

University of Groningen

Reperforming Cicero's Voice

Jansen, Leanne; Pieper, Christoph; van der Velden, Bram

Published in:
Portraying Cicero in Literature, Culture, and Politics

DOI:
[10.1515/9783110748703-018](https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110748703-018)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2022

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Jansen, L., Pieper, C., & van der Velden, B. (2022). Reperforming Cicero's Voice: Constructions and Negotiations of his vox publica. In F. Romana Berno, & G. La Bua (Eds.), *Portraying Cicero in Literature, Culture, and Politics: From Ancient to Modern Times* (pp. 313-337). (CICERO: Studies on Roman Thought and Its Reception; Vol. 4). De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110748703-018>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Leanne Jansen, Christoph Pieper, and Bram van der Velden
**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".

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.⁶ 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.⁷ 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.⁸

6 On the process of reduction 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 necesse est, multo plura dixisse, quam dixisset, putaretur; ego autem si omnia, quae dicenda sunt, libere dixerō, nequaquam tamen similiter oratio mea exire atque in vulgus emanare poterit. Deinde quod ceterorum neque dictum obscurum potest esse propter nobilitatem et amplitudinem neque temere dicto concedi propter aetatem et prudentiam. Ego si quid liberius dixerō, vel occultum esse propterea, quod nondum ad rem publicam accessi, vel ignosci adulescentiae meae poterit; tametsi non modo ignoscendi ratio verum etiam cognoscendi consuetudo iam de civitate sublata est.* ("The reason is this. If any of those whom you see here, in whom the highest authority and dignity are vested, had risen to speak and uttered a word about public affairs – a thing impossible to avoid doing in a case like this – it would be made out that he had said much more than he really did. On the other hand, as for me, even if I were to say freely all that there is to be said, my words will by no means be spread abroad in the same manner and become public property. In the next place, no word of theirs can pass unnoticed, owing to their rank and dignity, nor can any rashness of speech be allowed in their case owing to their age and ripe experience;

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 consulis 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 consular year. In November of the same year his voice has even gained the authority to exile Catiline (2.12: *Homo enim videlicet timidus aut etiam permodestus vocem consulis ferre 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

whereas, if I speak too freely, my words will either be ignored, because I have not yet entered public life, or pardoned owing to my youth, although not only the idea of pardon, but even the custom of legal inquiry has now been abolished from the State". Transl. Freese 1930). Cf. Cerutti 1996, 60–62 and Dyck 2010 *ad loc.* As Dugan 2005, 36 has rightly pointed out with regard to the later *Pro Archia*, passages like this transform judicial into epideictic oratory in that "the moulding of a voice [...] is tantamount to the construction of a self".

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".

¹⁰ Transl. Freese 1930. On the light metaphor, cf. Welch 2005, 317–318 and Pieper 2020.

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 debet 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”).¹⁵

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*, in that it still represents the elevated position in the state he has reached with its help: the voice is *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

15 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 (δημοσία δὲ βοῶς ἄλλως, κεκραγῶς τοὺς μισοὺς ἐκείνου λόγους) and 46.17.4 (μείζον γὰρ σοῦ βοήσομαι). 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 oratorical 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.²¹ 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 sequer properavi quem praesentes non sunt secuti, non ut proficerem aliquid – nec enim sperabam id nec praestare poteram – sed ut, si quid mihi humanitus accidisset – multa autem impendere videntur praeter naturam etiam praeterque fatum – huius tamen diei vocem testem rei publicae relinquerem meae perpetuae erga se voluntatis.²²

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,²³ 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,²⁴ 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.²⁵

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”.

22 Transl. Shackleton Bailey (rev. Ramsey/Manuwald) 2010, slightly adapted.

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 Alcidas’ *On Sophists*, which discusses whether the written word could eventually substitute the voice (as an εἶδωλον) 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.

28 Cf. Butler 2002, 117. Similarly, Walters 2011, 144.

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 (*talīs 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 increscat 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 *prosopopoeia* 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).

31 Cf. Sen. *suas.* 6.26.16: *Publica vox saevis aeternum obmutuit armis* ("voice of the public – now silenced for ever by cruel arms", transl. Winterbottom 1974), a formulation that Velleius Paterculus would take up in his eulogy of the dead Cicero in Vell. Pat. 2.66.2.

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.

34 Transl. Russell 2002, discussed in the context of ancient reflection on the voice in rhetoric by Schulz 2014, 315–317, and of ancient education on the *Pro Milone* by Keeline 2018, 44–46.

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*,³⁵ the *Invectiva in Sallustium*, and the *Epistula ad Octavianum*.³⁶ In this way, declaimers not only "become Cicero" but even become "CICERO" (to borrow Kaster's turn of phrase):³⁷ 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 Ciceronian thought and diction. But what is that essence exactly? With a few obvious exceptions (*quo usque tandem*;³⁸ *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*³⁹ and the clausula which it represents, and the use of rhetorical figures.⁴⁰

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 *pernicies*.⁴¹

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, quod acerrimus idem et procellis indignantis Oceani fremituque violentior. deni-
que de illo versus huiusmodi ferebatur: δεινὸς ἀνὴρ: τάχα κεν καὶ ἀνάτιον αἰτιόωτο
[Hom. *Il.* 11.654]. Alter vero, quem consularis purpura et coniurationis extinctae laurea re-
dimibat, mox ingressus curiam superum et in Iovis gratulatus est se venisse conspectum,
clamare laetior coepit: “o nos beatos, o rem publicam fortunatam, o praeclaram laudem
consulatus mei”.⁴²

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,⁴³ came into the senate of heaven, and, delighted to have come into Jove's presence, joyfully began to declaim: “How blessed we are, how fortunate the State, how brilliant the fame of my consulship!”.

³⁹ The reception of which phrase is discussed by La Bua 2019, 284–285.

⁴⁰ 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 over-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).

⁴¹ 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.

⁴² *De nuptiis* 5.430. Transl. Stahl *et al.* 1977.

⁴³ This seems to be based on a misunderstanding of Cicero's *cedant arma togae, concedat laurea 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.⁴⁴ 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*.⁴⁵ 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.⁴⁶ 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:

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 deprimit ad supplicium.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.⁴⁸ 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*),⁴⁹ together with Ciceronian vocabulary connected with these themes.⁵⁰

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.⁵¹

The same is true for pseudo-Cicero's *Invectiva in Sallustium*.⁵² Its author has clearly attempted to emulate Cicero's "rhetorical" style,⁵³ 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 experiri, quam universo 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 conferatur, animo quidem meo superet, cum universi 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 populus 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 reference 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”

⁵⁴ Transl. Novokhatko 2009.

⁵⁵ Although there are clear *parts* of Ciceronian passages reworked here, such as Cicero’s retelling of his post-exilic reception in Brundisium and later Rome in *Att.* 4.1 (=73 SB), and his presentation 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 on the matter). Cf. Keeline 2018, 170–171 for the voluntary-exile motif in the *Pridie*.

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 2018, 160–161 and 168–169 for *furor* in Pseudo-Ciceronian declamation.

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,⁵⁷ 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.⁵⁸

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.⁵⁹ Sallust, our only contemporary source dealing with Cicero's career, presents a silent version of an otherwise

⁵⁷ Cf. Leeman 1949, 158–167.

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.

⁵⁹ On Livy as a possible source for Cassius Dio, Millar 1961, 17–18 and Van Stekelenburg 1971, 63.

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 τοῖς λόγοις ἀμετρία τῆς περιαιτολογίας ἀκρασίαν τινὰ κατηγορεῖ πρὸς δόξαν, βοῶντος ὡς τὰ ὄπλα ἔδει τῇ τηβέννῳ καὶ τῇ γλώττῃ τὴν θριαμβικὴν ὑπέικειν δάφνην. ἰσχύειν μὲν γὰρ διὰ λόγου τὸν πολιτευόμενον ἀναγκαῖον, ἀγαπᾶν δ' ἀγεννὲς καὶ λιχνεύειν 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 the 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.⁶⁴ We find similar criticism of Cicero's overweening self-absorption in Cassius Dio.⁶⁵ The criticism is symptomatic: for the Greek historians, Cicero's voice was in first instance a shouting, boastful sound,⁶⁶ 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.⁶⁷ 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.⁶⁸ 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.⁶⁹ 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.

⁶⁴ See n. 44.

⁶⁵ Cf. Dio Cass. 37.38; 38.12.6–7.

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 ἔχθρα 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.

⁷² Bishop 2019, 173–219.

⁷³ Cf. Sanders 2014, 79–99. Leanne Jansen's dissertation further explores the relations between this theme in Cicero's own writings and the Attic oratorical corpus.

⁷⁴ A few examples, which are definitely not exhaustive: App. *BC* 3.53, χώρα ὄμορος, from Dem. 2.1; Dio Cass. 45.27.4, βοῶν καὶ κεκραγῶς, from Dem. 8.132, 199; Dio Cass. 46.2.1, ἄνω καὶ κάτω ταραττων, from Dem. 18.111; Dio Cass. 46.3.4, πλείονας μὲν τροπὰς τρεπόμενος τοῦ πορθμοῦ πρὸς ὃν ἔφυγεν, adapt. from Aeschin. 3.90; Dio Cass. 46.16.1, τραγωδεῖ περιῶν, 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,⁷⁵ 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.* 8.⁷⁶ 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),⁷⁷ both authors have incorporated the story, cultivated by Cicero in the original speeches,⁷⁸ 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 ἀλιτήριος οὐχ ἡμῶν μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης ὀλίγου πάσης γενομενος).⁷⁹ 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*).⁸⁰ 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, ἐχθές), 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 ἐμβά-λων; 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 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):

Ἄει μὲν ἔγωγε οἶμαι χρῆναι μηδένα μηδὲν μήτε πρὸς χάριν μήτε πρὸς φιλονεικίαν λέγειν, ἀλλ’ ὁ βέλτιστον ἕκαστος εἶναι νομίζει, τοῦτ’ ἀποφαίνεσθαι. δεινὸν γὰρ εἰ τοὺς μὲν στρατηγούοντας τοὺς θ’ ὑπατεύοντας πάντα ἀπὸ ὀρθῆς τῆς διανοίας ποιεῖν ἀξιώσομεν, κὰν ἄρα πῶς σφαλῶσιν, εὐθύνας παρ’ αὐτῶν καὶ τῆς τύχης ἀπαιτήσομεν, ἐν δὲ δὴ τῷ βουλευέσθαι, ἐν ᾧ κυριώτατοι τῆς ἡμετέρας αὐτῶν γνώμης ἐσμέν, τὰ κοινῇ συμφέροντα τῶν ἰδίων ἔνεκα πλεονεξίων προησόμεθα.

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

Ἔδει μὲν, ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, τοὺς λέγοντας ἅπαντας μήτε πρὸς ἔχθραν ποιεῖσθαι λόγον μηδένα μήτε πρὸς χάριν, ἀλλ’ ὁ βέλτιστον ἕκαστος ἠγεῖτο, τοῦτ’ ἀποφαίνεσθαι, ἄλλως τε καὶ περὶ κοινῶν πραγμάτων καὶ μεγάλων ὑμῶν βουλευομένων. ἐπεὶ δ’ ἔνιοι τὰ μὲν φιλονεικία, τὰ δ’ ἠτινιδήποτ’ αἰτία προάγονται λέγειν, ὑμᾶς, ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, τοὺς πολλοὺς δεῖ πάντα τὰλλ’ ἀφελόντας, ἃ τῇ πόλει νομίζετε συμφέρειν, ταῦτα καὶ ψηφίζεσθαι καὶ πράττειν.

⁸¹ Aeschin. 3.131, 136, 157; Dem. 18.159: Οὐκ ἂν ὀκνήσαιμ’ ἔγωγε κοινὸν ἀλειτήριον τῶν μετὰ ταῦτ’ ἀπολωλότων ἀπάντων εἰπεῖν, ἀνθρώπων, τόπων, πόλεων: ὁ γὰρ τὸ σπέρμα παρασχών, οὗτος τῶν φύντων αἴτιος (“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 οἶμαι, 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 recognizably 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, 7.7, 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. Dilts 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 δυσχερὲς εἰπεῖν οὐδὲν ἀρχόμενος τοῦ λόγου.⁸⁸ 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*.⁸⁹ Only when in the *peroratio* Cicero claims to have always acted with the *ὁμόνοια* and *ἐλευθερία* 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*.⁹⁰

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 (optimate) 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: δυσχερὲς 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 Kyhntzsch 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,⁹¹ 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".⁹² Vergerio wrote his letter under the guise and name of Cicero and addressed it to the father of humanism, Francesco Petrararch, by then already deceased for twenty years.⁹³

Vergerio's letter is a late answer to Petrararch's *Epistola familiaris* 24.3, written as a reaction to his finding of a manuscript of Cicero's *Letters to Atticus* in Verona

91 There is much to say about the influence of declamation on the speeches in Greek imperial historiography: see Keeline 2018, 177–188.

92 Cf. Witt 2000, 338–391 and 443–494; Witt 1990, 174–175. The recent overview by Van der Poel 2017, 272–288, does not mention Vergerio, but his contemporaries Antonio Loschi and Sico Polenton as the first generation that gave rise to humanistic oratory.

93 The letter has become famous through Hans Baron's treatment in several of his monographs (Baron 1966, 127–129; 1988, 120–121). As Baron himself has remarked in the appendix to his first ed. of *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance* (1955, vol. 2, 496 n. 2), the letter probably had less impact on the contemporaries. In 1416, Leonardo Bruni wrote to Poggio Bracciolini that he had discovered it and sent it to him (letter printed in Mehus 1741, vol. 1, 111); already in 1405, however, he might have known it (cf. Witt 2000, 385 n. 122). Important interpretations since Baron are McManamon 1996, 52–59; Enenkel 1998, 31–34; Renner 1998; Witt 2000, 384–387.

in 1345.⁹⁴ 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,⁹⁵ but by Cicero’s “private” voice in the letters, which was so different from Cicero’s *vox publica* he had known so far. In his indignant letter addressed directly to Cicero, Petrarch criticized Cicero for his inconsistent behaviour, *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 (*fam.* 24.4) Petrarch addresses Cicero in a hymnic way as *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.⁹⁶ Against Petrarch’s criticism that Cicero had “abandon[ed] the leisure fitted to your age and career and position” (*etati et professioni et fortune tue conveniens otium reliquisti*),⁹⁷ Vergerio’s Cicero answers by asserting that “a philosophy that lives in the cities and shuns solitude, always seemed mature and outstanding” (*ea enim michi matura semper et prestans philosophia visa est, que in urbibus habitat et solitudinem fugit*).⁹⁸ But the letter’s content does not interest us here as much as the orchestration of the (almost literal) resurrection of Cicero’s voice.⁹⁹ Whereas Petrarch has gone halfway in res-

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.

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, *e. g.* in his *Memorandarum rerum libri* (finished around the time of the discovery of the *Letters to Atticus*) or, much later, in his *Seniles* 16.1. Similarly, Renner 1998, 50; *contra* Witt 1990, 173.

⁹⁶ Cf. Renner 1998, 56; Robey 1983, 12. McManamon 1996, 56 defines Vergerio’s Cicero as a “model of rhetorical ethos”.

⁹⁷ Petrarch, *fam.* 24.3.2. Transl. Fantham 2017.

⁹⁸ Vergerio, *Cicero’s Letter to Petrarch* (in Smith 1934, 444.13–15, transl. Pieper).

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

urrecting the “real” Cicero by writing *to* him,¹⁰⁰ 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.¹⁰¹ 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.¹⁰² 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*.¹⁰³

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.* 24.4: 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”).

101 Enenkel 1998, 32 calls his style “perfect Ciceronian style” (“volmaakte Ciceroniaanse stijl”). Witt 2000, 381 is more sceptical about Vergerio's success in sounding like Cicero.

102 Cf. Renner 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 implorassent, consilio atque ratione profuimus* (Smith 1934, 438.22–439.3; cf. Steel 2007); *id vero otium et etas et professio et fortuna mea sibi exigebant 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 plures 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 stabiliende, 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 proclaram 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 Petrarch 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.

106 Cf. Baron 1966, 129; Robey 1983, 11; Witt 2000, 386; Enenkel 1998, 34.

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.¹⁰⁸ And "being like Cicero" means "being a good humanist", one to whom public affairs can be entrusted safely.¹⁰⁹ 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.¹¹⁰

108 Cf. McManamon 1996, 56 (as n. 105).

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).

