us some fragments”, citing Cic. leg. 2.20–21.} In conclusion, superstition was an advantage to the Romans, for not all citizens were wise and the enraged people needed instruments of control:

La crédulité du peuple réparait tout chez les Romains: plus une chose était contraire à la raison humaine, plus elle leur paraissait divine. Une vérité simple ne les aurait pas vivement touchés: ils leur fallait des sujets d’admiration, ils leur fallait des signes de la divinité; et ils ne les trouvaient que dans le merveilleux et le ridicule.\footnote{Mont. Dissertation 195: “The credulity of the people repaired everything among the Romans: the more a thing was contrary to human reason, the more it appeared divine to them. A simple truth would not have touched them deeply: they needed subjects of admiration, they needed signs of the divinity; and they found it only in the marvellous and the ridiculous”, citing Cic. leg. 2.20–21. Montesquieu’s interpretation here is very close to the reflections developed earlier in Polybius 4.56 and in Machiavelli’s Discorsi sopra la prima deca di Tito Livio 1.11.}
Auguries and divinations were politically useful to great public men, as Cicero showed it in several passages. First, in *De senectute*, when Fabius, as augur, ruled that what was advantageous to the Republic was always under good auspices. Second, in *De divinatione*, when Marcellus defended that, in spite of their origin from popular credulity, the augurs came to be of public utility. The omens could be used as means “pour détourner le peuple d’une guerre qui aurait été funeste, ou pour lui en faire entreprendre une qui aurait pu être utile”, but, at the same time, could make people believe that “les mauvais succès, les villes prises, les batailles perdues, n’étaient point l’effet d’une mauvaise constitution de l’État, ou de la faiblesse de la république, mais de l’impiété d’un citoyen, contre lequel les dieux étaient irrités”. For Montesquieu, men like Scaevola and Varro discovered the art of political secrets by admitting “qu’il était nécessaire que le peuple ignorât beaucoup de choses vraies, et en crût beaucoup de fausses”. He claims his findings are not arbitrary: the proofs are in ancient authors such as Cicero.

Montesquieu sees superstition employed to sustain the Republic. Cicero revealed it in *De divinatione*: the magistrates governed under the auspices of religion. Since monarchy, religious elements penetrated political and juridical structures, like the procedures of war. Later on, religion became an instrument of foreign policy and civilizational improvement, because, in contact with other peoples, the Romans began to submit themselves to alien gods. It was a smart move

---

102 Mont. *Dissertation* 197 (Montesquieu 1796): “To divert the people from a war that would have been fatal, or to make them undertake one that could have been useful”.
103 Mont. *Dissertation* 199 (Montesquieu 1796): “Bad successes, cities taken, battles lost, were not the effect of a bad constitution of the State, or of the weakness of the republic, but of the impiety of a citizen, against whom the gods were angry”.
104 Mont. *Dissertation* 200 (Montesquieu 1796): “That it was necessary for the people to ignore many true things, and to believe in many false ones”.
105 Mont. *Dissertation* 200 (Montesquieu 1796): “Those who read Roman history, and who are a little clairvoyant, at every step find aspects of the politics that we are talking about. Thus, we see Cicero who, in particular, and among his friends, at every moment makes a confession of unbelief, speaking in public with extraordinary zeal against the impiety of Verres”.
106 Mont. *Dissertation* 204 (Montesquieu 1796), citing Cic. *div.* 1.89.
for conquered peoples to look at Rome “plutôt comme le sanctuaire de la religion que comme la maîtresse du monde”. Montesquieu concludes that the Romans, in effect, had as their true great divinity “le génie de la république”.

In short, Cicero is a resource for modern philosophers to deal with issues they cannot face openly, like religion and its connection with politics. It is necessary to detail now how Ciceronian critical examinations are also important to Montesquieu’s other concerns.

4.2 A model of philosopher

In Pensée 969, Montesquieu argues that, like all people who wish to flourish and to be happy, the Greeks sought to cultivate the spirit and acquire knowledge, reason why they began to develop philosophy. However, certain philosophers later on tried to eliminate the belief in gods. In the Roman world, Cicero was the first to translate into Latin the dogmas of Greek philosophy, leading then to a critical interpretation of religion. Montesquieu refers mainly to De natura deorum. In his opinion, Cicero’s critical view “porta un coup mortel a la religion de Rome”. Andrivet observes that Montesquieu appreciated the Ciceronian duality to preserve traditional religious beliefs and exercise his intellectual freedom. He indeed wrote about “liberté de la philosophie”, meaning a free usage of reason. To do so, according to Volpilhac-Augé, he relied on the great masters, starting with Cicero himself (or his Cotta), followed by Descartes, Malebranche, and Bayle. He connects his arguments to the authority of tradition, but is bold: freely using reason, he can propose a virulent criticism of Christianity, its theological foundations, dogmas, and practices. This is very well stated in a note about De natura deorum: “C’est nost <ra> e raison qui est donnée pour no [us] éclairer non pas ce[lle] des autres”.

It is also free reason that Montesquieu will employ in his evaluation of certain Cicero’s interpretations. He does not consider all of Cicero’s ideas satisfac-

---

107 Mont. Dissertation 206 (Montesquieu 1796): “Rather as the sanctuary of religion than as the mistress of the world”, citing Cic. nat. deor. 3.42. Similar passage in Mont. Notes 88 (Benítez 2012).
108 Mont. Dissertation 207 (Montesquieu 1796): “The genius of the republic”.
109 Mont. Pensées 2.969 (Dornier 2013): “Dealt a fatal blow to the religion of Rome”.
110 Andrivet 2013.
111 Volpilhac-Augé 2013.
112 Mont. Notes 43 (Benítez 2012): “It is our reason that is given to clarify us, not that of others”, commenting Cic. nat. deor. 1.10.
tory, as in his great-unfinished project: *Traité des devoirs*. In 1725, the author announced that the first chapters would involve subjects such as “l’honneur, la probité, l’humanité, l’amour de la patrie”, to “invite men to virtue”. Later on, he announced the composition of a work on “the Duties of Man” (“les Devoirs de l’Homme”), theme “more difficult for a Christian philosopher to deal with” than to a pagan philosopher. He then concludes that “est utile que la Morale soit traitée en même temps par les chrétiens et par les philosophes, afin que les esprits attentifs voyent [...] combien peu de chemin il y a à faire pour aller de la philosophie au christianisme”. Finally, in a letter dated to 1750, Montesquieu recounts that for some thirty years he had set out that project mainly because of his delight with Cicero’s *De officiis*, chosen as a model because the Stoics were those who “ont mieux traité cette matière des devoirs”. However, he gave up, among other reasons, because Cicero’s duties division was “trop vague”. In spite of this negative observation, he then introduces a compliment: having “un rival tel que Cicéron” made his “esprit tombait devant le sien”. In a *Pensée*, Montesquieu explains that Cicero divides the honest into four fields: attachment to sciences and search for truth, maintenance of civil society, greatness of soul and appropriateness of actions *secundum ordinem et modum*. The consul believed “qu’un bon citoyen doit plutôt s’employer pour sa patrie”. Indeed, Montesquieu’s great concern is to discuss the moral duties of man as citizen: “l’esprit du citoyen” is oriented to public welfare and civic duties. Nevertheless, Roman civic attitude was partly different from the Greek desire for freedom, honour, and glory for great deeds, as he concludes in ambiguous terms: “Le peuple de Rome avec une haine toujours active contre les nobles chang[e]a de moy ens sans changer de fin d’abord il song[e]a à les abaisser en diminuant leurs privileges, et ensuite en augmentant l’authority d’un seul”.

---

113 According to *Pensées et fragments inédits*, published in 1899.

114 Mont. *Traité* 66 (Laboulaye 1879): “It is useful that Morality is treated at the same time by Christians and by philosophers, so that attentive spirits see [...] how little way there is to go from philosophy to Christianity”.

115 Mont. *Correspondance*, Lettre 518, a Mgr. de Fitz-James, October 8th, 1750, 304–305 (Gébelin/Morize 1914): “Have better dealt with this subject of duties”; “too vague”; “a rival such as Cicero”; “spirit fall in front of his”.


118 Mont. *Pensées* 3.1674: “The people of Rome, with an ever-active hatred against the nobles, changed their means without changing their ends; at first they thought of lowering them by decreasing their privilege, and then by increasing the authority of a single person”.
These ideas from *Traité* are developed in *De l’esprit* and are clearly consistent with the Roman conception of citizenship,¹¹⁹ very well registered in Ciceronian reflections.¹²⁰ Roman moral framework was important to Montesquieu because it was a base for the construction of his own framework of duties, destined for men of the present. An enterprise like that implied the defense of intertemporal validity of certain civic duties enunciated by Cicero. Conscience, for instance, had a relevant role, as in the story of the merchant of honey in *De officiis*, an example of how pagan philosophers discussed conscience with such candor of soul and delicacy that even Christians did not dare to judge it inadequate. Montesquieu concludes: the Christian duties were already part of pagan ideals of humanity and love for common good.¹²¹ Therefore, there is no incompatibility between Christian and pagan morality, like in the love for motherland, recorded in Greek and Roman histories, but now in decline.¹²²

These passages provide new insights into how the quarrel of the ancients and the moderns still reverberates in Montesquieu’s reflections. He declares his enjoyment in observing their contrapositions: “J’aime a voir les querelles des anciens et des modernes, cela me fait voir qu’il y a de bons ouvrages parmi anciens et les modernes”¹²³ As he concludes, if there are also good works among the ancients, this is enough to justify his great appreciation for them: “J’avoie mon goût pour les anciens cette antiquité m’enchante”.¹²⁴ As for the cities: “Rome antica e moderna m’a toujours enchanté”.¹²⁵

Montesquieu’s approach to Cicero reverberates such quarrel. Even in the complimentary tone of *Discours*, qualities and defects coexist. On the one hand, he is the guarantor of freedom, faithful to the duties as a citizen, besides being a great intellectual. On the other hand, his great philosophical face is not altogether perfect. Fott understands that Montesquieu would argue that most modern “are wiser than most people in ancient times and probably even that the wisest moderns excel the wisest ancients: something seems to have been

¹¹⁹ Nicolet 1976.
¹²² Mont. *Pensées* 1.221 (Dornier 2013).
¹²³ Mont. *Pensées* 1.111 (Dornier 2013): “I love to see the quarrels of the ancients and the moderns; it makes me see that there are good works among ancients and moderns”. A slightly different version is Mont. *Pensées* 1.171 (Dornier 2013).
¹²⁴ Mont. *Pensées* 1.110: “I admit my taste for the ancients, this antiquity enchants me”.
¹²⁵ Mont. *Correspondance*, Lettre LXXII, A M. le Grand Prieur Solar, ambassadeur de Malte à Rome (Gébelin/Morize 1914): “Rome antica and moderna always enchants me”.
lacking in Cicero’s philosophizing because he was able only to “destroy errors” and not “discover truth”.¹²⁶ I do not think this interpretation is entirely correct.

It is clear that the ancients had defects. For example, Montesquieu warns that ancient authors should not always be taken “pour exactement vrayes”; because they used to manipulate the narrative according to their practical necessities.¹²⁷ Indeed, the reasons why a philosopher or a writer could become famous in Antiquity changed since the invention of the press.¹²⁸ However, although what can be learnt about and from ancient philosophers is limited, there are some exceptions, like Cicero: “Cicéron ne nous a donné que de la métaphysique et de la morale, et ce qu’il nous en a donné est parfaitement beau”.¹²⁹

In fact, if Cicero and other ancients committed mistakes, they often “étoi[ent] la dessus dans la meme err[eur] que nous”.¹³⁰ In addition, they often had “lumier[es que] nous n’avons pas”.¹³¹ That is why one cannot confuse their eventual misunderstandings with savage rusticity. Great nations and savages are different because “celles-là se sont appliquées aux arts et aux sciences, et que ceux-ci les ont absolument négligés”.¹³² Thus, as ancient cultural achievements remain relevant nowadays, what is possible to admit concerning modern superiority is that “les découvertes de ce siècle si admirables, ce ne sont pas des vérités simples qu’on a trouvées, mais des méthodes pour les trouver; ce n’est pas une pierre pour l’édifice, mais les instruments et les machines pour le bâtir tout entier”.¹³³ Montesquieu wants to say that one of the great modern merits is the introduction of new mechanisms of critical thinking, the free use of reason. And he verifies some of the traits of this critical approach in Cicero’s philosophical critique.

Montesquieu reads the independent position promoted by the New Academy, of which Cicero declared himself an adept, as crucial to philosophical activ-

¹²⁶ Fott 2002, 728.
¹²⁷ Mont. Pensées 2.1308 (Dornier 2013): “For exactly true”.
¹²⁸ Mont. Pensées 2.899 (Dornier 2013).
¹²⁹ Mont. Pensées 1.211 (Dornier 2013) (footnote): “Cicero only gave us metaphysics and morals, and what he gave us is perfectly fine”.
¹³⁰ Mont. Notes 73 (Benítez 2012): “Were above in the same error as us”, commenting Cic. nat. deor. 2.50.
¹³¹ Mont. Notes 90 (Benítez 2012): “Lights that we don’t have”, commenting Cic. nat. deor. 3.24.62.
¹³² Mont. Discours sur les motifs 76 (Laboulaye 1879): “The former are applied to the arts and sciences, and the latter have absolutely neglected them”.
¹³³ Mont. Discours sur les motifs 79 (Laboulaye 1879): “The discoveries of this so admirable century are not simple truths that have been found, but the methods of finding them; it is not a stone for the building, but the instruments and the machines to build it as whole”.

ity, especially in discussions about religion. Fott tries to reformulate his earlier statement but ends up only observing a contradiction in Montesquieu’s negative opinion on Cicero’s dubious theoretical character. How can Cicero be a hesitant philosopher but adopt a sustainable method? In fact, I believe this is not a contradiction.

There are two possibilities to solve this problem. First, Montesquieu’s reprobation results from a prejudice against Ciceronian academic skepticism, common at that time. If this alternative prevails, Montesquieu’s Cicero would be concerned only with dispelling errors to find the probable truth (since the truth itself is uncertain). However, he would never be able to offer any constructive proposals after destroying false knowledge. Considering Montesquieu’s high praise of some of Cicero’s reflections, this conclusion is clearly not correct. The second alternative then is to admit that Montesquieu’s investigative approach adopts partially the Ciceronian method, at least when it comes to using different arguments with sincerity, contrasting different opinions to reconstruct complex realities. This interpretation seems correct especially when one realizes that Montesquieu reading of Cicero uses precisely this kind of approach, which allows him to acknowledge the author’s intricate profile. Thus, he is not ungrateful to Cicero the ancient philosopher: not only Montesquieu recognizes that, despite his mistakes (natural in ancient minds), Cicero was a great spirit, but also assimilates his critical behavior.

Indeed, Cicero’s letters written in exile display an important ancient quality: to put in the same terms great and small things. Somehow, this applies to modern men: always expecting great thinkers, they forget the popular function of philosophy, while “the wise men of antiquity” believed that “la sagesse devait être commune à tous les hommes, comme la raison, et que, pour être philosophe, c’étoit assez d’avoir du goût pour la philosophie”. Therefore, the moderns were not so superior to the ancients. Although very different, Caesar and Cromwell were both great men, so that “on ne peut pas dire que l’Anglois ait été inférieur au Romain par le genie”. This, I reiterate, stems largely from the recognition of the ancients’ intellectual autonomy, especially in Cicero.

134 Fott 2002, 730–731. See Cic. nat. deor. 1.10; 3.95; Tusc. 5.11.
135 Mont. Pensées 1.117 (Dornier 2013).
136 Mont. Discours de réception 245 (Montesquieu 1796): “Wisdom should be common to all men, like reason, and that, to be a philosopher, it was enough to have a taste for philosophy”.
137 Mont. Réflexions 180 (Montesquieu 1892): “One cannot say that the Englishman was inferior to the Roman by genius”.

For this reason, among his options of epigraph to *De l'esprit des lois*, Montesquieu listed “La loy est la raison du grand Jupiter. Cicéron *De legibus*. At the end, he preferred Ovid’s *Metamorphoses, Prolem sine matre creatam*, which described well his impetus of innovation. Nevertheless, his cogitation on a Ciceronian sentence is relevant not only for its content, but for the author. As someone stripped of people’s prejudices, Cicero accomplished much at a time when philosophical speculation was strange to the Romans, as they were occupied with “des arts de la guerre et de la paix”. Philosophy only took place when it was made compatible with political, legal, and military activities, as he observes Cicero, the main figure in charge of that mission. Therefore, Montesquieu reiterates Cicero’s role as a philosopher. In fact, as stated in *Notes*, if he had many rivals in eloquence, in philosophy he was the first:

Ciceron ne merit pas moins le titre de philosophe que d’orateur romain on peut [dire] meme qu’il s’est plus signalé dans le Licée que sur la Tribune, il est origin[al] dans ses livres de philosophie au lieu qu’il y a eu plusieurs rivaux de son éloquence il est le premier chez les Romains qui ait tiré la philosophie des mains des scavans et l’aït dégagée d[es] embarras d’une langue étrangere, il la rendit commune à tous les homes come la [raison] et dans l’applaudissement qu’il en reçut les savants se trouvèrent d’accord avec le peuple.

His importance stands out even more when considering “la profondeur de ses raisonnement”. The greatest proofs of this are his reflections on religion:

C’est une chose admirable de le voir[r] dans son livre de la nature des dieux se joier de la philosophie meme et faire combatre ses champions entre eux de manière qu’ils se détrui-

sent [aisément] les uns les autres celuy la est batu par celuy ci qui se trouve battu a so[n]

---

139 Rosso 1983, 238.
140 Santos; Miranda 2016, 197; Althusser 1992, 7–8.
142 Mont. *EL* 23.21: “The arts of war and peace”, quoting, in footnote, Cic. *off. 1.[150]*.
143 Mont. *Notes* 40 (Benítez 2012): “Cicero does not deserve the title of philosopher less than of Roman orator. One can say even that he is noted more in the Lyceum than on the Tribune. He is original in his books of philosophy. Instead, having several rivals of his eloquence, he was the first among the Romans who removed philosophy from the hands of the scholars and freed it from the embarrassment of a foreign language. He made it common to all men as reason, and in the applause that he received, the scholars found themselves in agreement with the people”.

tour. Tous les sixèmes s’évanouissent les uns devant les autres et il ne reste [dans] l’esprit du lecteur que du mépris pour le philosophe et de l’admiration pour [le] critique.¹⁴⁴

In other words, the Ciceronian approach contrasts different theoretical positions and makes their fragility and inconsistencies appear, so that philosophical systems would destroy themselves. Cicero’s critical posture serves as a model for all those who intend to philosophize, since the free use of reason allows one to penetrate many speculative investigations without the concern of committing heresies or harmonizing with prevailing Christian precepts:

Je n’ay pu m’empêcher en lisant ces merveilleux ouvrages de charger mes [marges] de quelques réflexions et je les ai faites dans la liberté de la philosophie j’ay souvant fait abstraction d’une religion que je revere, et come il est impossible d’estre philosophe et theologien tout ensemble, parce que ce qui es[t] selon l’ordre de la nature n’a point de raport à ce qui est selon l’or[dre] de la grace je me suis souvent mis à la place du pagan dont je lis[ais] les ouvrages bien résolu de rentrer aussi tost dans le devoir et de quitt[er] en sortant ces sentiments à la porte de mon cabinet.¹⁴⁵

Montesquieu even corrects Cicero when he notes the Roman philosopher not following his own argumentative parameters. Commenting a passage from De divinatione, in which Cicero declared preference for Plato and his greater authority, Montesquieu observes that the real justification should be the rational superiority of Plato’s arguments, that is, the criterion of authority is reason, not an abstract tradition.¹⁴⁶ Cicero’s passage is then reinterpreted in order to preserve the critical spirit praised by the Baron de la Brède.

Examining Notes, “we discover another Montesquieu”, following the emergence of a new philosophical attitude, a new spirit among French intellectuals. Montesquieu, as the future lumières, is no longer a passive reader but an active

¹⁴⁴ Mont. Notes 40 (Benítez 2012): “It is an admirable thing to see him, in his book On the nature of the gods, playing with philosophy itself and making its champions fight against each other so that they easily destroy each other. That one is beaten by this one, which is beaten in his turn. All the systems vanish one in front of the other and in the reader’s spirit only remains contempt for the philosopher and admiration for the critic”.

¹⁴⁵ Mont. Notes 41 (Benítez 2012): “I could not help, when reading these wonderful works, to load my margins with some reflections and I did it in the freedom of philosophy. I have often disregarded a religion that I revere, and as it is impossible to be a philosopher and a theologian all together, because what is according to the order of nature has no relation to what is according to the order of grace, I have often put myself in the place of the pagan, from where I read the works, determined to quickly return to duty and to abandon these feelings, leaving them at my office door”.

author, educated through the critical interpretation of classics. As Volpilhac-Auger concludes, “Montesquieu, reader of Cicero, becomes annotator”, someone who criticizes, accuses and acquires autonomy of philosophizing. Important for him is Cicero’s critical stance towards philosophy, or as Benítez states, “Montesquieu’s Cicero philosopher is the Cicero critic of the philosophy of the philosophers”, someone who already had that critical approach to knowledge that characterizes modern superiority. Cicero’s Cotta did this when dealing with Epicureanism and Stoicism in the discussion about the existence of gods. The result may not be a definitive conclusion in favor of a preexisting theoretical formulation, but is valid at least because it faces different arguments, fights superstitions, although not excluding possible uses that religion may have, as in Dissertation. The liberté de la philosophie is an explicit opposition to the restrictions of faith and to heterodox positions, moving away from masters’ authority in favor of philosopher’s autonomous thinking, without imposing a choice on readers, just as Cicero did. Montesquieu’s portrait of Cicero in Discours can finally be summed up by the pensée 773’s final sentence: “l’âme toujours belle lorsqu’elle n’était pas faible”. A statement not so negative considering the reception of Cicero in the rising Enlightenment.

In fact, by the XVIII century Cicero had been a widely recognized and beloved figure of the intelligentsia, incessantly read and often called with an unusual intimacy as “Tully”. Besides Montesquieu, I have also mentioned Voltaire’s passion. The enthusiastic connections with Cicero’s life and legacy allows Sharpe to describe that period “as one of the highpoints in Cicero’s reception”. He became a character of first importance in political and moral reflections, like Plutarch and Seneca. One of the possible reasons for this was a lumières’ cherished conception: philosophe.

The philosopher writes academic treatises, but also engages in practical life, has a good knowledge of rhetoric, he is a truly litterateur. According to Sharpe, there was still a desire of challenging medieval opposition between vita activa and vita contemplativa, a process by which Cicero was the best example of reconciliation: he was not only the archetypal of civic philosopher and defender of res publica, but also a “philosopher who would inspire others to critical thought and action”, like the lumières themselves. This was a romanticized representa-

147 Volpilhac-Auger 2013.
149 Mont. Pensées 1.773 (Dornier 2013): “The soul always beautiful when it was not weak”.
150 About Cicero during the French Enlightenment, see Berno (p. 370–371) in this volume.
151 Sharpe 2015, 334.
tion of Cicero, as the one Montesquieu had in his youth. When listing the virtues of the old consul, he invariably ended up designing the ideal philosopher. A precise description of such ideal is the *philosophe* entry in the *Encyclopédie*.

In Dumarsais’ text, probably retouched by Voltaire and Diderot, the philosopher is defined as someone who identifies causes and, if possible, predicts them. His mission is to identify the truth, as well as the false, doubtful or credible. In this process, “one of his great perfections is to remain undecided when he finds no suitable motive to judge”. In fact, his “spirit consists in judging well”, so he is content if the only way is to suspend his decision. Therefore, he does not “cling to a system to the point of not feeling the force of objections”, that is, he opens up to the comprehensive, clear understanding of different opinions, even if he rejects them.

Does Montesquieu and Voltaire’s portrait of Cicero fit this definition? Had not even Fontenelle fulfilled this ideal before them, when he compared himself to Cicero, a model of philosophical diffusion, as in his new type of work that dealt with philosophy in a non-philosophical way? Or Pierre Bayle, taken by Montesquieu as the embodiment of the philosopher’s model according to Cicero? The dialogue with Cicero by all these authors is no coincidence. As Gay observes, the two main Roman sources of inspiration for the *lumières* were Lucretius and Cicero. While the former provided them with slogans and attitudes, “their real favorite, Cicero, gave them even more – a philosophy.”

In particular, for Montesquieu, Cicero is part of another model for his own reflections: Roman constitutional structure, partially studied in *Romains*, and echoed in *De l’esprit*. According to him, following Polybius, and also Cicero, power was not concentrated, but divided between the spirit of the people, the strength of the senate, and the authority of certain magistrates. There was control of *abus du pouvoir*: “Rome avait des institutions admirables. Elle en avait deux surtout: par l’une, la puissance législative du peuple était réglée; par l’autre...”

---

155 Fontenelle 1686, preface: “Je suis à peu près dans le même cas où se trouvait Ciceron, lors qu’il entreprit de mettre en latin des matières de philosophie, qui jusque-là n’avaient esté traitées qu’en grecs” (“I am more or less in the same case in which Cicero found himself, when he began to put in Latin subjects of philosophy, which until then had been treated only in Greek”).
156 Benítez 2012, 17.
159 Santos/Oliveira 2016.
But political factions later degenerated the balanced configuration and ruined the Republic. Republican Rome is a model, just as Cicero is a paragon of civic philosopher. Concerning the separation of powers, English constitution is corrected by the lessons of the Romans. In contrast, Cicero the philosopher enables the evaluation of current philosophical positions and, as scholar engaged in practical political life, “draws people to virtue without preaching to them”. If it was an idealized view, which confused “what Cicero had wished to be for what he actually was”, at least it reveals what the lumièrees thought “a philosopher should be: the thinker in action”, with political and moral qualities, as a “dutiful, upright citizen”, with “that most elusive of antique philosophical ideals – humanism”. As Rosso observes, Montesquieu is a humanist who worshipped Antiquity, living in “constant cohabitation with the ancients”, in a century when Cicero’s humanitas was reappearing, permeating key conceptions from Voltaire to Kant. However, considering the early experience of rise and fall of Ciceronianism, Montesquieu did not develop a humanism based on literary style or moral superiority. His Latin heritage had been subjected to a historical and critical re-examination, something that made it impossible to resurrect the past. Montesquieu’s humanist Ciceronianism must include Cicero as citizen, magistrate, orator and philosopher, object of praise, but also flawed and subject to criticism, without losing its exemplary status.

What is still valid from Cicero’s exemplarity is his intellectual autonomy and struggle for universal recognition. If there are paradoxical aspects in this portrait, those elements mentioned above are precisely what makes Cicero compatible with Montesquieu’s perspective on philosophical research and what stimulated his own intellectual paths. Although he credited the moderns with some superiority, Cicero continued to be admired: as proclaimed in Discours, the consul was the ancient who “a eu le plus de mérite personnel, et qui j’aimerai mieux ressembler.”

---

161 Mont. EL 11.16: “Rome had admirable institutions. It had above all two: by one, the legislative power of the people was regulated; by the other, it was limited”.
162 Mont. Pensées 1.371 (Dornier 2013).
164 Gay 1967.
165 Rosso 1983, 240.
168 Mont. Discours sur Cicéron 1 (Montesquieu 1892): “Had the most personal merit, and who I would like better to resemble”.
5 Conclusion

Cicero is used as a historiographical source, political actor and philosopher in Montesquieu.

As a historiographical source, Cicero is one of the most quoted authors, although not merely as an exempla reservoir. History as magistra vitae was a declining paradigm. The doors were open to philosophy of history. Montesquieu was an undisputed contributor to future historiography, as manifested in his zeal in dealing with sources. Cicero and other ancient authors then reappear as still useful for modern men, permeating works like De l’esprit des lois, described by Gay as “a massive tribute to antique thought” which “supports its generalizations with numberless allusions to ancient politics”.

As a political actor, Cicero is considered halting, responsible for grave errors. For this reason, his ethical role is sometimes small. However, he died as a martyr dedicated to civic duties lamentably lost in Modern Age. Despite his flaws, it was through his political activity that he became a great character in history. If Montesquieu’s reproaches are consistent, they do not overshadow the other dimensions.

As a model of philosopher, Cicero performs reflective activity in a critical and independent perspective, as evidenced and exalted by Montesquieu, especially in his discussions on religion. Although most of these texts were written in his youth, they allow us to reconstruct some fundamental steps of his process of intellectual formation. Many elements and opinions born in comments, unfinished manuscripts, fragments, and scattered thoughts will follow Montesquieu throughout his trajectory. As Roman Republic was a model for political thinking, Cicero also seemed to him a parameter of great philosopher, essential for another would-be philosopher. On the one hand, Rome urged Montesquieu to confront the complexity of reality in its totality, the true task of a philosopher. Maupertuis was precise in describing this pretension: “Après avoir considéré les effets des passions dans l’homme pour ainsi dire isolé, M. de Montesquieu les considéra dans ces grandes collections d’hommes qui forment les nations, & choisit pour cela la nation la plus fameuse de l’Univers, les Romains.” On the other hand, Cicero urged Montesquieu to deal with reality by a plurality of philosophical approaches, that is, to have critical attitude, which implied comparing, opposing, refuting, confirming, reevaluating, even refraining from concluding. But

---

170 Maupertuis 1756, 399: “After having considered the effects of passions in man, so to speak, isolated, Mr. de Montesquieu considered them in these great collections of men that form the nations, and chose for this purpose the most famous nation in the Universe, the Romans”.
since Cicero was also a model of civic philosopher, he shows the meaning of true political philosophy, which can, for example, condemn religions in its theological grounds, but recognize its utility as instrument of social control.

Montesquieu, “naturellement curieux de tous les fragments des ouvrages des anciens auteurs”,¹ had Cicero as his supreme exemplar of philosophical and political excellence.

¹ Mont. Pensées 1.773 (Dornier 2013): “naturally curious about all fragments of the works of the ancient authors”.
Francesca Romana Berno
Cicero in the Shadow of the Bastille

1 Introduction

We might imagine that the French révolutionnaires, in the crucial years from 1789 to 1794, had other priorities than fighting over which of them was the best aemulus of Cicero. But on the contrary, ancient history in general was taken as a model, while national history was often ignored, and the former had such an important place in the political debate of those years as to be considered by modern scholars to have been a crucial focal point for the newborn French Republic.¹ The Roman Republic was particularly appreciated because it arose through the expulsion of kings: the influence of this model was so strong that it conditioned social life at every level, from toponomastic to personal names (the most frequent names given to babies were Brutus and Scaevola).² It is a rich and varied picture that I do not intend to judge from a historical or political point of view.³ Yet I would like to focus on a peculiar detail of this story: the relevance of the character of Cicero, the most renowned Latin author in these years due to scholastic teaching, in which he played a very important role.⁴ Even if characters and histories are often bound up with each other – Sparta and Rome, the Gracchi and Brutus, Socrates and Cato – Marcus Tullius Cicero enjoyed a special place in the political debate of those years on two different and interrelated levels: as an orator and as a politician. It was not coincidental that the references to Cicero in the debates, assemblies, and journalism of those years were far more numerous than those to other classical authors.⁵

¹ In general, for the role of classics in the French Revolution see Récatas 1955; Parker 1965; Mossé 1989; Dubuisson 1989, who notes (35) that in speeches and pamphlets there were twice as many references to ancient Rome as to ancient Greece; Grell 1995; Giardina/Vauchez 2000, 127–134; Trebulsì 2009; Arici 2013; Di Bartolomeo 2017, 146–147. My deepest thanks to Rosalie Stoner for kindly editing my English.
⁴ Parker 1965, 14–16, stresses the fact that the school handbooks selected only speeches by Cicero. In the second half of the 18th century, higher education was focused on law and Latin culture, especially the Roman Republic, while among Greek texts Plutarch’s Lives was the most famous (Dubuisson 1989; Trebulsì 2009, 217). There was in general in this period an incredible number of works focused on antiquity (Récatas 1955, 496–497).
⁵ Parker 1965, 18–19, with special reference to the Verrinae and to the second Philippic.
Cicero’s privileged position made perfect sense: his passionate defense of the Roman Republic, to the point of physical sacrifice, his constant fight against political conspiracies, especially Catiline’s, and his non-aristocratic origin, all fit perfectly as a historical model for the French Republicans – but also for their enemies.

Indeed, given the permanent state of political confusion and tension, with ceaseless exchanges of accusations and conspiracy complaints, the roles of the Roman consul and of the subversive fallen nobleman were attributed to, or self-attributed by, different characters at different times, most of all Robespierre. This is the picture I would like to sketch, after a brief introduction explaining why Cicero was regarded as a model at the end of the 18th century.

2 How did Cicero arrive in the French Revolution

Why Cicero? This is the first question classicists might ask when looking at how the most charismatic characters of the Revolutionary period fought for the distinction of being the new Cicero. He was certainly no great commander, but on the contrary was often blamed for his irresoluteness and inconsistency in politics, and was known as fearful and sometimes even coward, far removed not only from persons with absolutist ambitions, such as Gaius Marius and Julius Caesar, who were not appreciated by the revolutionaries, but also from the legendary Cato of Utica, still celebrated as an outstanding martyr of the Republic by Montesquieu (Considérations XII 140 – 141).

In order to understand this exceptional fortune of Cicero, it is necessary to go back a few decades in the 18th century and take a look at the French cultural landscape of that time. The revaluation of Cicero in that period starts in Great Britain with the History of Marcus Tullius Cicero by Conyers Middleton (1741), translated into French by the Abbé Prévost (1743). In his analysis, Middleton combines political and philosophical judgement: he destroys the myth of Cato, describing him as a slave of an extremist faith, Stoicism, and thus incapable of adapting to reality – and Middleton is here repeating accusations that Cicero himself had addressed to Cato in the Pro Murena and elsewhere. Catiline for his part is considered a per-

---

6 Cf. Martin 1984; Chomarat 1991; Eden 2015; also Moraes Santos, p. 341–367 in this volume.
7 Zieliński 1912, 245–257 (Enlightenment); 257–267 (French Revolution); Grell 1995, 1090–1098.
8 Cambiano 2006; Fox 2013; Ingram 2015. On this influential work, see Kenty, p. 199 and 205 in this volume.
sonification of the enemy of the laws, a dangerous subversive.⁹ Cicero, on the other hand, understood as a quintessential representative of Academic philosophy, is praised for his moderation, sense of justice, and practical spirit. This interpretative scheme, which had been adopted in Great Britain in the context of Anglican religion is in France applied to the political aspects and social origins of the protagonists. In 1748, Crébillon stages the drama *Catiline*, which features a feeble senate and a Cato with tyrannical ambitions.¹⁰ Moreover, the numerous translations of Sallust and the essays on his *Conspiracy of Catiline*, especially the *Histoire de la Conjuration de Catilina* by Isaac Bellet in 1752, who contradicts Sallust himself, portrays Cato as representative of an impotent senate, Catiline of the degraded aristocracy, but Cicero of the vital forces of the city.

Cicero thus becomes a symbol of the new social forces trying to save the state, an ideal model for the contemporary *bourgeoisie*. Along these lines Voltaire, with his *Catilina ou Rome sauvée* (1752)¹¹ affirms, not without some controversy, that Cicero had saved the Republic despite the senate’s feebleness and that his death had been due to the triumph of prejudices over virtue and merit: a position that will be shared also by André Chénier.

In brief, the XVIII century bequeaths to the revolutionaries a political Cicero with strongly idealized traits, leaving aside his philosophical, poetical, and rhetorical interests. The complexity of his character and of his public and private story is reduced to a few crucial elements: his humble origin, devotion to the Republic, victory over noble subversion, oratorical cleverness. This is the Cicero over whom the protagonists of the history of those years will fight, as if for a trophy.

After presenting some iconographic evidence, I will focus on three episodes of the years 1789–1794: the trial of the king, the trial of a Latin professor, and the end of Robespierre. In each case I will quote a number of original texts to support my arguments. Most of the texts contain echoes of Ciceronian passages, but I will not examine these in depth, lest we lose sight of the focus of my research.¹²

---

⁹ This idea has lasted until recent times, as various novels and TV series show (see Stutz in this volume, p. 220–221).
¹⁰ On this and other theatrical pieces, see Martin 1984; Manuwald 2018b, 87–93. The same Crébillon in 1754 staged *Le triumvirat ou la mort de Cicéron* (Manuwald 2018b, 108–111; on Voltaire, 198–202).
¹¹ Martin 1984, 236–242; on Voltaire and Cicero, Sharpe 2015.
¹² Some hints on this theme in Ternes 1991.
3 The first steps of the Revolution

In 1789, Isaac René Guy Le Chapelier, a rich lawyer known for his oratorical ability, was elected the first president of the new Jacobin club and, from the 3rd to the 16th of August, president of the National Assembly, which approved the Declaration of Human Rights. To celebrate this historic moment, he commissioned an engraving from Jean-Baptiste Vérité with a significant epigraph: “the venerable deputy from Rennes gives new life in his speeches to the art and boldness of Cicero and Demosthenes: and to his talent we owe our freedom”.

Slightly earlier in the same year, André Boniface Louis Riquetti, count of Mirabeau, proved himself an exceptional representative of the Third Estate in the National Assembly. He played a crucial role in the fight against the monarchy, but also acted as a brake upon popular insurrections. The count initially achieved enormous popularity, and sometimes referred to the Catilinarian conspiracy and Cicero’s speeches in his own.¹³ He was the agent of some of the Assembly’s main appropriations, including the confiscation of clergymen’s property. After his unexpected death in 1791, an engraving was commissioned from Louis-Joseph Masquelier, which represents Mirabeau arriving at the Champs Elysées; over his head flies the Spirit of Freedom with the words: “France Free”.

Mirabeau walks towards Rousseau and hands him the Constitution. Franklin puts a crown on his head in the presence of Montesquieu, Voltaire, Mably, and Fénélon, all 18th-century Frenchmen who played a role in inspiring, or taking part in, the Revolution. On the second floor in this contemporary scene are Cicero and Demosthenes, who look at Mirabeau with interest and admiration. They are the only ancients.

So, Cicero and Demosthenes were the authorities to whom the protagonists of the very first steps of the French Republic referred, with special emphasis on their oratorical abilities. And yet, needless to say, they were not only the greatest orators of ancient times but also two martyrs who died fighting against a tyrant (Philip of Macedonia for Demosthenes, Mark Antony for Cicero). And they fought with words, not with arms.

¹³ Brasart 1991, 15 – 16; Trebulsi 2009, 219, with reference to the speech of Sept. 26, 1789 to the National Assembly (AP IX196); see also Blackman 2014, on the oath of the tennis court. Here and below, the abbreviation AP stands for Archives Parlementaires de la Révolution Française, a rich collection of original documents, newspapers, and reports related to the period of the French Revolution (1789–1799), whose publication started in 1862, increased progressively, and is now digitalized (free access to these documents is available at www.gallica.bnf.fr and www.frda.stanford.edu/fr), and on schedule for completion (cf. http://www.bibliotheque.sorbonne.fr/biu/spip.php?rubrique211).
Cicero was appreciated also by the political opposition to the Revolution. Shortly after the aforementioned actions of Le Chapelier and Mirabeau, the countess of Montrond, Angelique Marie Darlus du Tailly, published anonymously a royalist essay entitled *Le long Parlement et ses crimes. Rapprochements faciles à faire – A Paris, à l’imprimerie d’un royaliste*, 1790. The author describes the republicans as subversive people whose aim is the destruction of the state. The essay ends with some *Reflections on Catiline and his conspiracy*. Here, the Countess draws a parallel between Catiline’s Rome (where Catiline stands for the French republicans), Cromwell’s London, and contemporary Paris, and praises
Sans Catilina et Pompée, peut-être que Rome auroit eu dans Cèsar qu’un grand Général, et non pas un Dictateur altéré du pouvoir suprême. Catilina, sans moeurs, sans probité, sans respect pour les Dieux, dont l’ambition étoit la seule divinité […] se servant du prétexte de l’intérêt du peuple pour perdre Rome et subjuguer l’Italie […]. Rome échappa, à plusieurs reprises, à la tyrannie des ambitieux; mais le Sénateurs pouvoient parler; mais le Sénat étoit honorable et respecté, et si les ambitieux se formoient dans son sein, ils y étoient en petit nombre. Tout était auguste dans cette Assemblée. Le peuple, successivement séduit par les plus sanguinaires des humains, Cinna, Maris, Scilla [sic], Catilina lui-même, qui tous se couvoient du voil de son intérêt pour l’asservir après l’avoir enviré d’hommages; le peuple n’exprimoit ni applaudissement ni blâme. L’orateur étoit écouté de quelque parti qu’il fût, et Cicéron dénonça en plein Sénat Catilina présent.¹⁴

¹⁴ “Without Catiline and Pompey, it is likely that Rome would have had with Caesar nothing other than a great general, and not a dictator with absolute power. Catiline, who had no values,
There is also a note to this text that states: “Cicero, displeased by the feebleness of the senate towards Catiline, said: ‘This feebleness arises from the fact that a part of the senate has too much fear, another part has nothing to fear’”.\textsuperscript{15}

4 The Trial of King Louis XVI

As is well known, the king of France, Louis XVI, after an initial phase in which it seemed possible to calm the political disorder through the institution of a constitutional monarchy, was progressively stripped of power by the revolutionaries, and finally deposed on August 10, 1792. He then tried to escape, while exhorting other European monarchies to fight against the French republicans. He was caught in Varenne, tried, and condemned to death with his wife, Marie Antoinette.

The trial, held from December 5, 1792 to January 17, 1793, had much in common with the expulsion of the kings by the Romans in 509 BCE\textsuperscript{16} – the king was indeed caught betraying his fatherland – but also with the senate’s proceedings against Catiline’s followers in 63 BCE: A peculiar correspondence between the two situations concerned the possibility for the accused to appeal to the people; this would have been very dangerous for the provisional government, given the strong influence that the monarchy exercised over the poor. Some Montagnards,\textsuperscript{17} including Robespierre and Saint-Just, would even have preferred a con-
demnation without a trial, and it is precisely in this regard that they evoked Roman precedents.

Here is a fragment of the speech by Louis Antoine de Saint-Just, given on November 13, 1792:¹⁸

On s’étonnera un jour qu’au dix-huitième siècle on ait été moins avancé que du temps de César - là le tyran fut immolé en plein Sénat, sans autres formalités que vingt-trois coups de poignard et sans autre loi que la liberté de Rome. Et aujourd’hui l’on fait avec respect le procès d’un homme assassin d’un peuple, pris en flagrant délit, la main dans le sang, la main dans le crime! […]

Louis était un autre Catilina; le meurtrier, comme le consul de Rome, jugerait qu’il a sauvé la patrie. Louis a combattu le peuple: il est vaincu. C’est un barbare, c’est un étranger prisonnier de guerre. Vous avez vu ses désseins perfides; vous avez vu son armée; le traître n’était pas le roi des Français, mais le roi de quelques conjurés.¹⁹

It is interesting here that Saint-Just, while completely justifying Cicero’s behavior towards the Catilinarians and identifying Louis with Catiline, cites the death of Caesar and not of the Catilinarians. This is because he knew well that the death of the Catilinarians caused the banishment of Cicero a few years later for having condemned Roman citizens without due process: a story that had much in common with that of the trial of the king.

More specifically against the appeal to the people are the words of Robespierre (December 28, 1792):²⁰

La minorité a partout un droit éternel, c’est celui de faire entendre la voix de la vérité ou de ce qu’elle regarde comme telle.

La vertu fut toujours en minorités sur la terre. Sans cela, la terre serait-elle peuplée de tyrans et d’esclaves? […] les Critias, les Anitus, les César, les Clodius, étoient de la majorité; mais Socrate étoit de la minorité, car il avala la ciguë; Caton étoit de la minorité, car il déchira

¹⁹ “People will wonder one day that in the 18th century we were less advanced than in the times when Caesar the tyrant was killed in the middle of the Senate, without any other formalities than twenty-three stabs, and without any other law than Rome’s liberty. And nowadays we celebrate with respect the trial against a man who killed his people, caught in the act, with blood on his hands, his hands in the crime! […] Louis is another Catiline: his murderer, just like the consul of Rome, should think he has saved his fatherland. Louis fought against his people: he was defeated. He is a barbarian, a stranger, a prisoner of war. You have seen his evil projects; you have seen his army; this traitor is not the king of the French anymore, but the king of some conspirators”.
ses entrailles. Je connais ici beaucoup d’hommes qui serviront, s’il le faut, la liberté [...] forts des armes de la justice et de la raison, tôt ou tard vous les verrez triompher.

It is quite striking to read these words from a man who supported republican rules and the rights of the people. In this case, Robespierre was well aware that the king still possessed considerable authority in the eyes of the people, and so he chose to base his argumentation on those who were falsely accused by a majority (including people who were opposed to Cicero, like Caesar and Clodius) and had to face death, like Socrates or Cato. Historical examples like these will return, as we shall see, in Robespierre’s last speech.

Let us quote another participant in the debate, the Montagnard Jean-Bon Saint-André:

Il ne faut accuser personne; mais l’appel au peuple dans cette crise où l’opinion est comme déchirée, peut détruire la République, qui ne démêle point parmi les images terribles et l’amertume qu’on nous oppose des ressentiments sous des traits étrangers: Catilina aussi parlait de la souveraineté du peuple romain. C’était en son nom qu’il conjurait contre la liberté. Quel monstre sur la terre n’a point déguisé sa noirceur sous le masque de la vertu? Catilina prenait à témoin les dieux, Catilina demandait l’appui des lois; vous qui parlez d’appel au peuple, que nous dites-vous autre chose? Quels sont ceux qui nous ont proposé la force armée? Quels sont ici les hommes les plus passionnés? Quels sont ceux qui font de ce temple de la liberté un autre tartare qui semble habité par les furies? Quels sont ceux qui n’ont encore ici proposé que des lois de sang avant des lois humaines? Ce sont les mêmes qui proposent l’appel au peuple.

21 “The minority has everywhere an eternal right, that of spreading the voice of the truth, or of what it considers to be such. Virtue has always belonged to the minority on earth. If not, would the earth be populated by tyrants and slaves? [...] The Critiases, the Anytoses, the Caesars, the Clodii were the majority; but Socrates belonged to the minority, because he drank the hemlock; Cato belonged to the minority, because he eviscerated himself. I know here some people who will serve freedom, if it is necessary [...] with justice and reason as their weapons, sooner or later you will see their triumph”.

22 Jean-Bon Saint-André, discours à la Séance du mardi 1 janvier 1793 (AP LVI 119).

23 “I do not want to accuse anyone; but the appeal to the people in this crisis, in which public opinion is torn apart, can destroy the Republic, which cannot sort out the fearful images and the bitterness which gives us resentments under foreign appearances: Catiline also spoke of the sovereignty of the Roman people. It was in its name that he conspired against freedom. What monster on earth has not disguised his darkness under the mask of virtue? Catiline took the gods as witnesses, Catiline asked for the application of the laws: you who talk about appealing to the people, are you telling us anything different? Who are those who proposed military force? Who are here the most passionate men? Who are those who make this temple of liberty another Tartarus inhabited by the Furies? Who are those who have only proposed here the laws of blood before human laws? Those are the same who propose the appeal to the people”.
5 Being a Latin professor in Paris in 1793: the trial of Antoine Le Tellier

A first, albeit unfruitful, review of some arbitrary arrests was followed by a few students protesting at the National Convention. They brought attention to the case of Professor Antoine Le Tellier, who had been imprisoned on May 14, 1793 because of some of his history lessons. The Law Committee was entrusted with verifying the facts, and on May 26, the deputy Gilles Porcher-Lissonnary read the committee report, which was favorable to the release of the professor. Of the five persons arrested on that occasion, Le Tellier was the only one still in prison, because the Paris municipality refused to drop the charges. The professor, who taught at the Collège Quatre-Nations, faced multiple charges of subversive political propaganda: the main evidence against him was “Un des morceaux les plus vigoureux de la première Catilinaire de Cícéron, donné à traduire à ses écoliers”. Among the dangerous homework assignments distributed to his students were many Latin passages from Cicero and Sallust. Le Tellier was said to have exhorted his pupils to pay attention to the analogies between Robespierre’s Paris and Catiline’s Rome, both in the hands of an ignorant mass. Porcher argued convincingly that he had in fact done so, and added that the conspirators reminded him of Clodius, Cicero’s archenemy. But, despite fierce opposition from Marat, Porcher persuaded the Convention to release the professor. Porcher did not deny that the accused held such views, but he ridiculed the fact that the charges were rooted in texts that were almost two thousand years old.

Here are some passages from Gilles Porcher’s report:

“Là, c’est un des morceaux les plus vigoureux de la première Catilinaire de Cícéron, donné à traduire à ses écoliers, et un des plus propres à faire trembler les conspirateurs et les factieux” […] (Murmures prolongés sur la Montagne.)

[…] Salle: “Allons, un décret d’accusation contre Salluste”.

Un autre membre (à droite): “Non, je demande qu’il soit traduit avec Cícéron à l’Abbaye”.

(Violentes interruptions des tribunes.)

Porcher-Lissonnary, rapporteur, poursuit: “Je passe en revue lès différents devoirs donnés à ses jeunes élèves, qu’on a joints ici comme une preuve du danger qu’il y avait à confier à ce citoyen une éducation républicaine. Mes yeux parcourrent partout, avec plaisir, les plus beaux endroits de Cícéron, de Salluste et de Raynal.

---

25 “One of the most vigorous sections of Cicero’s first Catilinarian, given to his pupils to translate”.
26 AP LXV, séance du 26 mai, 347–348 and 350.
J’y vois Rome élevée au plus haut degré de grandeur et de force, sur le point d’être rien: versée par un petit nombre de scélérats qui avaient juré sa perte. ‘Ils paraîsaient les décrets du Sénat, ils séduisaient la multitude ignorant; ils corrompaient l’esprit public; ils rendaient si puissante la contagion qu’ils glissaient dans l’âme de tous les citoyens, que personne, dit Salluste, ne sortit du camp de Catilina pour découvrir la conjuration qui menaçait la liberté’.

On lit, dans un autre devoir, un tableau bien frappant de la cause des mauux qui auraient perdu Rome à cette époque, sans le génie de Cicéron. ‘On vit arriver dans Rome’, dit encore Salluste, ‘comme dans un égout, des hommes fameux par leur brigandage, qui avaient consommé leur patrimoine dans la débauche et dans l’infamie, tous ceux que leurs crimes avaient chassés de leur patrie; ils entraînaient le peuple loin des vrais principes; ils applaudissaient au dessein de Catilina, ce qui était naturel; car, le plus souvent, ceux qui sont dépourvus de richesses portent envie aux bons, élèvent les méchants, se nourrissent de troubles et de séditions, haïssent les lois, et désirent de nouvelles’ 

Citoyens, on vit toutes ces horreurs dans Rome; mais lorsque les projets liberticides de Catilina furent déjoués, on ne vit point les complices de sa conjuration lever insolennement la tête, et accuser de trahison les meilleurs citoyens’.

27 “Here is one of the most vigorous passages of Cicero’s first Catilinarian, given to his students to translate, one of the most appropriate for making conspirators and sectarians tremble” [...] (prolonged murmur from the Mountain) [...] Salle steps in: “Let us draw up a charge against Sallust!” Another member from the right: “No, I demand that he be taken with Cicero to the Abbey!” (violent interruption from the stands). Porcher-Lissonnary, the speaker, continues: ‘I sort through the different homework assigned to his young students, which have been here reported as evidence of the danger in confiding in this citizen a republican education. My eyes wander with pleasure among the most beautiful passages of Cicero, Sallust, and Raynal. [An Enlightenment author.] I see Rome, raised to the highest level of greatness and power, on the point of being reduced to nothing, overturned by a small number of villains who had sworn its ruin. ‘They have paralyzed the Senate’s decrees, seduced the ignorant people, corrupted the public spirit, made the infection so powerful that it spread in the soul of every citizen, to the point that no one’, says Sallust, ‘went out of Catiline’s camp to reveal the conspiracy which put liberty at risk’. In other homework you can read an impressive list of the causes of the evils which would have ruined Rome in those years, if not for Cicero and his genius. ‘You can see arriving in Rome’, says Sallust again, ‘as in a sewer, persons who are famous for their banditry, who had consumed all their property in infamous vices, all those whom their crimes had banned from their fatherland: they alienated people from authentic principles, they approved Catilene’s projects, as was natural: because those who have lost their property feel envy against the good, choose the evil, feed off seditions and revolution, destroy the laws and desire new ones’ [...] Citizens, you see all of these horrors in Rome: but when the freedom-killing projects of Catiline were revealed, one could not see the accomplices of his conspiracy raising insolently their heads and accusing the best citizens of treason”.
The newspaper *Le Patriote Français*, managed by Brissot, a deputy of the Girondes, agreed with Porcher and added some sarcastic details to the story:²⁸


And so Professor Le Tellier was released, despite his supposedly dangerous Ciceroonian and Sallustian readings. Those readings were indeed evidence of a political position that was firmly against the ideas of Robespierre and his supporters, as subsequent events soon showed. A short time after these occurrences the insurrection of June 2 took place; on June 3 the professor was imprisoned again, then released, imprisoned another time (May 16, 1794), and finally condemned to death on June 24, for a reason that this time was exclusively political and not cultural: his support for the conspirators Brissot, Gorsas, and others.²⁹

---

²⁸ *Le Patriote Français* 1383, du 28 mai 1793, 591: “The huge fault of Le Tellier, professor at Quatre-Nations college, for whom the Convention ordered the extension [sc. of the imprisonment], was to have written some Latin poems against Robespierre and Marat, and to have translated in his class Cicero’s *Catilinarians* and Sallust’s *The Conspiracy of Catiline*. Salle requested sarcastically a formal accusation against Sallust, and an arrest warrant for Cicero. Some local members, who believed that Cicero and Sallust were contemporary politicians who met at Valazé’s, cried: ‘To the polls!’ Bourdon, Bentaboll, and others demanded the reading of Le Tellier’s poems, but they were told that these would have had to be translated for them, and there was a certain embarrassment.”

²⁹ “Le Tellier has been condemned because he was acknowledged guilty of being one of the fiercest federalists, and of having exchanged mail with them; of being a friend of Buzot; of having provoked more than once the citizens who compose the general assembly of the section of the Unity; of having tried to justify Brissot, Gorsas, and other conspirators” (Rabourdin 1998, 185).
6 Robespierre

Robespierre is one of the most charismatic protagonists of the Revolution, and so he naturally deserves an important place in this story. His relationship with Cicero began through another professor, Monsieur Hérivaux, who played a crucial role in Robespierre’s conversion to the republican cause. Hérivaux taught rhetoric at the Louis-Le-Grand college, and had a genuine passion for Greek eloquence and most of all for the rhetoric of the Roman Republic. These are Robespierre’s memories of Hérivaux, collected by a famous biographer:

Monsieur Hérivaux [...] avait une âme qui sympathisait singulièrement avec la mienne; à force d’expliquer à ses élèves les beaux faits de la République romaine, les moeurs austères de Sparte et le prodiges d’art et d’éloquence que la liberté avait enfantés au milieu des légers et spirituels habitants de l’Attique, il avait fini par vivre dans ce circle d’idées; et devenu républicain enthousiaste, il nous préchait les bienfaits et les merveilles du gouvernement qu’il s’était fait. Les chefs du collège souffraient ses véhéments panégyriques; ils en plaisantaient même, comme d’un travers sans conséquence; mais nous qui devions plus qu’eux saisir le côté plaisant de la chose, nous avions eu le travers de la prendre au sérieux. Jusqu’alors j’avais montré peu de facilité à mémoriser; les éloquentes harangues de Cicéron étaient pour moi sans charmes; mais dépouillées de l’intérêt qui s’attache à la réalité, privées de la vie que leur donne l’appréciation des temps, elles n’excitaient en moi qu’une sterile admiration. Les paroles de M. Hérivaux m’ouvrirent les yeux: il évoquait les vieilles ombres des Gracques, reconstruisait la tribune au milieu du Forum, ou la chaise curule des sénateurs, et remplissait le Sénat, la place publique, de vieillards vénérables blanchis au service de leur patrie, ou d’une multitude immense, d’un peuple entier délibérant sur le choix des ses déléguées, accusant, jugeant et punissant [...]. Je voyais le mont Aventin, et j’enviais le sort de ces tribuns courageux, chargés de mettre un frein aux empiétements du patriciat et de sauvegarder les droits du peuple [...]. Je dois à ces premières instructions, que l’étude avait depuis rectifiées, les semences de mes invariables opinions. M. Hérivaux s’aperçut des vives impressions que son enthousiasme avait laissées dans mon esprit; il s’en applaudit, et me donna, en plaisantant, le surnom de ‘Romain’ qu’il avait déjà reçu lui-même.

---

31 Graterolle 1894, 16–17.
32 “Monsieur Hérivaux [...] had a soul which was particularly in tune with mine: by dint of explaining to his pupils the fine deeds of the Roman Republic, the sober customs of Sparta, and the prodigies of art and eloquence which freedom had created within the light and spiritual inhabitants of Attica, he ended up living within that circle of ideas; thus, having become an eager republican, he preached to us the merits and marvels of a government which he himself had created. The deans of the college were annoyed by his fierce panegyrics; also, they made fun of them, like a digression without any consequence: but we, who should have laughed at that
So, enlightened by his inspiring Latin professor, Robespierre became a renowned lawyer and presented himself as a new Cicero, a heroic defender of the Republic. But he soon found, albeit more due to his previous political extremism than to his role in the proscriptions, that he was accused of being the opposite of a Cicero, i.e. a new Catiline or even a new Caesar. In the following pages, I will quote only some of the many passages on this subject. Jean-Baptiste Louvet, a Jacobin who later allied with the Girondins, at the National Convention of October 29, 1792 accused Robespierre of tyrannical aspirations and called for a new Brutus against him:

Ainsi tu marchais à grand pas, Robespierre, vers ce pouvoir dictatorial dont la soif te dévorait, mais où t’attendait enfin plusieurs hommes de quelque résolution, et que, n’en doute pas, ils avoient juré par Brutus, tu n’aurais pas gardé plus d’un jour.

The same Louvet published a pamphlet on the subject, where he draws significant parallels:

Citoyens, s’il existoit dans la république un homme né avec le génie de César, ou l’audace de Cromwell, un homme qui, avec le talent de Sylla, en auroit les dangereux moyens, je story more than they – we ventured to take it seriously. Up until then I had never been easily moved; the eloquent harangues of Cicero seemed to me empty of charms; deprived of the interest that is connected to reality, without the life given them by the appreciation of the times, they excited in me only a sterile appreciation. The words of M. Hérivaux opened my eyes: he evoked the shadow of the Gracchi, he rebuilt the tribune in the center of the Forum, or the curule chair of the Senators, and filled the Senate, the public place, with venerable white-haired old men in the service of their fatherland, or with an immense crowd, a whole people deliberating on the choice of their delegates, accusing, judging, and punishing [...]. I saw the Aventine, and I envied the fate of those brave tribunes who were entrusted with the task of limiting the encroachments of the patricians and protecting the people’s rights [...]. I owe to this primary instruction, which later my personal study completed, the origin of my personal convictions. M. Hérivaux realized the vivid impression that his enthusiasm had left on my spirit; he was pleased by this, and he gave me, for fun, the nickname “Roman”, which had previously been given to himself”. On the nickname “Roman”, see Récatas 1955, 211.

33 Trebulsi 2009, 255.
34 We can add e.g. the reference made by Brissot to Marat, whom he compared to Clodius (Brissot 1793, 34 n. 1); in two letters addressed to the Committee on Public Safety (June 16, 1793) and to the citizens of Gannat (June 17), he justifies his flight from Paris due to his fear of Marat, stating that even Cicero was not ashamed of fleeing from Clodius (Perroud 1911, 356 and 358).
35 Louvet 1792a, 13.
36 “You moved quickly, Robespierre, towards that dictatorial power for which you felt a devouring thirst, but where many people with strong resolution were waiting for you: I have no doubt that, if they had sworn for Brutus, you would not have had more than one day left”.
37 Louvet 1792b, 6–7.
viendrois avec courage l’accuser devant vous; un tel homme pourroit être dangereux à la liberté. S’il existoit ici quelque législateur d’un grand génie, d’un caractère profond, ou d’une ambition vaste; je demanderois d’abord s’il a une armée à ses ordres, ou un trésor public à sa disposition, ou un grand parti dans le sénat ou dans la république [...]. Mais des hommes d’un Jour, de petits entrepreneurs de révolution, des politiques qui n’entreront jamais dans le domaine de l’histoire, ne sont pas faits pour occuper le temps précieux que vous devez aux grands travaux dont le peuple vous a chargés.38

The long argument goes on to accuse Robespierre of having created an actual triumvirate.39

Robespierre’s reply to Louvet in front of the National Convention contains a clear self-identification with Cicero:40

On lui reproche des arrestations qu’on appelle arbitraires, quoiqu’aucune n’ait été faite sans un interrogatoire. Quand le consul de Rome eut étouffé la conspiration de Catilina, Clodius l’accusa d’avoir violé les lois. Quand le consul rendit compte au peuple de son administration, il jura qu’il avait sauvé la patrie, et le peuple applaudit. J’ai vu à cette barre, tels citoyens qui ne sont pas des Clodius, mais qui, quelques temps avant la révolution du 10 août,31 avaient eu la prudence de se réfugier à Rouen, dénoncer emphatiquement la conduite du conseil de la commune de Paris. Des arrestations illégales? Est-ce donc le code criminel à la main, qu’il faut apprécier les précautions salutaires qu’exige le salut public, dans les temps de crise amenés par l’impuissance même des lois?42

38 “Citizens, if there has ever existed in the Republic a man who was born with the genius of Caesar, or with the audacity of Cromwell; a man who, with Sulla’s talent, would have had his same means, then I would bravely come to accuse him before you; a similar man could be dangerous for freedom. If there existed here a legislator of great genius, of profound character or with limitless ambitions, I would immediately ask you if he has an army at his orders, or an immense treasure at his disposal, or a great party of supporters in the Senate or in the Republic [...] but some men for a day, some little businessmen of the revolution, some politicians who never come into the ranks of history, are not made to occupy the precious time that you owe to the great duty with which the people have entrusted you”.

39 Louvet 1792b, 51. The fellow partners in the triumvirate would have been Marat and an unidentified person. Later on, in 1794, the same accusation was made in reference to Robespierre, Saint-Just, and Couthon (Baczko 1989, 20).


41 This is the date of the storming of the Tuileries Palace, which led to the abolition of the monarchy.

42 “He is accused of arbitrary arrests, although none of them were made without an interrogation. When the consul of Rome stilled the conspiracy of Catiline, Clodius accused him of having violated the laws. When the consul rendered an account of his administration to the people, he swore that he had saved his fatherland, and the people applauded. I have seen at this bar some citizens who are not like Clodius, but who, some time before the Revolution of August 10, had had the foresight to run away to Rouen, to denounce emphatically the behavior of the council of the Commune of Paris. Illegal arrests? It is then with the criminal code in hand that it is neces-
The legitimacy of breaking laws in order to save the Republic remains a crucial point in the discussion.

Later on, in 1793, the attacks against the so-called “enemies of the Revolution” begin. Among these were the principal members of the Gironde, including Élie Guadet, an eminent lawyer who was renowned for his oratorical passion. He was one of the targets of Robespierre’s accusations. Here is the opening of one of his replies, pronounced on April 12, 1793:43

Citoyens, si en dénonçant au Sénat de Rome celui qui avait conspiré contre la liberté de son pays, si en accusant Catilina, Cicéron eût fondé son accusation sur des preuves de la nature de celles que Robespierre a produites contre moi, Cicéron aurait excité contre lui-même l’indignation de tout le Sénat: et si après avoir annoncé “qu’il venoit remplir un ministre douloureux et pénible”, si après avoir déclaré que l’amour de la patrie et la connaissance d’une grande conjuration avoient seules pu le forcer à rompre le silence, Cicéron eût terminé son accusation par une plâtre et froide plaisanterie; si mêlant aux grands intérêts de la liberté des ridicules jeux de mots, il eût conclu en faveur de l’accusé, après l’avoir peint comme un vil scélérat, Cicéron eût été honteusement chassé du Sénat: car à Rome on détestoit la calomnie et on savoit punir les calomniateurs. Mais Cicéron étoit un homme de bien, il n’accusoit pas sans preuves [...]. Cicéron aimoit son pays: il n’eût pas pris le mouvement de l’orgueil et de la haine pour les élans du patriotisme. Cicéron enfin... je m’arrête. Aussi bien que peut-il y avoir de commun entre Cicéron et Robespierre, entre Catilina et moi?44

In this speech, not only the subject, but also the style – anaphoric, emphatic, pathetic, with a final aposiopesis – is exquisitely Ciceronian, especially typical
of Cicero’s speeches to the people. The end of Guadet’s speech also contains very Ciceronian overtones:⁴⁵

Citoyens […] songez qu’ils vous demanderont compte, un jour, de l’usage que vous aurez fait de ce pouvoir. Songez que l’anarchie est le garant du succès de toutes les conspirations, que l’ordre et l’amour des loix en sont le tombeau; songez enfin, songez que c’est dans l’anarchie qu’est l’espoir de nos ennemis. C’est elle, et non Pharsale, qui livra Rome à César; c’est elle, et non les victoires de Cobourg qui vous livreront à l’Europe coalisée.⁴⁶

In addition to denying the identification of Robespierre with Cicero in this passage, Guadet is perhaps recalling another speech, that of Caesar in Sallust’s *De coniuratione Catilinae*. Here, speaking of the possible condemnation of the Catilinarians, Caesar warns the senate, and most of all the consul Cicero, that the future will inquire about the decision they are making. And we know that Cicero was later sent into exile for this. So, in a way, Guadet is recognizing Robespierre as a new Cicero, but in a peculiar respect: that of someone who misuses his power, doing something illegal for which he will later have to answer.

On June 2, 1794 many Girondins were arrested, and Guadet was among them. After having escaped and tried variously to resist and to raise an insurrection, he was caught and guillotined with his father, his aunt, and his brother on June 17.⁴⁷

The Revolution considered itself a new order, to be preserved against attempts to subvert it, but this effort was soon to fail. The bloody repression of revolts raised ever stronger waves of resentment against Robespierre and his friends, as his enemies sought his downfall.

Robespierre’s final speech, delivered in the meeting of 8 Thermidor,⁴⁸ contains a self-defense against the charges of tyranny that is clearly influenced by Cicero: “qui suis-je, moi qu’on accuse? Un esclave de la liberté, un martyr vivant

---

⁴⁵ Guadet 1793, 47–48.
⁴⁶ “Citizens […] you have to remember that they will demand an account from you, one day, about the use you made of this power; you have to know that anarchy is the guarantee of success for all conspiracies, while order and respect for the laws declare their death; you have to know, finally, that in anarchy lies the hope of our enemies. This, and not Pharsalus, is what delivered Rome to Caesar; this, and not the victories at Coburg, will deliver you to Europe united against you”.
⁴⁷ Around the same time, the municipality of Marseille turned against the Jacobins, evoking the burning zeal of Cicero against the fury of Catiline (*Moniteur* VIII 147, 25 mai 1793); cf. Di Bartolomeo 2014, 196–197.
⁴⁸ The philological reconstruction is that by Hamel 1897, based on the manuscripts preserved by the heirs of Simone Duplay, who was Robespierre’s secretary. The quoted passages come from pages 248, 251, and 253. The same text appears in Robespierre, *Oeuvres*, vol. X (Bouloiseau/Souboul 1967), 556, 565, and 567.
de la République, la victime autant que l'ennemi du crime”.\textsuperscript{49} Regarding his former comrades who betrayed him, especially Barère, he says: “aujourd'hui ils me caressent de nouveau: leur langage est plus affectueux que jamais. Il y a trois jours ils étaient prêts à me dénoncer comme un Catilina: aujourd'hui ils me prêtent les vertus du Caton”.\textsuperscript{50} Again:

En voyant la multitude de vices que le torrent de la Révolution a roulés pêle-mêle avec les vertus civiques, j’ai craint, quelquefois, je l’avoue, d’être souillé aux yeux de la posterité par le voisinage impur des hommes pervers qui s’introduisaient parmi les sincères amis de l’humanité, et je m’applaudis de voir la fureur des Verrès et des Catilina de mon pays tracer une ligne profonde de démarcation entre eux et tous les gens de bien. Je conçois qu’il est facile à la ligue des tyrans du monde d’accabler un seul homme, mais je sais aussi quels sont les devoirs d’un homme que sait mourir en défendant la cause du genre humain.\textsuperscript{51}

A source favorable to Robespierre, Ernest Hamel, proposed a new reconstruction of the meeting of 8 Thermidor, and praised Robespierre’s choice to avoid a popular insurrection in his own defense, writing:

*Custodiatur igitur mae vita reipublicae.* Protégé donc ma vie pour la République aurait-il pu dir avec Cicéron; et cette exclamation eût suffi, je n’en doute pas, pour remuer tout le peuple de Paris. Il ne voulut pas la pousser. Mais que, cédant à un sentiment de mélancholie bien naturel, il se soit écrié: ‘S’il faut succomber, eh bien! Mes amis, vous me verrez boire la ciguë avec calme’, cela est certain.\textsuperscript{52}

So, in the end Robespierre compared himself not only to Cicero, but also to the most famous political martyr of all, Socrates, who, although innocent, was condemned to death by his fellow citizens.

\textsuperscript{49} “Who am I, I who am accused of tyranny? A slave of liberty, a living martyr of the Republic, a victim no less than an enemy of the crime”.

\textsuperscript{50} “Today they are caressing me anew; their words are sweeter than ever. Three days ago they were ready to report me as a new Catiline: today they bestow on me the virtues of Cato”.

\textsuperscript{51} “Looking at the number of vices which the stream of Revolution has dragged confusingly together with the civic virtues, I was afraid sometimes, I confess, to be defiled in the eyes of posterity by the impure nearness of those perverse men who presented themselves as authentic friends of humanity, and I am happy to see that the frenzy of the Verreses and Catilines of my country trace a deep dividing line between them and all the good men. I know that it is easy for the coalition of tyrants to ruin a single man, but I also know what the duties are of a man who knows how to die defending the cause of the human race”.

\textsuperscript{52} “Protect my life for the Republic’ he could have said, with Cicero [*Phil. 12.30*]: and this sentence would have been enough, I have no doubt, to raise all people in Paris. He did not want to say it. But that, giving in to a naturally melancholic mood, he would have said ‘If I have to die, my friends, you will look at me drinking hemlock peacefully’ is certain.” (Hamel 1897, 270).
In this same regard we refer to another source, but hostile to Robespierre, who, not coincidentally, chose the following Sallustian snippet as an epigraph for his pamphlet: *at qui sunt qui rem publicam occupavere? Homines sceleratissimi, immani avaritia; nocentissimi, iidemque superbissimi* “who are those who seized the Republic? Most wicked men, of infinite avidity, most dangerous and also most insolent” (Sall. *Iug.* 31.12). This author envisions the following exchange as part of the last parliamentary fight between Jean-Lambert Tallien and the Incorruptible:

Je le demande: est-il un représentant du people qui voulût exixter sous un tyran? Robespierre, comme frappé de la foudre, reste immobile; lui, devant qui ses collegues tremblaient il y a deux jours, tremble à son tour [...] demande qu’il lui soit permis de parler. Tallien lui lance un regard furieux, lui fait un geste menaçant, lui ferme la bouche, et dit: ‘Par ce que je viens de voir, les conjures seront anéantis, et la liberté triomphera.’ En disant ces mots, Tallien tire un poignard, le fait briller aux yeux des spectateurs, et continue: ‘C’étoit dans la maison de Robespierre où l’on conspirait, où l’on dressoit des listes de proscription. [...] si l’étoit possible que que le décret d’accusation ne fut pas porté contre Robespierre, je me tuerois à l’instant avec ce poignard. [...] Catilina est dans l’assemblée.”

And so, in the end Robespierre, who had presented himself continuously as a new Cicero, found himself defined, as in the words of Tallien on 9 Thermidor and in those of the whole assembly on the 10th, “a modern Catiline”. This is confirmed by a contemporary anonymous engraving of his decapitated head gushing blood, with the text “Robespierre, surnommé le Catilina moderne, exécuté le 10 Thermidore du 3e [sc. année] de la République”. The engraving also includes a phrase attributed to him: “J’ai joué les Français et la divinité... Je meurs sur l’échafaud, je l’ai bien mérité”.

---

53 Des Essartes 1797. The quoted passages come from pages 140 – 141. Right before Robespierre’s surrender in July 1794, a translation of *The Conspiracy of Catiline* by Charles de Brosses was published, where again Robespierre appears as a new Catiline. The same thing happened in 1795, with a translation published by Louis Joseph Billecocq.

54 ‘I am asking you: is there a representative of the people who would like to live under a tyrant?’. Robespierre, as if hit by a bolt, remains motionless; he, in front of whom his colleagues trembled just a few days before, is himself trembling [...] he requests permission to speak. Tallien casts him a furious look, he makes a menacing gesture, he prevents him from talking, and says: ‘From what I have just seen, the conspirators will be destroyed, and freedom will triumph’. Saying these words, he takes out a dagger [it was Brutus’ dagger, as his supporters say; his mistress’, as some malicious enemy suggests], he makes it shine in front of the spectators’ eyes and says: ‘It is in Robespierre’s house that they conspire, that they make the proscription lists [...] if it will not be possible to charge Robespierre directly, I will turn this dagger against myself [...] Catiline is in this assembly’.

Yet Robespierre’s death appears more like that of Cicero, betrayed by his former ally Octavian and beheaded by Marc Antony’s hit men, than like that of Catiline, who died with his supporters while fighting against the regular army of the Romans.\footnote{Cf. Fig. 17 and 18 in Martin Puente, p. 165–166 in this volume.}

In 1795, Félix Louis de Montjoie published the *Histoire de la conjuration de Robespierre*, a pamphlet which is – from the title on – a violent attack against the Incorruptible, and an identification between him and Catiline. The text opens with a mention of Catiline’s conspiracy (Sall. *Cat.* 14.2) and a sharp judge-
ment (p. 3–4): “Robespierre, pendant qu’il vivait, étoit surnommé le Catilina moderne; depuis le supplice qui a terminé ses jours, il a été comparé par les uns à Catilina, par les autres à Cromwel. On l’a mal jugé avant et après sa mort. Ce monstre fuit plus stupide que Claude, et mille fois plus féroce que Néron”.

The hatred against Robespierre lasted for years. In 1800, François-Xavier Pagès de Vixouse published the *Nouveaux dialogues des morts* between the protagonists of the French Revolution and many famous men. His model is clearly Lucian. In this book, Robespierre appears twice; he is indeed portrayed in conversation with both Catiline and with Sulla. The dialogue with Catiline opens as follows (p. 17):

Salut, Catilina; vous voyez en moi ce Robespierre qui a cherché, mais par des moyens différents des vôtres, à asservir à sa domination un empire presqu’aussi puissant que celui dont vous voulûtes vous rendre le maître. Des hommes tells que nous aurait-ils jamais dû soucomer, l’un sous le faible et timide Cicéron, et sous un sénat divisé et corrompu; l’autre sous une assemblée non moins divisée. Et sous les rivaux les plus vils à mes yeux?

Again, we have an identification, or at least a comparison, of Robespierre with Catiline, while the criticisms of Cicero are presented as false, because they are pronounced by the villain Robespierre.

7 Conclusion

Beyond a political evaluation, which is not the purpose of this limited study, a general conclusion is that the protagonists of the Revolution shared a deep classical culture in which they believed and sought their roots. In a way, this was not so different from how European humanists many centuries earlier had engaged in a similar endeavor. Despite all the historical, political, and social changes that

---

57 “While he was alive, had been nicknamed ‘a modern Catiline’; since the execution that ended his days, he has been compared by some to Catilina, by others to Cromwell. He has been judged bad before and after death. This monster has been duller than Claudius, and a thousand times crueler than Nero”. Another pamphlet, published by Edme-Bonaventure Courtois in 1795, was, significantly, titled *Ma Catilinaire*.

58 “Hello to you, Catiline; you see in me that Robespierre who tried, but in different ways from yours, to enslave to his power an empire almost as powerful as that of which you would have liked to become the master. Persons like us should have not succumbed, the one to the feeble and trembling Cicero, and to a divided and corrupted senate; the other to a not less divided assembly, and to viler rivals, in my opinion”.

divided those two eras, the attitude towards the classics did not substantially change. The Revolutionaries did not want to present themselves as something completely new, but rather as the prolongation of a noble classical tradition whose spirit Cicero perfectly embodied.

It is beyond any doubt that the Revolutionaries appreciated in Cicero that which he himself cared for the most, *i.e.* his zeal for liberty, his oratorical ability, and his love for the Roman republic. And they chose him as a defender of the Republic over Cato, who was perceived as too radical and idealistic, a political failure, and over Brutus, who was perfect as a character but without any works or speeches that could have fostered an identification with him. Instead, they chose Cicero the consul, the winner over the attempted subversion of Catiline. They ignored the irresolute Cicero of the civil war, the Cicero who flattered Caesar while he was in triumph, and focused on the heroic Cicero, the opponent of, and subsequently martyred by, the usurper Marc Antony.

From Cicero’s complex political life, the Revolutionaries selected the moment that saw him legally invested with the highest political responsibility of all, during which he fought with all means, even to the point of illicitly issuing death penalties, in order to preserve the order such as it was. They chose the consulship as the quintessential Ciceronian moment, which Cicero himself celebrated in his poetry and which was the sole image he would have liked to leave to his successors. It is not a coincidence that some ancients, including Seneca, said that it would have been better for Cicero to have died right after the conspiracy of Catiline (*Marc. 20.5*).
Philippe Rousselot

Cicéron face aux dictateurs, 1920–1945

E parvi che il nome di Cicerone dovesse esser cancellato dalla storia
Emanuele Ciaceri.¹

1 Introduction

Dans le courant des années 1920–1930, le portrait de Cicéron est figé et hautement contradictoire. Depuis une cinquantaine d’années, deux traditions s’opposent frontalement, que l’on pourrait caricaturer par l’opposition entre deux savants : Mommsen et Boissier. Chaque lecteur disposait, non sans un certain confort, de tous les éléments pour prendre parti pour ou contre Cicéron. Ses défenseurs, ébranlés par les arguments de l’accusation, avaient dressé de Cicéron un portrait qui, pour être recevable, devait être mitigé et reposer sur une concession : l’Arpinate avait été un grand humaniste mais un piètre politique. Ce Cicero Bifrons, mis au point par les « amis » de Cicéron, allait de pair avec une figure politique et sociale : pour les uns, il était la référence ultime des républicains et des régimes parlementaires ; pour les autres, le parangon d’une classe bourgeoise lâche et profiteuse. Comme l’a judicieusement remarqué Sergueï Utshenko :

Qui l’a condamné en tant qu’homme et politicien, l’a admiré en tant qu’écrivain, qui ne l’a pas reconnu en tant que philosophe, a rendu hommage à sa brillante éloquence.²

L’arrivée sur la scène politique européenne des trois dictatures marxistes, nazies et fascistes brise cette continuité. Au temps de la querelle succède celui du silence. Pour les dictatures, Cicéron est condamné à l’oubli radical ou à la plus grande discrétion. On peut s’en étonner. Cicéron, au terme de la querelle qu’il a déclenchée, représentait, lui et ses défenseurs, un monde détesté par les idéologies extrêmes. Il s’annonçait comme la victime idéale des propagandistes ; il fut simplement condamné à une indifférence proche de la damnatio memoriae. Durant ces périodes si dures pour eux, les cicéroniens malmenés, exilés ou conditionnés ont résisté à leur manière.

¹ Ciaceri 1926, xv.
² Utchenko 1972, 181 (traduit par nous).
2 La querelle : Cicéron, grand homme ou personnage secondaire ?

Le Cicéron des Lumières était un être proche et un modèle de vie. Montesquieu (1689–1755) parle pour tous lorsqu’il écrit : « Cicéron est de tous les anciens, celui qui eut le plus grand mérite personnel, et à qui j’aimerais le mieux ressembler ». Cette abolition de la distance entre soi et Cicéron devient une norme au cours de la Révolution française. Cependant, cette « overfamiliarity », pour reprendre l’expression de Matthew Fox, avait atteint ses limites.

L’icône cicéronienne fut brisée par les travaux de Drumann (1786–1861) et de Mommsen (1817–1903). Leur effet sur la postérité de l’Arpinate durera obsessionnellement pendant plus d’un siècle. La Geschichte Roms de Drumann, qui commence à paraître en 1834, est l’ouvrage majeur qui brise le consensus d’une manière que personne n’avait su prévoir. Pour des raisons mal documentées à ce jour, Drumann déteste Cicéron. Chacune de ses attaques est appuyée d’un torrent de références et d’arguments auquel rien ne semble pouvoir résister. Le jeune Mommsen, son fervent admirateur, en reprend la teneur dans sa Römische Geschichte en 1854. Il amplifie la charge contre Cicéron grâce à ce qui manquait à Drumann : le style. Les deux historiens sont ulcérés et scandalisés par l’infatuation de l’aristocratie romaine, ouvrière de sa propre déchéance et si constante dans la mal-gouvernance. Cicéron est la marionnette consentante de cette classe médiocre et, dans ce rôle politico-ancillaire, il est pietre en toutes choses. Le nœud de la vision drumanno-mommsenienne tient en une phrase : Cicéron n’a pas l’importance historique qu’on lui a attribuée. Même si Mommsen ne se prête pas de comparer l’œuvre de Cicéron à « un vaste Sahara d’idées », c’est à un autre courant – la Quellenforschung – que revient la tâche de destituer Cicéron philosophe. En démontant pièce à pièce ce que Cicéron doit aux Grecs, les philologues font de Cicéron un vulgarisateur, un dilettante, et

---

4 Fox 2007, 285: « Cicero has acted as a figure who allows easy identification [...]. Indeed, even professional scholars have been too keen to identify Cicero with themselves, and this has had the effect of producing a neglect of his actual historical achievements and an overfamiliarity ». Cf. Rosner 1986, 182: « [Victorians] writers perceived Cicero as someone like themselves ».
5 Drumann 1834–1844.
6 Wilamowitz-Moellendorf 1921, 155.
7 Mommsen 1854.
peut-être un voleur d'idées. Démystifié, Cicéron devient un politique déclassé et un intellectuel déchu. Les admirateurs traditionnels de Cicéron semblent appartenir à un monde passé. Dans le portrait global d'une élite romaine corrompue, avide de pouvoir et dénuée de vision, César apparaît « comme le soleil levant qui chasse les nuages ». Il est un tournant de l'histoire. Mommsen jette ainsi les bases d'une opposition « Cicéron vs César » ou « lâcheté vs force » que les décennies suivantes se chargeront d'exacerber.

La contre-attaque contre les deux philologues allemands se déclenche très tôt et dure jusqu'en 1940. Le porte-parole de l'offensive est indiscutablement Gaston Boissier (1823–1908), auteur d'un des plus grands best-sellers cicéroniens – sinon le plus grand – *Cicéron et ses Amis*, publié en 1865. Sans doute son succès est-il dû, à l'instar de celui de Mommsen, à l'élégance de l'écriture. Autour de ce duel, la période est marquée par un raz de marée bibliographique. Entre la parution de la *Geschichte Roms* de Drumann et le déclenchement de la seconde guerre mondiale, on ne compte pas moins de 25 biographies. La plupart sont des défenses de Cicéron, sinon de véritables panégyriques. Cette frénésie bibliographique, qui n'avait pas eu de précédent et n'aura pas de suite, traduit un phénomène capital : il y a, durant cette période, un public que passionnait la mort de la République et le destin de Cicéron. Tous ces plaidoyers *pro Tullio* ont un point commun, celui de la concession. Cicéron, pour être sauvé de Mommsen, doit être imparfait et offrir deux visages. Alors que pour Mommsen, Cicéron fut un politique médiocre parce qu'il était un penseur sans valeur, pour ses défenseurs il fut un nain politique parce qu'il était un génie littéraire. De cette topique est issu un *Cicero bifrons*, incapable de choisir entre ses deux vocations. Ce Cicéron dramatique est celui que vont développer les défenseurs de Cicéron. Deux exemples suffiront. Le premier est tiré de l'ouvrage d'Orlov (1871–1953), destiné au grand public, dont le *Cicero Bifrons* est aussi triste que convenu et se présente comme un parallèle entre Cicéron et... Cicéron :

*Cicéron est mort tout comme il a vécu : hésitant et lâche. Cette indécision, ce manque de courage pour affronter le destin et le malheur avec le calme qui sied aux hommes de devoir et de force, tel est le fil rouge qui traverse toute sa carrière. [...] « [Mais] Homme doué par la*
nature de riches capacités, d’une vive imagination et d’un cœur sensible, Cicéron se situait alors au sommet de la culture de son temps, dépositaire de la plupart des connaissances de l’époque, vivifiées par la grâce de ses mœurs et de son bon goût. Il était sans aucun doute l’âme de la société; vaniteux et lâche, il séduisait cependant tous ceux qui le connaissaient, par sa franchise, sa bonne nature, son tact et sa loyauté dans ses affections personnelles.¹²

Dans le monde universitaire, André Piganiol (1883–1968), pourtant fervent ciceronien, décrit l’Arpinate comme « spirituel et sensible, homme d’État malhâble, juriste médiocre, artiste admirable ».¹³ Ces deux exemples, pris au hasard des lectures, résument parfaitement le portrait de Cicéron mis au point par ses défenseurs. Il est tout à la fois un pic de la civilisation et inapte à la politique. Le caractère tragique de la personnalité infirme de Cicéron est parfaitement isolé par Froude en 1879 et même présenté comme une forme de dédoublement de la personnalité chez Jackson en 1932.¹⁴ Ce portrait est théorisé par Henri-Irénée Marrou dans sa Défense de Cicéron en 1936.

C’est à Boissier, plus qu’à quiconque, que revient la paternité du paradigme qui se répand partout : un homme de lettres ne peut être un homme politique.¹⁵ Mais Boissier va plus loin encore. Il attribue à Cicéron une qualification politique résolument moderne, celle du centriste et du modéré. Cette politisation correspond à l'idée générale que Boissier se fait du « modéré » : il est condamné à l’échec. C’est toute la stratégie de Boissier d’avoir retourné l’argument de Mommsen : ce que l’historien allemand détestait chez Cicéron est précisément ce qui fait sa grandeur.¹⁶

Entre 1880 et 1930, Cicéron fait l’objet d’une adulation sans réserve dans un monde qui se tient à l’écart de ce débat : c’est la classe politique modérée et de gauche. Cicéron est la marque matricielle de la «République des avocats». Pour s’en tenir au seul cas de la France, on la suit à la trace chez les grands orateurs

---

¹³ Piganiol 1927, 382–387.
¹⁴ Froude 1879, 420–21. Cicéron était « a tragic combination of magnificent talents, high aspirations, and true desire to do right with an infirmity of purpose and a latent insecurity of character which neutralized and could almost make us forget his nobler qualities... In Cicero Nature half-made a great man and left him incompletely », Jackson 1932, 85–91. La double personnalité de Cicéron est également annoncée dans les deux articles de Trollope (1877a et 1877b).
¹⁵ Boissier 1865, 37.
de l’époque, Gambetta, Waldeck Rousseau, Poincaré, Clémenceau, Grévy, Poincaré, Jaurès, Blum. Tous ces hommes politiques étaient avocats (comme le quart des députés à l’époque). Pour eux, la pratique et la proximité de Cicéron étaient un motif de fierté et de reconnaissance entre soi.\footnote{17}

Cette classe d’avocats politiques, orateurs surentraînés, dreyfusards et fondateurs de la ligue des Droits de l’Homme, fera l’objet d’une haine inextinguible. Personne ne l’a mieux exprimée, au nom de l’extrême droite, que Drumont (1844–1917) dans la France Juive (1886) qui stigmatisait les professeurs et les marchands de parole […], le tribun flatteur de foule, révolutionnaire du langage, radical, socialiste, tout ce que l’on voudra […], qui n’ont conservé qu’une chose de la Révolution, dont le sens leur est maintenant absolument étranger : la phraséologie solennelle, emphatique, la manie ou plutôt le maniement des grands mots abstraits : «Justice, Humanité, Lumière».

Il ne serait pas difficile de retrouver le même registre lexical chez Mommsen :\footnote{19}

Cicéron, avocat libéral […] Au fond n’appartenant à aucun parti, ou ce qui revient au même, fidèle au parti des intérêts matériels […] [il est] un libéral que le droit a rendu sceptique et qui ne va pas au bout d’une possible conviction […]. Conservateur notoirement trembleur, dûment compté parmi les girouettes politiques [appartenant à] l’ordre moyen [des] riches négociants, des riches propriétaires [où] l’on compte bon nombre d’affranchis ou de parvenus […]. De conviction, de passion, Cicéron n’en a pas ; il n’est qu’un avocat.\footnote{20}


L’échec de Giolitti et de Brüning justifie le comportement de Cicéron dans l’affaire de Catilina ; le culte rendu sous nos yeux à Mussolini éclaire le culte de rois hellénistiques et

\footnote{Rousselot 2010, 82–84.}
\footnote{Drumont 1886, 11, 21.}
\footnote{Rousselot 2010, 85–86.}
\footnote{Mommsen 1854, II, 116, 125, 131, 151, 404, 490 (traduit par Charles Alexandre)}
\footnote{Carr 1939, 509. Cf. également Shaull 1931, 270 : «One wonders what [Cicero] would think of Mussolini in his own beloved Italy or of the modern trend toward dictatorships in Europe!» ; Ullman 1935, 400–401 dresse un parallèle audacieux entre le parcours biographique et politique de César et ceux de Mussolini, d’Hitler, Staline et... Roosevelt. Autres apparitions de ce type de comparaison : Richards 1935.}
de l’empereur romain, phénomène inconcevable dans l’Europe chrétienne, il y a une génération.\textsuperscript{22}

Loin d’être un intellectuel égaré politique, Cicéron devient le prototype de l’homme lucide et courageux en lutte contre le concept inventé par Mussolini : le totalitarisme. Dans son ouvrage paru en 1942, \textit{This was Cicero, Modern politics in a Roman toga}, Henry Joseph Haskell (1874 – 1952) façonne un nouveau Cicéron, champion du combat démocratique.\textsuperscript{23} Toujours en 1942, un autre ouvrage, d’une qualité très supérieure, est celui que Hartvig Frisch (1893 – 1950) a consacré aux derniers mois de Cicéron. Son introduction propose un nouveau programme de recherche :

Maintenant que nous sommes instruits de nouvelles expériences, que nous avons vu toutes les bénédictions de la liberté subverties qui, au XIX\textsuperscript{e} siècle, étaient reconnues comme allant de soi, même par la Réaction, il est naturel que le jugement porté sur Cicéron, le républicain et le parlementaire, le philosophe et le publiciste, fasse l’objet d’un examen renouvelé.\textsuperscript{24}

Il reste désormais à examiner l’accueil que les dictatures ont réservé à ce Cicéron préparé par plusieurs décennies de querelles.

3 Cicero sovieticus

Pendant que le duel entre Mommsen et Boissier faisait rage en Europe et aux Etats-Unis, la Russie n’avait pas une grande réputation académique.\textsuperscript{25} Il s’agissait d’une erreur de perception due au fait que de nombreuses publications n’étaient pas traduites du russe. \textit{Rossica sunt, non leguntur}.\textsuperscript{26} Pourtant, dès 1830,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{22} Marrou 1939, 21.
  \item \textsuperscript{23} Haskell 1942. Dans Haskell 1939, 170, il avait qualifié Catilina de bolchévique.
  \item \textsuperscript{24} Frisch 1942, 7 (traduit par nous). Hartvig Frisch est un universitaire ayant embrassé la carrière politique, sous la bannière sociale-démocrate. Son séjour en Italie dans le courant de 1920, et sa rencontre avec le fascisme naissant, lui laisse une impression déterminante pour la suite. Le programme politique de Frisch, qui a été ministre de l’éducation, ont toujours été inspirées par ses études des textes classiques. Il a également écrit \textit{Cicero og Caesar} (Frisch 1946).
  \item \textsuperscript{25} Herbert A. Strong (1841–1918), dans un ouvrage paru en 1909, a des mots cruels : « [Russian] classical scholarship generally has been but a feeble and languishing product. At the present day [...] it is at a low ebb indeed, if that term be permissible in a case where the tides were never high.»: Strong 1909, vii.
  \item \textsuperscript{26} Comme le rappelle avec amertume Rostovtzeff à propos de ses articles écrits en russe et que personne n’a jamais lus : Rostovtzeff 1926, 520, n.17.
\end{itemize}
un miracle se produit en silence qui mènera à l’Age d’Argent. A la veille de la Révolution d’Octobre, Moscou et surtout Saint-Pétersbourg sont devenues des centres de philologie de haut niveau, illustrés par l’éclosion de savants de renommée mondiale comme Zieliński et Rostovtzeff. Pour comprendre la situation de Cicéron sous la dictature soviétique, il importe de mesurer la place qui fut la sienne durant cette période.


Entre 1850 et 1860, sous la direction d’intellectuels brillants, les questions relatives à la liberté individuelle, à la dignité humaine, à l’acquisition de la terre par les paysans sont un sujet majeur. Selon eux, la lutte de l’aristocratie avec la démocratie est le contenu entier de l’histoire. Peu à peu, le portrait de Cicéron en Pater patriae perd de son lustre. En 1842, Vissarion Belinsky (1811–1848), éminent critique littéraire, avait noté son «caractère insignifiant et mesquin » ; en 1857, Nikolaï Dobrolioubov (1836–1861) le considérait comme «un brillant sophiste» et Alexander Herzen (1812–1870) lui est ouvertement hostile tandis qu’Osip-Julian Senkovsky (1800–1858) se livre à des attaques virulentes contre lui ; Nikolaï Tchernychevski (1828–1889) se montrait plus indécis : «Cicéron était un homme bon (nous le supposons, bien que beaucoup en doute) ».31 Cette

28 Matveevich Murav’ev-Apostol 1818.
29 Traduit en anglais by Dewey 2014.
31 Cités par Bugaeva 2010, 131–139 (traduit par nous).
distance prise avec l’Arpinate est due à une spécificité russe, appelée à prospérer : ce n’est plus à César qu’on l’oppose, mais à Catilina. Pour Dobrolyubov, il s’agit d’une personnalité remarquable et douée. Une particularité russe se fait jour : les intellectuels y sont moins à la recherche d’un sauveur de la république que d’un révolutionnaire. Cicéron en pâtit. Dans une Russie ravagée par les attentats nihilistes et les complots en tous genres, Salluste et Tacite deviennent des auteurs à succès, Catilina et Pison des modèles de réflexion. La confrontation entre Cicéron et Catilina, plutôt que face à César, avait séduit les historiens Babst (1823–1881) et Klevanov (1826–1889) dans leurs travaux sur Salluste. La non-violence inhérente à la pensée cicéronienne ne répond pas à toutes les attentes. Orlov, dont on a vu qu’il reproduit fidèlement les tics de langage lanés chez les auteurs occidentaux, en militant socialiste qu’il est, introduit une idée appelée à se développer dans la production russe ultérieure : Cicéron est victime de la société malade qu’il a défendue.


32 Ernest Romanovic von Stern (1859–1924), influent représentant de l’école allemande en Russie, s’y opposa et réfuta pied à pied toute tentative de réhabilitation de Catilina (Stern 1883).
34 Klevanov 1859.
35 Orlov 1888, 2.
38 Zhikov 2009, 263.
livres de classe. Partout se développaien zd es lycées classiques enseignant les langues anciennes, favorisant l’apparition d’un public attentif.


L’Arpinate tient une place particulière au sein des 800 travaux publiés de Zieliński. Fin expert de la prose cicéronienne, Zieliński avait été frappé de la variété des connaissances nécessaires pour comprendre un discours de Cicéron. Au début des années 1890, il se lance dans la publication en russe des discours de Cicéron. L’édition, l’apparat critique et les notes lui reviennent, la traduction est confiée à Vasily Alekseev (1863 –1919). Après dix ans de travail, le premier volume (1901) proposa au public russe des œuvres jusqu’à présent jamais traduites. La révolution brisa net ses ambitions, et le reste de son travail ne sera jamais publié.

Il publie en 1897 son célèbre ouvrage qui, pour des raisons éditoriales, est rédigé en allemand : Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte. Il s’agit de la première étude de réception écrite sur Cicéron, et la seule pendant de longues années. Au-

39 Ainsi, Pro Roscio Amerino, I. Rostovtseva (1869) et A. Klevanova (1876) ; De Provinciis consularibus, Fochta (1879) ; Tusculaneæ Disputationes, Sadov (1886 –1887) ; Pro Milone, Miroshnikova (1891), Protasov (1893) et Tsvetkova (1899) ; De Oratore, Korsh (1893, extraits) ; De Natura Deorum, Blazheevsky (1892 –93) ; Laelius, Semenov (1893), In Catilinam, V. A. Alekseev, 1896 ; Pro Archia, L. Georgievsky et S. Manstein (commentaires de I.V. Netushila), 1912.
40 Mirovshchikova 2016, 164.
43 Zieliński 1904, Zieliński 1913. Dans le premier, il étudia les clauses métriques des discours de Cicéron et dans le second, publié en 1913, il montra les régularités et le système rhymique de la prose de Cicéron. Grâce à ces travaux, il fonda un tout nouveau domaine d’étude, celle du rythme du discours en prose, sans lequel il est impossible d’apprécier la richesse du discours cicéronien, la beauté, l’humour, les sous-jacents, le rythme, la musique, la grandeur, les à-côtés, les banalités et les coups de maître. C’est ce qu’a bien identifié Rostovtzeff 1914 et qui se retrouve, quelques années plus tard chez Louis Laurand, son meilleur successeur (et critique).
delà de la perspective nouvelle qu’il donne de Cicéron, il inaugure aussi le genre particulier des études de réception.⁴⁵ Dès 1898, Zieliński confère à Cicéron une épaisseur nouvelle. C’est grâce à Cicéron, écrit-il, que

Nous pouvons nous représenter l’humanisme antique comme un système d’éthique pratique et comme une vision du monde intégrale en lien direct avec la vie [...] peut-être que sans s’en rendre compte, sa créativité personnelle a joué et lui a permis de créer la philosophie romaine et avec elle toute la philosophie de l’occident romanisé.⁴⁶

La grande ambition du savant était de dépasser le seul renforcement de l’école philologique russe pour créer, au sein de la société, un humanisme russe. Il était fasciné par l’extraordinaire influence que Cicéron exerça en Europe, dès le moyen-âge et sans discontinuer. L’illustre professeur avait préparé une biographie politique de Cicéron à paraître dans le deuxième volume des Discours qui, malheureusement, ne sera pas publiée. L’esquisse de cette biographie figure dans l’article qu’il écrivit sur Cicéron dans l’encyclopédie Brockhaus-Efron et qui constituait à l’époque le meilleur écrit biographique en russe sur Cicéron.⁴⁷

L’admiration qu’il éprouve pour l’Arpinate est d’un nouveau type. Certes, le portrait qu’il en trace relève de la tradition libérale, mais Zieliński admire aussi chez Cicéron l’homme qui a su corriger toutes ses faiblesses par une volonté raisonnée d’apprentissage et d’auto-éducation permanente.⁴⁸

Pour Zieliński, Cicéron est sa propre œuvre, une création de soi-même, différente et meilleure que ce que la nature a donné, un homme transformé par l’étude et qu’anime une morale de l’amélioration permanente. Ayant terminé sa fresque sur la postérité de Cicéron avec la Révolution française, Zieliński marquait le peu d’intérêt que suscitait en lui la querelle cicéronienne du XIXᵉ siècle. Au fond de sa pensée, il ne pouvait s’agir que d’une parenthèse due à l’école allemande, qui avait donné le primat aux études grecques et s’était installée dans un esprit prussien du culte de la force. Cicéron, écrit-il, est trop complexe pour la critique allemande. Selon lui, Drumman et Mommsen se contentaient de

⁴⁵ La première phrase de l’ouvrage est une profession de foi : Cicéron « fait partie des personnalités culturelles au sens plénier du terme dont la véritable biographie ne commence qu’au jour de leur mort (traduit par nous) ».
⁴⁶ Zieliński 1898, 200 (traduit par nous).
⁴⁷ Zieliński, 1903, 254–256.
⁴⁸ Zieliński 1903, 255 : « Cicéron n’est pas une personnalité simple et entière, mais clairement double : chez lui, les qualités innées se chevauchent avec celles développées par l’étude [...]. C’est cette dualité qui a privé Cicéron de son vivant de la force d’impulsion et de décision qui est le propre des natures simples et solides ; c’est elle aussi qui fait de lui un sujet d’étude passionnant et qui conforte son influence après la mort » (traduit par nous).
recycler une vielle et fausse monnaie qui datait de l’Antiquité, du cercle de Pollion, des rhéteurs et de Dion Cassius, des œuvres de circonstances et des joutes oratoires nécessairement excessives. Zieliński pensait que le début du XXème siècle allait inéluctablement rendre à Cicéron sa juste place, seul vrai père fondateur d’une culture mondiale que Zieliński appelait de ses vœux.⁴⁹

Zieliński resta un homme déçu. Non seulement sa biographie et la collection des discours ne furent jamais publiées, mais Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte ne fut jamais traduit en russe, contre tous ses espoirs.⁵⁰ Pire encore, l’atmosphère de la révolution d’octobre charria un fort sentiment anti européen. L’ouvrage de Zieliński, chant en l’honneur de l’esprit de la culture européenne, est arrivé trop tard ou trop tôt.

C’est en dehors de la sphère savante que Ciceron est saisi par la révolution de 1917. Un texte particulièrement intéressant du poète Alexander Blok, écrit en 1918,⁵¹ s’empare de Cicéron et entreprend sa liquidation. L’ouvrage, très enlevé, représente le courant de pensée des jeunes intellectuels russes du tout début de la révolution : l’adhésion au bolchévisme s’appuie sur un élan romantique et mystique. Pour Blok, Catilina, saint patron de la Garde Rouge, symbolise le «bolchévisme romain», et la révolution permanente. Ciceron est un koulak, le traître à la classe populaire. Il faut s’en débarrasser :

Le Moyen-Âge a suffoqué sur la philosophie exposée par Ciceron. Le peuple a bu cette eau fétide jusqu’à ce que la Renaissance ne découvre les eaux vives de la vie. Les élèves des pays civilisés, y compris, comme chacun sait, les élèves russes, ont perdu leur temps sur les compositions de Ciceron.


⁵⁰ Belkin 2002, 368.
⁵¹ Blok 1919 (traduit par Jacques Michaut).
⁵² Ibsen 1850 (première représentation en décembre 1881 à Stockholm). Il y a tout lieu de penser que Blok ne connaissait pas la pièce de Ben Johnson ni celle d’Alexandre Dumas, sur le même personnage.
rendre justice à Catilina,» il se livre surtout à une méditation enjouée qui actualise Rome dans la Russie de 1918. Il compare avec allégresse Salluste à un «bureaucratie offensé», Catilina à un «révolutionnaire romain» et Cicéron est ramené à l’état «d’intellectuel impotent» ou «d’avocat de second rang». Dans la déliquescence républicaine, Catilina est le seul ennemi digne de l’oligarchie, et non César. Sur ce point, Blok est à l’opposé de Mommsen. Derrière l’attaque contre l’Arpinate, subsistent de rares éléments positifs. Non seulement, Cicéron n’a jamais cédé au militarisme, mais il

Raisonnait de façon plus conséquente ; non pas parce qu’il était supérieur à bien des intellectuels russes d’aujourd’hui – des Cicéron nous en avons – mais peut-être parce que Rome ayant depuis quatre siècles un gouvernement républicain, son intelligentsia, dont le développement avait été naturel, ne se sentait pas déracinée ; elle ne s’était pas comme la nôtre, déchirée dans des luttes sans fin avec une espèce de demi-réalité stupide, aussi stupide que peut l’être la bureaucratie [russe].

Après Blok, la présence de Cicéron s’éteint. Il disparaît des textes russes et désormais soviétiques. Cela s’explique par l’animosité du gouvernement bolchévique pour l’antiquité classique. Dès 1918, le grec et le latin disparaissent de l’enseignement secondaire. La doxa soviétique, celle de Lénine tout d’abord, puis celle de Staline, si prompte à vouloir rivaliser avec l’Occident dans le domaine du savoir, considérait les études classiques comme le marqueur social des élites de Saint-Petersbourg ou de la révolution des petits bourgeois de 1905, milieux dont Th. Zieliński et M. I. Rostovtzeff, fervents cicéroniens, étaient le pur produit. Sans distinction, les savants sont condamnés à l’exil (Zieliński, Vipper, Rostovtzeff) à la persécution (Buzeskul et Zhebelev) ou au Goulag (Dovatur, Krueger, Beneshewich). Alexander Blok, grand admirateur de Zieliński, meurt
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56 Gamalova 2012, 39.
57 T. Zieliński fut le professeur de Rostovtzeff à Saint-Petersbourg. Le disciple en conserva une affection particulière pour Cicéron. Du fond de son exil, Rostovtzeff publie en 1918 un petit ouvrage, Rozhdenie rimskoi imperii, dans lequel il reconnaît que la situation révolutionnaire au temps des guerres civiles à Rome doit beaucoup à celle que connaît la Russie. Il compare les populaires aux «proléhariens», Lenine et Trotzki à Catilina ou Clodius, et Kerensky à Cicéron, lequel reste pour lui «totalement moderne et le meilleur homme de son temps» : Rostovtzeff 1927, 5 et 16 ; Wes 1990, 43.
misérablement en 1921 après que Lénine a refusé qu'il aille se faire soigner en Finlande.59


60 Mirovshchikova 2016, 165–166.

61 Mishulin 1938 (traduit par nous) : «L’histoire ancienne reste pour l’essentiel entre les mains des anciens historiens de formation bourgeoise qui, non seulement ne voulaient pas apprendre la méthode marxiste, mais ont ouvertement évité de citer les noms mêmes de Marx et Engels dans leurs écrits. La jeune science historique marxiste a dû nettoyer les Ecuries d’Augias de l’histoire bourgeoise. Prenez des forces et engagez-vous au combat pour l’application de la méthode marxiste à la recherche sur l’histoire ancienne !».


63 Souvarine 1940, 4.
priétaires d’esclaves et scella l’abolition de l’esclavage comme forme d’exploitation des travailleurs».64 Cette petite phrase suffit à créer dans le monde des antiquisants un point de ralliement majeur : Spartacus.65 Ce personnage, et avec lui la lutte des esclaves contre leur maîtres, première épure de la lutte des classes,66 éclipsa tous les autres.

De gré ou de force, les meilleurs esprits de cette génération marquent une distance nouvelle avec Cicéron. Robert Vipper (1859–1954), dans ses Essais sur l’histoire de l’Empire romain, publiés pour la première fois en 1908, dresse, à son retour d’exil, un portrait mitigé de Cicéron dans l’édition de 1923. Bien que démocrate dans le début de sa carrière et étranger au militarisme de Sylla et de ses suiveurs, Cicéron manquait de courage et de certitude. Ses aspirations monarchiques apparaissent dans le De re publica où il se montre partisan d’une «république passive» dans laquelle la res populi est une donnée fictive. Par ailleurs, ajoute Vipper, Cicéron se rêvait en «président de la république».67 Dix ans plus tard, V. Sergeev (1883–1941), lauréat du prix Staline, en réécrivant l’histoire de la chute de la République au canon du matérialisme historique, achève de travestir Cicéron comme parangon de la classe capitaliste. Son ouvrage est caractéristique d’une historiographie à la dérive : les platitudes succèdent aux audaces (l’empire romain est un régime féodal), pour ne rien dire des graves anomalies (Contra Verrem au lieu de In Verrem, De bello Jugurtino au lieu de Bellum Iugurthinum).68 Sofya Protasova (1878–1946) sauve l’honneur, du fond de la Sibérie, dans un essai sur le De re publica, et estime que le terme de rector n’a pas de valeur juridique ou institutionnel, mais renvoie plutôt à un modèle de comportement, celui du bon citoyen.69

Cependant, les latinistes se taisent mais n’oublient pas. Fedor Petrovsky (1890–1978) ou Aristide Dovatur (1897–1982), durent attendre leur retour du

---

64 Mishulin 1938 (traduit par nous).
66 Mirovshchikova 2016, 164 ; Irmscher 1983.
68 Sergeev 1938.
69 Protasova 1927.
Goulag et le Dégel pour reprendre leurs travaux sur Cicéron.\textsuperscript{70} Les souvenirs des uns et des autres témoignent de cette dure période. Ainsi Vasily Rudich dans ses mémoires :

je me souviens non sans nostalgie les longues heures de débats passionnés dans la petite cuisine de l’un d’entre nous sur ce que signifiait d’être un dissident ou un savant.\textsuperscript{71}

Tatyana Bobrovnikova, dans l’essai historique qu’elle a récemment consacré à Cicéron, rappelle comment son grand-père, Grigory Bashmakov, éminent juriste né en 1895, après un exil sibérien de plusieurs années (1917–1932), avait formé autour de lui un cercle de jeunes gens qui venaient l’écouter parler de Cicéron :

Je me souviens que lorsque j’étais petite fille, il parlait de la mort de Cicéron d’une voix tremblante. Cicéron était pour lui un ami proche, comme un frère mort durant la guerre civile.\textsuperscript{72}

Les études cicéroniennes se poursuivirent dans le plus grand silence et dans une sorte de clandestinité, non sans une certaine efficacité.\textsuperscript{73} La meilleure preuve en est donnée par les travaux qui seront publiés après la guerre. En effet, à la fin de sa vie, et sans que l’on sache pourquoi, Staline décide de desserrer l’étouff entre les études grecques et latines. Il est désormais possible de s’intéresser à Cicéron sans risque. La réaction du milieu académique ne tarde pas. En 1947, Iosif Tronsky (1897–1979)\textsuperscript{74} publie son Histoire de la littérature antique. Les dix pages qu’il consacre à Cicéron sont la synthèse du peu qui l’a précédé et forment son

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{71} Rudich 1993, xiii (traduit par nous).
\item \textsuperscript{72} Bobrovnikova 2017, 4 (traduit par nous).
\item \textsuperscript{73} Sur l’atmosphère clandestine des études classiques sous Staline : Davidson 2009, 16–21.
\item \textsuperscript{74} Iosif Tronsky, de son vrai nom Trotsky, avait commencé sa carrière universitaire avec un mémoire sur Cicéron et les œuvres d’art (1918). Après avoir passé de longues années sans salaire, son Histoire de la littérature antique, d’abord présentée comme une thèse en 1941, lui vaut d’être considéré comme une voix autorisée du régime, avant et après le Dégel. Son livre sera traduit dans une douzaine de langues et six fois réédité, jusqu’à la fin du XX\textsuperscript{ème} siècle.
\end{itemize}
portrait officiel pour près de vingt ans. Cicéron est avant tout un écrivain et à ce titre mérite une forme de respect.

Cicéron est le plus grand maître de l’éloquence et ses œuvres se sont révélées fondamentales pour tout le développement ultérieur de la prose latine [...] Aucun ancien écrivain romain n’a eu autant de poids dans l’histoire de la culture européenne que Cicéron [...]. Une des personnes les plus instruites de son époque, [Cicéron] n’était pas un penseur indépendant et il ne s’attribuait pas lui-même une originalité philosophique. 

Au plan idéologique, il est peu conforme à l’idéal socialiste. En dépit de son «flirt» avec le parti démocratique au début de sa carrière,

Cicéron n’était en aucun cas un démocrate [...]. Le principe de l’inviolabilité de la propriété privée est mis en exergue [dans le De re publica] avec une intensité particulière « [Par ailleurs,] le rôle personnel de Cicéron dans les événements de son consulat est extrêmement exagéré par lui-même [...] Dans ses activités politiques, Cicéron était malchanceux et myope [...] Indécis aux moments les plus cruciaux, immensément prétentieux et se prêtant facilement à des humeurs éphémères, il a souvent perdu le sens de la réalité politique et prenait mal la mesure des hommes. 

Dès 1948, sous la direction de V. O. Gorenstein, un groupe de latinistes publient, dans un tirage confidentiel, la première édition complète en russe des Lettres *Ad familiares* dans les éditions de l’Académie des Sciences.77 Dans la préface, l’académicien Ivan Tolstoï (1880–1954), de retour du Goulag,78 se félicite de pouvoir donner «aux étudiants russes, aux diplômés, aux scientifiques et à un cercle plus large de l’intelligentsia soviétique une traduction en russe des lettres de Cicéron». Il trace néanmoins un portrait de Cicéron conforme au canon soviétique:

75 Tronsky 1947, 327 ; 338 ; 333 (traduit par nous).
76 Tronsky 1947, 330 ; 33 ; 331 ; 332 (traduit par nous).
Représentant typique de la classe moyenne des chevaliers, Cicéron se distinguait, dans sa pratique politique, par son instabilité, son incohérence et son indécision. Ses opinions politiques étaient partielles et sans originalité.\footnote{In Gorenstein 1949, 385 (traduit par nous).}


Le dictateur meurt en 1953 et avec lui la pure dictature qui a coûté tant de sang et de douleur à la communauté des antiquisants. Il n’aura pas pu maintenir Cicéron dans un silence absolu, comme le montre, à la fin de son règne, la publication des Lettres. Ici s’arrête notre survol, car la période du Dégel, inaugurée par Kroutchev en 1956, libère les énergies jusque-là muselées ;\footnote{Cf. XXᵉ congrès du Parti Communiste (« Surmonter le culte de la personnalité et ses conséquences »).} certes, la dure période de l’homo sovieticus allait durer encore quelques décennies. Mais la dureté du régime post-stalinien ne fut pas comparable à celle de la terreur stalinienne. Le carcan saute : les références aux travaux extérieurs sont autorisées et les ouvrages soviétiques doivent être connus à l’étranger. Toute une école cicéronienne se reconstitue peu à peu, autour de Mariya Grabar-Passek (1893–1975), puis de Serguei Utchenko (1908–1976). La première biographie de bon niveau est donnée par Grabar-Passek dans le premier volume de l’Histoire de la

4 Cicéron et la « romanità » fasciste

Une rumeur a longtemps circulé selon laquelle l’absence de statue de Cicéron à Arpino était due à une interdiction de Mussolini. De cette fausse nouvelle, nous tirons deux faits objectifs : le premier est que Cicéron était *persona non grata* sous le régime fasciste ; la vindicte supposée de Mussolini montre que l’Arpinate était un gêneur. Cette ancienne *fake news* nous apprend autre chose : une telle interdiction ne s’est pas produite car elle était impossible. En Italie, Cicéron est une gloire nationale. La dictature ne pourra faire amnésie sur lui.

Le fascisme, comme le rappelle son nom, s’est auto-centré sur une nouvelle vision de Rome, une romanità (romanità) dont il fit sa « garde robe ». Il s’est présenté explicitement comme un nouveau *Risorgimento* faisant rupture avec la Vieille Italie, celle des socialistes, rendus coupables de la défaite de Caporetto et de tous les désordres sociaux ayant suivi la guerre. Cette romanità concerne moins le littéraire que l’homme d’action. Pour le fascisme, le philologue n’est pas un héros. La Rome du discours fasciste est moins une occasion de célébrer un passé glorieux que de construire le présent et même l’avenir. Personne ne le dit mieux que Mussolini dans une totale actualisation du passé :

> Pour le peuple italien, tout est éternel et contemporain. Pour nous, c’est hier que César a été assassiné. Ceci est propre au peuple italien, c’est quelque chose qu’aucun autre peuple ne
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84 Grabar-Passek 1962.
86 Utchenko 1972, 2.
88 Selon l’expression juste de Nelis 2007b, 988 qui montre bien le caractère esthétique, symbolique et ostentatoire de cette romanità.
possède à une telle échelle\textsuperscript{89} [...] L'esprit immortel de Rome, pour l'essentiel, resurgit dans le fascisme. Romain est le militant, romaine est notre organisation de combat, romains sont notre honneur et notre courage. \textit{Civis romanus sum}.

\textit{Civis romanus sum} est sans doute la seule allusion à Cicéron que l'on puisse isoler dans les discours de Mussolini.\textsuperscript{91} Car dans cette construction de la Nouvelle Rome, Cicéron ne sera jamais invité. Les seules gloires qui ont été officiellement célébrées furent Virgile, Horace et Auguste. Les circonstances s'y prêtaient du fait de leur bimillénaire.\textsuperscript{92} Auguste, héros classique officiel du fascisme, fut, pour les idéologues du régime, l'occasion d'un effet miroir avec Mussolini. En 1937, Giuseppe Bottai (1895–1959) dans une conférence donnée à l'\textit{Istituto di Studi Romani} dit les choses simplement : «l'âge d'Auguste» annonce «l'âge de Mussolini». Avec l'un et l'autre, l'Italie recouvre son identité et rompt définitivement avec la république maladive.\textsuperscript{93} Cependant, l'analyse des textes de propagande ou des \textit{opera omnia} du \textit{Duce} montre que le vrai modèle mussolinien fut Jules César, à l'origine d'une immense production savante, vulgarisatrice ou artistique.\textsuperscript{94} L'histoire de Rome commençait pour les uns aux Ides de mars, pour les autres au sacre d'Auguste.\textsuperscript{95} Dès lors, Cicéron était hors du champ de vision de la \textit{romanità}. Les intellectuels, les artistes, les universitaires furent mobilisés...
pour accompagner cette nouvelle renaissance.\textsuperscript{96} La réforme de l’éducation supérieure menée en 1923 par Gentile (1875–1944) aboutit à la suppression des cours de rhétorique, dont il se méfie et qui est la marque des letterati de la Vieille Italie. Il avait prévenu les instituteurs de Trieste en 1919 :

\begin{quote}
La lourde tradition classique des exercices de rhétorique pèse sur nos épaules; mais dans la période de la renaissance morale et politique de notre nation, nous n’avons pas manqué de proclamer avec énergie la nécessité de nous en libérer: de la libération de la rhétorique, le fléau de la littérature italienne et de l’âme [...] Nous lisons toujours Cicéron; mais corrigeons sa redondance avec les nerfs de Tacite.\textsuperscript{97}
\end{quote}

Comme en Allemagne, Tacite l’emporte sur Cicéron. On observe dans ce manifeste que Cicéron n’est pas oublié mais il est explicitement minoré. Pire, il représente un danger, celui du bavardage et du manque de nerf. Contrairement à Virgile, Horace et Auguste, travestis pour l’occasion, Cicéron ne portera jamais de chemise noire. Pour beaucoup, il est un contre-révolutionnaire. Pour Luigi Pareti (1885–1962) qui, à défaut d’être fasciste déclaré, se situe dans l’air du temps, Cicéron représente l’oligarchie bourgeoise réactionnaire et Catilina la voie de la révolution sociale :

\begin{quote}
Cicéron n’est pas autre chose qu’un myope stipendié par la faction des ploutocrates: prêt à toute ruse, à tout blanchiment illégal, à toute violence, pourvu qu’elle n’implique pas sa seule responsabilité, contre les démocrates, ses adversaires.\textsuperscript{98}
\end{quote}

Chez les socialistes italiens, mais aussi pour la branche socialisante du fascisme, Catilina recueille tous les suffrages, comme l’avait pressenti Blok.\textsuperscript{99} Chez les socialistes, Mario Trozzi (1887–1932), dans son essai de 1924,\textsuperscript{100} reproche à Cicéron d’être le héraut de l’oligarchie réactionnaire et capitaliste. Nicola Critini, le meilleur spécialiste de la postérité de Catilina, remarque avec justesse que le discours socialiste de Trozzi est fondamentalement le même que celui des fascistes, qu’il combattait pourtant.\textsuperscript{101}

\textsuperscript{96} Sur le rôle et les affinités politiques des classicistes sous le régime : Cagnetta 1979 ; Canfora 1976 ; Nelis, 2007b.
\textsuperscript{97} Cité et traduit dans Lanfranchi 2006, 37.
\textsuperscript{98} Pareti 1934, 177 (traduit par nous).
\textsuperscript{100} Trozzi 1924. On retrouve la même critique de Cicéron dans La rivolta di Catilina de Amato, publié en 1934.
\textsuperscript{101} Critini 1968, 117, n. 40.
Cicéron n’en reste pas moins une référence minimale de la romanità. Marcello Piacentini (1881–1960), l’illustre architecte du régime, a souvent placé des citations de Cicéron sur les murs de ses constructions. Le professeur de littérature latine Vincenzo Ussani (1870–1952) s’était fait une spécialité de choisir de belles citations pour le marbre des monuments. Cicéron, certes opposant de Jules César, était aussi le défenseur des moeurs anciennes et un inépuisable trésor de citations, quitte à ce que certaines d’entre elles soient de « belles infidèles ».


C’est surtout à Guglielmo Ferrero (1871–1942), auteur particulièrement influent au début du siècle, que revient le mérite de tracer un portrait nuancé et nouveau de Cicéron. Dans Grandeur et décadence de Rome, publié en 1907, il adopte un modèle d’écriture et de composition très proche de celui de la Römische Geschichte de Mommsen, mais l’intention est d’en renverser le sens : César ne fut pas un grand homme d’État mais un révolutionnaire démagogue. Auguste, quant à lui, loin d’être le médiocre héritier de César, fut le restaurateur des vertus républicaines et réalisa sur terre ce que Ferrero appelle « l’utopie du

102 Marcello/Gwynne 2015.
103 Gamberale 2011 a montré qu’il s’agit souvent de collages de plusieurs textes.
104 Pour reprendre l’expression de Paratore 1959, 121.
105 Messina 1878. Cf. Croce 1946, 64.
106 Débat déjà ancien, ouvert en 1848 par Vincenzo Gioberti (1801–1852) : Gioberti 1848, 254.
De republica» de Cicéron. Cette thèse eut un grand retentissement et une longue postérité. Il est sans doute le premier, presque en même temps que Zieliński, à découvrir dans l’Arpinate un modèle civilisationnel unique et irremplaçable, le fondateur d’une « longue dynastie », la plus vivace de toutes, celle de l’homme politique qui tire sa légitimité de son statut d’intellectuel. Les pages d’anthologie qu’il consacre à la fortuna de Cicéron, ne jouent pas sur son influence littéraire, comme le fit Zieliński, mais sur son caractère de prototype de la civilisation européenne.

Dans l’histoire de Rome et par suite dans l’histoire de la civilisation européenne dont Rome est l’origine, il fut le premier homme d’État appartenant à la classe des intellectuels [...] Cicéron fut le premier de ces hommes de plume, qui dans toute l’histoire de notre civilisation ont été tantôt les soutiens de l’État et tantôt les artisans de la révolution ; rhéteurs, juristes, polygraphes dans l’empire païen ; apologistes ensuite et pères de l’Église ; moines, législateurs, théologiens, docteurs et lecteurs au moyen âge ; humanistes à l’époque de la Renaissance ; encyclopédistes en France au dix-huitième siècle ; et de nos jours avocats, journalistes, publicistes et professeurs [...]. C’était un de ces hommes comme il ne s’en rencontre que rarement, même dans le monde des penseurs et des écrivains [...]. De tous les hommes qui gouvernèrent alors le monde romain, Cicéron seul ne perdit pas entièrement dans l’affreuse politique de son époque cette conscience du bien et du mal qui, si elle ne met pas l’homme à l’abri des petites faiblesses, l’empêche cependant de commettre les grands crimes.¹⁰⁸

Ces pages eurent un profond retentissement en Allemagne, en France et aux États-Unis, beaucoup moins en Italie. Il lui manquait une chose : son Cicéron n’était pas assez italien. Tout comme Zieliński, il en faisait d’abord un européen. Ces deux auteurs ne purent jamais trouver de compromis avec la dictature et furent condamnés à l’exil.¹⁰⁹

Il fallait cependant que la philologie italienne reprenne ses droits sur la prééminence allemande. Les textes de Mussolini ou de Ciano avait fixé le cap : grâce à la « romanità », l’Italie était supérieure à l’Allemagne.¹¹⁰ C’est sur ce point

¹⁰⁹ Ferrero, placé en résidence surveillée en 1925, s’exile en Suisse, jusqu’à la fin de ses jours, en 1929.
que Cicéron entre en scène. Bien plus que César, Auguste ou Tacite, il doit être repris à Mommsen et italienisé. Un des premiers universitaires qui se met à l’œuvre est Francesco Arnaldi (1897–1980) dont le Cicerone, publié en 1929, est aujourd’hui peu lu. L’ouvrage se réclame d’une nouvelle approche : il doit être écrit « avec l’esprit italien ». Il s’agit d’enraciner l’Arpinate dans sa vraie patrie et de le libérer du joug allemand, représenté par Drumann, Mommsen et Plasberg. Même l’ouvrage de Gaston Boissier ne trouve pas grâce à ses yeux (« une œuvre plus vive que profonde »). Fort de son italianité, son livre met à jour la profondeur spirituelle de Cicéron qui se résume en ceci : Cicéron est avant tout un artiste. L’orateur, le politique et le philosophe sont les produits de ce trait profond. Rendre Cicéron à l’Italie relève de l’esprit du temps et sera utilisé aussi par le Régime pour la constitution d’un portrait conforme à l’idéologie fasciste. Cependant, la contribution d’Arnaldi ne dépassa pas jamais cette limite.

Ce que Mussolini ne fit pas pour Cicéron, les intellectuels fascistes le firent pour lui : ils érigèrent Cicéron en « grand homme ». Un universitaire de renom, Emanuele Ciaceri (1869–1944), et un journaliste militant, Maffeo Maffii (1881–1957), se chargèrent de cette mission. Il s’agissait de le rendre compatible avec le fascio.

Décisive sera la contribution de Ciaceri, dont le Cicerone e i suoi tempi (deux volumes, 1926 et 1930) est encore considéré comme une des meilleures biographies de la première moitié du XXe siècle. Ce savant était un homme du régime fasciste. Il convient de s’arrêter sur son cas : en lui se concentrent tous les topoï et toutes les ambiguïtés du Cicéron de l’ère mussolinienne. Dans ses premières productions savantes, il avait pourtant durement étrillé l’Arpinate. Dans une étude sur la conjuration de Catilina, parue dans un ouvrage d’Ettore Pais (1856–1939), il contestait sévèrement les analyses de Boissier et de Ferrero, il y


111 Arnaldi 1929, v.
112 Flores 2018.
113 Flores 2015, 192 devine chez Arnaldi un sentiment antisocialiste propre aux années 1920.
114 Ciaceri (1869–1944), normalien, professeur à l’université de Padoue puis de Naples fut un militant fasciste récompensé par le prix Mussolini de l’Académie d’Italie en 1934. Un an auparavant, dans une étonnante conférence, il avait inversé la structure mise au point par Mussolini : au lieu que Rome surgisse dans le fascisme, c’est le fascisme qui était déjà présent dans l’Antiquité. Ce genre de fantaisie n’était pas isolé dans l’œuvre de Ciaceri, pour qui la culture romaine est de nature mystique plus que philosophique : Ciaceri 1933. Cf. Cesarini 2012, 259.
115 Ancien disciple de Mommsen à Berlin et lui-même futur dignitaire du régime fasciste.
moquait la vanité et la peur de Cicéron,116 et surtout la part de mensonge contenue dans les Catilinaires.117 Son Cicerone, écrit 20 ans plus tard, marque un grand revirement.118

Sa biographie est la première qui, depuis un siècle, se fixe comme objectif explicite de faire oublier Drumann et Mommsen, tous deux proprement étrillés dans l’introduction du premier volume.119 Dans de longues phrases au style périodique, il y dresse son programme patriotique :

Dépouillé de cet esprit de résignation consentie qui, trop souvent et trop longtemps, a marqué la conduite des savants italiens de notre temps face à la critique littéraire outre-alpine, j’ose relever le vieux défi de l’historien allemand et faire une tentative qui s’adresse naturellement aux savants mais aussi, et surtout, à nos jeunes chercheurs qui, après la Grande Guerre, ont rendu à la patrie les frontières qu’Auguste lui avait assignées, et se sont forgé une nouvelle conscience nationale, afin qu’ils puissent apprendre puis inculquer à leur tour comment honorer la mémoire de celui que, à bon droit, nous devons considérer comme l’une des figures les plus représentatives de la Rome antique, en rappelant que, de son temps au notre, il a toujours été le grand Maître de culture pour toute peuple ayant mérité une place notable dans l’histoire de la civilisation.120

Il s’agit d’une contre-biographie destinée à « dégermaniser » Cicéron, qu’il appelle « il Nostro » et à le décrire « con pensiero italiano » : « l’Italie, patrie de Cicéron et berceau et siège de la magnifique Romanité » (Romanità).121 Les ciceroniens italiens et fascistes doivent se sentir décomplexés.122 Il rejoint Arnaldi dans ce parti pris national ainsi que dans le portrait qu’il trace de Cicéron. « Père exemplaire », « bon italien », « bon citoyen, mais surtout gentilhomme », il n’était

116 Ciaceri 1908, 516, Cicéron « est connu pour son amour exagéré de la gloire et un sentiment de vanité le poussant à parler et à faire parler de lui et de son consulat et de la conjuration de Catilina. » Sur la peur que le peuple inspire à Cicéron, Ciaceri 1908, 520 (traduit par nous).
117 Ciaceri 1908, 560 (traduit par nous) : « Dépouillée des formes légendaires que lui attribue la tradition, la conspiration de Catilina devient un fait très peu important dans l’histoire de Rome, et ne mérite guère le nom de conjuration. Elle n’est rien d’autre qu’un épisode de la grande lutte entre la démocratie tendant à la satisfaction des nouveaux besoins et le parti conservateur intéressé à la survie des vieilles institutions ». Cf. De Sanctis 1966, 286–287.
118 Ciaceri 1926, I 309 : « Le consulat de Cicéron occupe une place singulière dans l’histoire de Rome ».
119 La colère anti-allemande fut tempérée dans la seconde édition, comme l’y obligeait la proclamation de l’Axe Rome-Berlin le 1er novembre 1936. Un changement de ton signalé par Canfora 1980, 11, qui remarque que la perte de leur meilleur ennemi plonge les antiquisants italiens dans le tourment.
120 Ciaceri 1926, I, IX (traduit par nous).
121 Ciaceri 1926, I, xxxvii.
122 Ciaceri 1930, II, vi.
pas, comme les autres, un fourbe. «Créateur d’une prose artistement philosophique», il enseigne dans le De Officiis que l’homme a des devoirs particuliers envers l’État et la patrie, que le citoyen est «subordonné» à l’État.

Dès lors, visant la régénération morale et civile de la société romaine, il eut à cœur de susciter une révolution des consciences qui, dépassant largement les frontières de la patrie, concernait les relations avec toute la famille humaine.¹²³

Dans le De re publica, il sut joindre, avec bonheur, le passé et le présent, Scipion Emilien et Auguste.¹²⁴ Attaqué par les démagogues, il n’est pas un membre du parti conservateur, mais un «indépendant».¹²⁵ Face aux «ennemis occultes» de la République, il a sauvé la patrie (I. 307). Il termine son ouvrage par une longue conclusion au titre révélateur, Cicerone e noi :

Il ne fut pas un homme politique au sens commun du terme [...] Conservateur éclairé, il fut en fait toujours cohérent avec lui-même en politique. Il condamna toujours les ailes extrêmes des partis, qu’elles soient oligarchiques ou démagogiques... Il ne fut pas, en vérité, un politique, car il n’a jamais su prendre la mesure de manière pratique des nouvelles nécessités issues d’un long processus historique dont il n’avait pas pris conscience... De tendances conservatrices, mais libérales [...] il sut préférer les boni cives aux Optimates [...] Il est tombé défaite pour la violence, toujours seul à lutter avec la seule vigueur de la pensée et de la parole, désarmé au milieu des chefs de guerre. Il est tombé défaite, mais non vaincu ; car ses idées, après la mort, étaient vouées à revivre d’une nouvelle vie, faisant rayonner son nom d’une lumière nouvelle.¹²⁶

Sans doute une lecture attentive permet de deviner les choix politiques personnels de Ciaceri, qui font de Cicéron le précurseur de la doctrine chrétienne,¹²⁷ le défenseur «de l’ordre et de la paix sociale»,¹²⁸ l’ennemi désigné des sociaux-démocrates¹²⁹ et l’ennemi déclaré du social-communiste¹³⁰ en lutte contre «les fausses facilités d’une liberté individuelle illimitée».¹³¹ Mais Ciaceri, en universitaire accompli, sait également écrire selon le canon académique. L’ouvrage ne contient aucun effet miroir «César-Mussolini» ni la moindre concession explicite

¹²³ Ciaceri 1930, II, 382 ; 393 ; 395 ; 396 ; 390 ; 392 (traduit par nous).
¹²⁴ Ciaceri 1926, I, 309.
¹²⁶ Ciaceri 1930, II, 397 – 401 (traduit par nous).
¹²⁷ Ciaceri 1930, II, 376, 393 – 394.
¹²⁸ Ciaceri 1926, I, 238.
¹²⁹ Ciaceri 1926, I, xxxvii.
¹³⁰ C’est-à-dire de Catilina, Ciaceri 1926, I 246.
¹³¹ Ciaceri 1926, I, xx.
à l'idéologie dominante. Sans doute flatte-t-il le Zeitgeist fasciste en assurant à l'Italie la pleine propriété de Cicéron, héros national libéré de l'emprise allemande. Mais, non sans courage, il rétablit «l'ennemi de César» dans ses droits et ne cède pas à la contamination fasciste.¹³²

L'ouvrage de Ciaceri était trop fouillé, trop érudit, pour avoir prise sur un large public. Il avait fait son travail pour la communauté scientifique. Il restait à un journaliste de reprendre la tâche pour le grand public, ce que fit Maffeo Maffii, un notable du régime fasciste.¹³³ Son Cicerone e il suo dramma politico, publié en 1933, reçut un excellent accueil et eut plusieurs traductions.¹³⁴ Cet ouvrage, narratif et dépourvu de notes, qui rompt avec Mommsen (qui, sans surprise, est le seul auteur cité), s'appuie pour l'essentiel sur la Correspondance.¹³⁵ Bien écrit et parfois subtil, il adopte l'image rituelle de Cicéron en intellectuel égaré dans un monde trop dur pour lui. Mais, venant d'un fasciste, le portrait est surprenant : Maffii ne reconnaît à Cicéron aucun des défauts véniels et habituels dont l'assailaient jusqu'à lors ses meilleurs défensoirs. Il défaillait un à un tous les lieux communs de la biographie cicéronienne habituelle : l'Arpinate, loin d'être une «girouette politique», a toujours su choisir son camp, celui de la République et de la dignité, en dépit des mille difficultés qui se sont accumulées contre lui.¹³⁶ Il n'est jamais vaniteux, jamais indécis, jamais flatteur, mais, pour reprendre une terminologie typiquement fasciste, «viril» et «ni de droite ni de gauche» et «en dehors de partis»¹³⁷. Le portrait de Cicéron est destiné à un public déjà acquis à la cause fasciste. Il n'était plus question du philosophe, encore moins de l'avocat mais bien d'un personnage qui se résume en un seul mot : c'est un patriote, pour ne pas dire un nationaliste. Dans une lettre de 1922, l'illustre économiste Wilfrid Pareto (1848–1923) appelait de ses vœux la trans-

¹³² Pour reprendre l'excellente expression d'Arnaldo Momigliano, qui a critiqué les errances de Ciaceri mais a reconnu la valeur de son Cicerone, qui montre qu'il fut moins contaminé par le fascisme que ses homologues allemands ou que Carcopino : Momigliano 1969, 46.


¹³⁴ Sur les traductions, cf. bibliographie.

¹³⁵ Il est difficile de savoir si Maffii a lu Ciaceri. Toutefois, la notion de dramma politico figure déjà chez l'universitaire (Ciaceri 1930, II, 376) ainsi que de nombreux traits de Cicéron.

¹³⁶ Maffii 1937, 39–41.

¹³⁷ Maffii 1937, 75.
formation du mouvement fasciste en organisation de gouvernement. Il avait cette phrase :


Ce mélange, anachronique et très étrange, éclaire avec quelques années d’avance l’adoption de Cicéron par le militant Maffii : Cicéron, c’est l’ordre. Il s’agit de protéger l’État «menacé de se désagréger parce qu’il se trouve à la merci de la corruption, de l’argent et de la parole»,¹³⁹ Le dramma politico de Cicéron, c’est qu’il a parfaitement théorisé la nécessité de confier les rênes de l’État à un rector, dont Maffii dresse un portrait qu’il n’est pas difficile d’assimiler à Mussolini¹⁴⁰ mais qu’il n’a jamais su choisir son homme fort, que ce soit César, Pompée ou Octave. L’ouvrage suggère qu’il aurait dû céder aux appels de César, le seul qui ne l’a jamais trahi et qui aurait conduit Cicéron vers sa vraie vocation, celle de numéro deux et de conscience morale d’un régime autoritaire. Maffii fait de Cicéron un héros tragique, mais il laisse son lecteur sans regret : le destin de Rome était bien d’avoir un chef unique.

5 Cicéron et le IIIᵉ Reich

A la veille de la première guerre mondiale, la bibliothèque cicéronienne est allemande.¹⁴¹ Edition des textes, lexiques, analyses textuelles, commentaires, biographies, revues et enseignements magistraux : qui veut étudier Cicéron doit parler allemand.¹⁴² Les cicéroniens de la génération suivante, qui enjambe les deux siècles, sont à la fois les grands témoins du triomphe de la philologie

---

¹³⁸ Paretto 1922, 311 (traduit par nous).
¹³⁹ Maffii 1937, 220.
¹⁴⁰ Maffii 1937, 220.
allemande et, à la fin de leur carrière, les spectateurs attristés d’une université allemande qui se délité face aux pressions du national-socialisme. Ces érudits seront les maîtres de la jeune génération qui entre dans la carrière sous la république de Weimar (1919–1933) et qui sera la plus directement touchée par le nazisme.

Pour la plupart, ces philologues et historiens ont protesté contre le portrait de Cicéron par Mommsen et restauré l’image d’un Cicéron digne d’intérêt, tandis que d’autres, parmi les plus célèbres, comme Eduard Meyer (1855–1930) ne peuvent tout à fait se détacher du grand historien. A ces spécialistes de Cicéron, s’ajoute toute la classe intellectuelle allemande qui connaît l’Arpinate depuis le lycée. Sous le régime nazi, Cicéron s’efface progressivement et disparaît du débat public. Contre toute attente, il ne sera pas la cible idéale d’une idéologie qui haïssait le parlementarisme, les avocats, les modérés, les bourgeois, tous ces topoï qui dessinaient à la fois le portrait de Cicéron et celui de la République de Weimar. La voie ouverte par Drumm et Mommsen ne sera pas exploitée. Certes, l’université résiste. Des livres et des articles lui sont consacré, mais de moins en moins. Si bien qu’en 1945, un grand retournement s’est produit. Le ciceronien ne parle plus allemand, il parle anglais.

A la veille de l’arrivée au pouvoir des nazis, le grand public dispose d’une image mitigée de Cicéron. Theodor Birt (1852–1933), excellent philologue, occupe ses loisirs à écrire des saynètes sur l’antiquité. Celle qu’il consacre à

144 Par exemple Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1921, 155. E. Meyer 1918, vi qualifie l’ouvrage de Drumm «d’étrange produit de l’érudition allemande».
145 Ainsi Leo Friedrich, pour lequel Cicéron «réclame d’être aimé avant de dévoiler son esprit et révéler ses richesses», Miscella ciceroniana, Index scholarum Gottingae, 1892, 18 in Lévy 1992, 63.
146 Ainsi Meyer 1918, 120 critique vertement la position «optimiste» de Heinze sur le caractère de Cicéron. Plus généralement, il dresse un portrait à la Mommsen de Cicéron, avocat pamphlétaire, capable de défendre toutes les causes et d’y perdre sa dignité (Meyer 1918, 60 ;121).
147 Fishwick 2013, 9 n’a pas tort d’écrire que «those who do not read Latin and German fluently are blocked in Ciceronian scholarship, which tends to make Cicero the property of university elites». Mais il parle ici d’une culture de bibliothèque, pas de l’influence scientifique. Hölkeskamp 2010, ix est plus fidèle à la réalité lorsqu’il écrit : «it took me years to realize and at last resign myself to accepting it as a fact of academic life : »Teutonica sunt, non leguntur«.
148 Voir par exemple Birt 1909.

Mais il ne fait qu’écrire, il écrit et il écrit. Que pouvaient faire les cent livres enflés de Cicéron et toute cette sagesse de papier de l’époque contre une seule parole des hommes de pouvoir qui savaient gouverner ?

Cette image dégradée, mais bonhomme, de Cicéron se noircit nettement chez l’écrivain expressionniste Klabund (1890–1928) qui, le traitant de «vipère venimeuse», se fait l’écho d’une génération marquée par la cruelle défaite de 1918 et par l’impotente république de Weimar :

Les discours de Cicéron sont encore au programme des gymnases à cause des cours de latin classique. On s’y ennuye à mourir. Même ses moralités épaisse sont très étranges chez un homme dont la seule qualité était la vanité débridée à laquelle il a tout sacrifié, même la vérité.

Cette haine de Cicéron, tout droit venu du XIXᵉ siècle, est absente de l’imaginaire nazi. Cette anomalie s’explique, comme tout ce qui n’est pas advenu, par une série d’hypothèses. La première est que la dilection des idéologues du IIIᵉ Reich et de Hitler lui-même passait d’abord par la Grèce, de préférence spartiate. La fantasmagorie nazie recyclait à sa manière la vieille préférence allemande pour la Grèce, d’abord illustrée par Winckelmann puis par tous les savants. Platon lui-même fut mobilisé à cette fin sous la forme renouvelée du penseur combattant, sportif, un Kampfer dont les philosophs des Professoren de

---

149 Birt 1913, 147 (traduit par nous).
150 Klabund 1930, 57.
151 Klabund 1922, 20 (traduit par nous).
152 Butler 1935 ; Losemann 2001 ; Bruhns 2005 ; Losemann 2007 ; Losemann 2012 ; Roche 2013.
l’université de Weimar étaient dépossédés. En dépit de la filiation établie par Hitler lui-même entre Grecs et allemands, cette préférence laissait toutefois une place de choix à Rome. Hitler, longtemps envieux de la romanità mussoliniennne, souhaitait ruiner la supériorité apparente des Italiens en la matière. Il fixa dans Mein Kampf une doctrine décrétant que les Romains sont des Germains et que c’est ainsi qu’il fallait apprendre l’histoire à l’école. Rome, dispensatrice d’exemples de vertus sacrificielles et de grandeur collective, devint une référence centrale. L’hoplote et le légionnaire sont les dignes descendants des anciens Germains et les dignes modèles des Germains modernes. Dans la victoire (Fabius Cunctator, Auguste) comme dans la tourmente (Léonidas), le chef ne plie jamais.

Cette histoire était d’autant plus facile à réécrire que les élites nazies ne connaissaient quasiment rien de la philologie allemande. Celle-ci ne constituait en rien un motif de fierté nationale. Le mépris des nazis pour le monde de la philologie était si connu que les antiquisants éprouvèrent en 1933 une grande frayeur à l’idée que le grec et le latin disparaissent des programmes scolaires. Hitler le résume sans ambages : l’histoire romaine doit être connue «dans ses grandes lignes».

Moins inculte que Staline, moins cultivé que Mussolini, Hitler a peu de références. Pour lui, la mission des Romains est de représenter l’État. Il admirait leur capacité de choisir leurs dictateurs, leur sens du collectif et de la discipline et surtout leur capacité à étendre leur empire à l’issue de chaque guerre. Dans ses premiers discours, Hitler se plaît à nommer Hannibal, Scipion, Caton, Marius, Sylla ou César, sans oublier Ponce Pilate, celui qui sut résister

154 Chapoutot 2008c, 146.
«comme un roc à la séduction juive».

Le seul auteur latin qui trouvait grâce aux yeux des nazis – jusqu’à l’obsession – était Tacite.

Dans cette antiquité revue et corrigée par les nazis. Il n’y pas de place pour Cicéron. Rien d’héroïque n’est à mettre à son crédit. Rien dans son œuvre n’appelle l’imagerie virile aryenne, la discipline de fer du combattant, le debellare superbos de Virgile ni le solitudinem faciunt de Tacite. Parce que l’Arpînate n’évoque rien de tangible pour le nazi, parce que cedant arma togae est la contre devise du régime et le ius gentium une idéologie ennemie, parce que les élites en chemise brunes sont pour la plupart dénuées de culture classique, ce qui conduit le panthéon romain à se réduire à quelques noms seulement, il n’est pas invité à la célébration de la grandeur du Reich. Si les idéologues nazis cherchent dans l’Antiquité un contre-exemple, c’est vers Socrate qu’ils se tournent volontiers, le «social-démocrate internationaliste de son temps» selon Alfred Rosenberg (1893–1946). Tout au plus, se souvient-on que Cicéron est le témoin maladroit de la chute de la République, période au cours de laquelle se déchaînent, toujours selon Rosenberg, les passions les plus abjectes. Une des grandes affaires de l’historiographie orthodoxe nazi fut le choc entre Rome et les sémites, contre Carthage d’abord, puis contre la Palestine. Dans cette

160 Demandt 2002, 300.
162 Comme le fait remarquer justement Chapoutot 2016, 209: «No Nordic mind would have imagined that all men could be considered equal, called to membership in some universal fellowship of the human race (universi generis humani societate) as imagined by the Roman Stoic Cicero, an unrecognizable χοσμόπολις devoid of all hierarchies based on racial values ».
164 Rosenberg 1937, 63. Le seul passage de Rosenberg qui cite Cicéron.
165 Cette théorie sera reprise également par les milieux universitaires, du moins pour les philologues et historiens désireux de flatter le Zeitgeist nazi, comme Joseph Vogt (1895–1986) et tant d’autres. Vogt 1943, 8 : «Encerclée par les races des marins d’Asie Mineure, Rome a dû de plus en plus souvent tirer sans aucune pitié son glaive pour s’affirmer. La destruction de Carthage a été un événement incroyablement déterminant du point de vue de l’histoire des races : elle a préservé la future civilisation occidentale des miasmes de cette peste phénicienne». Joseph Vogt, qui ne craint pas de parler de guerre d’extermination (Vernichtungskrieg), fut un savant réputé et notamment, avant 1933, un excellent cicéronien. Membre de la SA en 1933, puis de la Nationalsozialistischer Lehrerbund (Ligue national-socialiste des enseignants), il entre au parti nazi en 1937. En 1942, il est membre correspondant de l’Institut zur Erforschung der
confrontation entre Rome et le monde sémite, Cicéron ne tenait aucune place, en dépit des efforts, restés sans suite, d’auteurs obscurs pour faire de l’Arpinate un pionnier de l’antisémitisme. ¹⁶⁶

Comme ce fut le cas en URSS du jour où Staline prononça le nom de Spartacus, la dilection manifestée par Hitler pour l’antiquité dans Mein Kampf poussa les enseignants de lettres classiques à favoriser leur discipline dans le système éducatif nazi. La rude discipline romaine et du patriotisme sourcilleux du mos maiorum trouvent une place de choix dans les manuels scolaires. Il s’agit davantage d’exempla que d’apprentissage du latin.¹⁶⁷ Le ministre de l’instruction publique établit en 1937 des directives pour les langues anciennes :

Le but de l’enseignement du latin n’est pas d’apprendre le latin [...] Nous devons considérer la langue comme l’expression du caractère et de la volonté des chefs romains. Les universitaires peuvent parler autant qu’ils veulent du latin comme outil de communication, mais les écoles allemandes n’ont rien à voir avec cela.¹⁶⁸

Cicéron ne sera plus un professeur de latin et de bonne grammaire. Il doit, comme les autres, servir de modèle. Dans ce rôle, il vient loin derrière César, Tite Live et Caton. Dans le programme scolaire officiel de 1938, il n’est cité que pour les Catilinaires, afin de montrer aux élèves comment


¹⁶⁶ L’idéologue Dietrich Eckart (1868–1923), nazi ultra-orthodoxe et grand inspirateur de Hitler, a publié le récit délirant d’un dialogue fictif entre Hitler et lui. Dans ce brûlot antisémite, Hitler cite de mémoire des passages entiers de la Bible, de Strabon, de Thomas d’Aquin, de Giordano Bruno ou de Schopenhauer. A cette première surprise, s’ajoute celle de le voir citer Cicéron, celui du Pro Flacco (28) qui, on s’en souvient, contient une charge sévère contre l’esprit de résistance du peuple hébreu. Eckart n’hésite pas, comble de l’anachronisme, à le faire dialoguer avec Flavius Josèphe. C’est à travers cet apocryphe qu’apparaît la seule mention de Cicéron par Hitler. Sur le même sujet et sur un mode plus académique : Maschke 1942.


Les forces de décomposition de l’empire étaient à l’œuvre et que les dangers encourus par le peuple étaient visibles, tout comme l’étaient l’appel à un sauveur et la force raciale qui subsistait de l’époque de la vieille Rome.¹⁶⁹

Dans ce délire, surnageait également le De re publica, « Der Staat » considéré comme indispensable pour son « orientation nationale-politique » qui avait permis à Auguste de reprendre en main un régime républicain agonisant. Ces quelques apparitions de Cicéron sont condensées dans un article dû au pédagogue Hermann Lang, Die Cicerolektü re im Dienste der nationalpolitischen Erziehung, qui s’attache, en 1938, à extraire, tant bien que mal, de la vie et des œuvres de l’Arpinate les éléments de tendance nationale-socialiste. Lang sacrifie aux lieux communs (Cicéron est le pionnier du Führerstaat romain) mais tempère son portrait en précisant que le profond conservatisme de Cicéron l’avait empêché de comprendre les aspirations du prolétariat et de placer la res publica sur la bonne ligne d’horizon. Plus encore, il s’était révélé incapable de comprendre le rôle que joue « le sang et la race » dans sa conception de l’État. Lang conclut par une sorte de morale :

À travers l’examen biographique de son évolution et de son caractère, nous voulons assurer les fondations de notre État plus profondément encore afin que rien ne vienne plus jamais les ébranler.¹⁷⁰

Cet obscur pédagogue avait fait son devoir, mais sans grand résultat. Cicéron restait un personnage de second rang qui n’apparaissait qu’épisodiquement dans les manuels scolaires. Il ne fonctionnait pas comme exemplum, car inexploitable pour les concepts de rassenpolitisch ou de nationalpolitisch qui fleurissaient dans les manuels scolaires.

Une autre raison expliquant la disparition de Cicéron est le train de mesures répressives frappant les universitaires allemands à partir de 1933. Le cas du philologue Konrat Ziegler (1884 – 1974), éditeur du De re publica et du De legibus, démis de ses fonctions, est révélateur de la rupture du régime avec la tradition savante allemande, « ces insupportables humanistes de la Weimarer Klassik »¹⁷¹. Il en est de même pour le philologue Karl Meister (1880 – 1963) dont la procédure de destitution fut entamée à l’occasion de sa conférence « Cicéron comme orateur et homme politique ».¹⁷² De plus, la loi d’aryanisation de la fonction pu-

¹⁶⁹ In Chapoutot 2016, 135 – 6 (traduit Johann Chapoutot).
¹⁷⁰ In Roche 2018, 246 (traduit par nous).
¹⁷¹ Selon l’expression de Chapoutot 2009, 79.
¹⁷² Chaniotis/Thaler 2006, 399.
bligue allemande du 7 avril 1933, provoque une purge sans précédent dans l’enseignement supérieur.

Cicéron aurait pu, pour les nazis, représenter un épouvantail – nous l’avons dit – mais aussi un modèle. En effet, il était facile de faire de l’auteur du De re publica, comme le firent les fascistes italiens, l’annonceur et le théoricien du gubernator et du rector suprême, restaurateur de l’ordre dans un monde désintégré. Le sujet avait déjà intéressé les savants allemands.


175 Chapoutot, 2008, 167.


177 Hell 2019, 344–346.

178 Werner Schurr a été membre des SA avant de rejoindre le NSDAP en septembre 1937. Il établit clairement le lien entre Auguste et le Führerprinzip dans Schurr 1934.


180 Malitz 1998. Toutefois, l’étude du lien entre le De re publica et le Principat reste un sujet central tant pour les universitaires les plus en faveur du national-socialisme que comme pour les spécialistes les moins engagés dans la mouvance nazie. Par exemple, Premerstein 1937 qui, dans
obéissance nazie, Cicéron fait figure de visionnaire raté, d’autres, comme Ulrich Knoche (1902–1968), en font le père spirituel de l’empire augus- 
téen («Wegbe-

treiter des Augusteischen Sendungsbewußtseins»). ¹⁸¹

Les articles et ouvrages que Joseph Vogt (1895–1986) a consacré à Cicéron (Ciceros Glaube an Rom en 1935 et Cicero und Sallust en 1938) ne laissent pas toujours percevoir son engagement politique nazi (cf. supra, n. 165 p. 421–422). On y trouve le portrait d’un Cicéron qui n’a pas su prendre la mesure de son temps :

Nous devons être surpris […] qu’un homme politique qui a célébré si inlassablement la grandeur du passé, qui a vu si clairement le déclin du présent et qui a regardé avec tant d’inquiétude vers l’avenir, ait si insuffisamment apprécié l’importance des énergies vitales dans la vie des nations. ¹⁸²

Dégénérescence de la citoyenneté, déclin de la classe dirigeante, ruine de la paysannerie italienne, rien de tout cela ne l’a touché («alle diese notorischen Schäden haben ihn nicht erschüttert»). Cicéron, qui se faisait «une image presque exclusivement spirituelle de l’homme», s’était rendu coupable («schuldig gemacht») d’avoir négligé le rôle que joue les liens du sang dans l’État et la vie sociale. ¹³ Sur un mode à peine moins explicite, le même reproche se retrouve chez Johannes Stroux (1886–1954) ou chez Hans Volkmann (1900–1975), pour lesquels Cicéron, qui avait tous les concepts pour y parvenir, n’a pas compris la «grandeur prédestinée» du Principat. ¹⁸⁴ Seul Hermann Strasburger (1909–1985), dans son Concordia Ordinum de 1931, avait vu en Cicéron un dirigeant disposant d’un programme politique (le consensus omnium bonorum) et un praticien de la «Realpolitik». Il est sans doute un des rares savants à considérer que la chute de la République n’était pas inéluctable. ¹⁸⁵

En même temps que les universités, toutes les revues scientifiques étaient soumises à une «réorganisation». ¹⁸⁶ Même la «Real-Encyclopädie» n’échappe
pas à la nouvelle atmosphère. Il est difficile, en l’état de nos recherches, d’établir les preuves d’une corrélation entre les nouvelles règles qui s’imposent aux revues et le destin de Cicéron. Le graphique suivant reprend les données fournies par l’Année Philologique pour les années 1933–1947.¹⁸⁷

![Graphique des articles allemands consacrés à Cicéron, années 1933–1947](source: Année Philologique)

Fig. 1: Articles Allemands consacrés à Cicéron, année 1933–1947 (Source : Année Philologique).


la culture de l’antiquité s’est effondrée en Allemagne. En témoigne cette lettre de l’évêque de Mayence, en 1946, sur l’enseignement secondaire :

L’Église attend de ces théologiens qu’ils aient certaines connaissances en latin et en grec. Il en est de même pour la philologie. Jusqu’à maintenant, il fallait déjà imposer aux théologiens et aux philologues des cours spéciaux de rattrapage en humanités avant de les laisser commencer leur spécialité. Avec le nouveau régime des études, on ne peut plus guère envisager que la lecture de Cicéron soit encore possible.¹⁸⁸

Au total, le régime nazi, par son inculture et les besoins de la reconstruction de l’histoire, a créé autour de Cicéron une aura protectrice. Les philologues et historiens, protégés dans la forteresse universitaire que les nazis ont eu beau-coup de mal à investir, ont résisté à leur manière.¹⁸⁹ Leur production scientifique sur l’Arpine cependant ne suscitait plus la moindre querelle ni le moindre débat. Cicéron allait désormais se reconstruire outre-Atlantique.

6 Une défaite dans la dignité

Il apparaît que Cicéron a reçu un traitement particulier sous les dictatures. Les références citées dans cette étude pourraient paraître assez nombreuses pour donner l’illusion que la présence de Cicéron, après tout, fut réelle. Il n’en est rien. Les biographies de Maffii et de Ciaceri sont des îlots dans un océan d’in-différence. Silence complet et mortel sous Staline, disparition nécessaire sous Hitler, oubli céasarien sous Mussolini, c’est finalement au français Carcopino que reviendra la charge d’écrire le livre que l’on attendait des régimes dictatoriaux. Nous avons vu que les savants, exilés ou mis sous la férule des services de sécurité, n’ont jamais perdu prise. Arnaldi se souvient que lorsqu’il donnait à Naples ses cours de littérature latine sous les bombes, «era un po’ anche combattere, se non per la vittoria, per una dignitosa sconfitta».¹⁹⁰ Cette notion de «défaite dans la dignité» est le résumé de ce qui est arrivé aux ciceroniens sous le joug dictatorial. Dostoïevsky a parfaitement senti la vérité profonde du destin d’un Cicéron dans un régime totalitaire. Dans Les Démons, il fait dire à Piotr Stépanovitch, avocat d’un régime dictatorial espéré,

D’abord abaisser le niveau de la culture, des sciences et des talents. Un niveau scientifique élevé n’est accessible qu’aux intelligences supérieures, et il ne faut pas d’intelligences

¹⁸⁸ Rüdiger 1981, 144.
¹⁹⁰ Cité par Flores 2015, 192.
supérieures ! Les hommes doués de hautes facultés se sont toujours emparés du pouvoir, et ont été des despotes [...]. Ils ont toujours fait plus de mal que de bien ; on les expulse ou on les livre au supplice. Couper la langue à Cicéron, crever les yeux à Copernic, lapider Shakespeare [...]. La soif de l’étude est une soif aristocratique [...] Le nécessaire seul est nécessaire, telle sera désormais la devise du globe terrestre.¹⁹¹

Tel est, sans doute, la morale de la *fortuna* de Cicéron sous les dictatures. Il n’était pas nécessaire, ni en bien ni en mal.

¹⁹¹ Trad. Derély 1886.
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