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ABSTRACT

The focus of this thesis is the rhetorical depictions of character in Cicero’s correspondence in the period following the assassination of Caesar. Letters have long been accepted as an affected form of communication, but the extent of rhetorical characterisations in the letters of Cicero has not yet been fully appreciated. Epistolary persuasion is a relatively new field in classical studies and an extensive exploration in this important area will reveal further insights into the form and function of letter writing in the ancient world. This study focuses on the characterisation of C. Cassius Longinus and M. Iunius Brutus in Cicero’s writings. Firstly it will explore the sloganising of the collective nouns which were used for the conspirators in order to gain a contextual understanding of what these words meant in the Late Republic. Secondly it will examine the rhetorical assembling of character through the medium of comparative portraiture. Finally it will examine the notions of popularity, universal consent and duty as rhetorical arguments to persuade the conspirators to continue the fight for the republic. The identification and exploration of character depiction as a rhetorical device in the letters are vital in the historical and literary research into Cicero, his correspondence, and indeed the understanding of the crucial events of this period.
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INTRODUCTION

The aim of this thesis is to investigate the depictions of personality in the correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero during the final years of the Roman Republic, from Caesar’s death until the end of the extant correspondence in July 43. There was a period of immense power struggles following the assassination, as Roman politics teetered between the hope of a return to republican sensibilities and a continuation of the autocratic rule of Caesar through his notebooks and the rivalries of his successors.¹ This thesis looks to reveal the rhetorical and literary devices which are used for character depictions in Cicero’s letters by investigating the representations of two major personalities of the Late Republican period, C. Cassius Longinus and M. Iunius Brutus. This identification and examination of personality and depictions of character in these writings is vital for illuminating historical and literary research into Cicero, his correspondence, and indeed the understanding of the crucial events of this period.

Letters are an affected form of communication, and whilst this concept is not novel, the extent of Cicero’s use of characterisation as a rhetorical device in the letters has not yet been fully appreciated. The seemingly candid conversational

¹ I have chosen to use the term ‘republic’ in the lower case for Cicero’s res publica throughout this thesis. It will be suggested that the term ‘Republic’ is unsuitable (p. 58), but there is a need to call it something, and it is better to call it by a term by which it is commonly known and accepted. By placing it in the lower case I hope to separate it from any connotations of a formal governmental system.
INTRODUCTION

style and innocent expressions of news and opinion contained in the letters, as well as Cicero’s own declarations of what a letter is and should be, often conceal the underlying characteristics of persuasion perhaps expected more in oratory. Many historians have been led astray by Cicero’s statements of fact, wanting this to represent a true account of history and personality. Whilst this is true to an extent, it is Cicero’s account of history and the individuals of this period that is presented in the letters. The affected nature of his correspondence illuminates how he constructs these representations of character. In this process, the methodology Cicero employs in these representations will be investigated and analysed to identify where depictions exist and to posit, when possible, how he uses these characterisations for political and personal ends.

0.1: TERMINOLOGY

It is first necessary to define key terminology which will be used throughout this study. Although many of these terms may seem self-evident, tracing their nuances will clarify how Cicero’s use of personality portraiture is constructed. This sub-section does not claim to be an exhaustive historical, philosophical or philological study of these words. The aim is solely to put them into the context of this study.
Characteristics represent those features or qualities which are taken to define a person. These qualities can be physical, psychological, personality traits, behavioural or anything which defines an individual. Collectively they create one’s character: the combination of features that identify an individual and his or her personality. This is the key point in my definition: character is always a ‘constructed’ character, implicated in personal and situational histories, negotiation of power, and rhetorical and social structures. The terms character and characteristic contains no judgement of veracity, since all characteristics are constructed and it is vain to look behind the constructive for a ‘more real’ world. For instance, when Cicero refers to Matius by the term Calvenna he is describing the physical characteristic of Matius being ‘bald’ (Att. 14.5.1; 14.9.3; 16.11.1). It is clear, however, that Cicero’s meaning extends far beyond a mere description of his physical features. In this way this characteristic is both an actual physical description and an applied, derogatory term, but the two cannot be separated.

The most important terms used throughout the thesis are portrait, portraiture and depiction. These terms are synonymous for the representation of characteristics and character: that is, the image which is built up or used to
represent that individual, his or her personality and motives. In other words, these *depictions* are a creation of reality where the writer attempts to represent someone or something as he wants them to seem. This is achieved through comparisons, omissions and even accentuation of events, facts and personality traits. This thesis aims primarily to identify these depictions in the letters and to analyse the methods by which Cicero builds these up into images of persuasion.

### 0.2: CHARACTER DEPICTIONS: BRUTUS, OCTAVIAN AND ANTONIUS

The importance of character depiction is best viewed through an example from the correspondence, such as this letter written to M. Iunius Brutus in April 43. In this letter, Cicero attempts to explain to Brutus his support of Octavian. In doing so he reveals his own opinions on Brutus, Octavian and M. Antonius (*ad Brut. 2.5.1-2*)

---

2 The philosophical idea of representation has a rich tradition, including Auerbach’s work on *imitatio* (1953), and Hegel’s writings on *Vorstellung*: summary in Duprè (1973). Another discussion on the representation of reality can be found in Goodman (1976: 3-44).

3 For the staging of character in letters, see Stowers (1986: 32-35); Stirewalt (1993: 20-4); Malosse (2005). See also Lausberg on *ethopoieia* (1960: 407-411 §820-5), and the *Progymnasmata* of Aelius Theon (115), Hermogenes (20) and Nicolaus the Sophist (67).

4 All translations in this thesis, unless otherwise stated, are those of the author.
voluntas mea, Brute, de summa re publica semper eadem fuit quae tua, ratio quibusdam in rebus (non enim omnibus) paulo fortasse vehementior. scis mihi semper placuisse non rege solum sed regno liberari rem publicam; tu lenius, immortali omnino cum tua laude. sed quid melius fuerit magno dolore sensimus, magno periculo sentimus. recenti illo tempore tu omnia ad pacem, quae oratione confici non poterat, ego omnia ad libertatem, qua sine pax nulla est. pacem ipsam bello atque armis effici posse arbitrabar. studia non deerant arma poscentium, quorum repressimus impetum ardoremque restinximus. itaque res in eum locum venerat ut, nisi Caesari Octaviano deus quidam illam mentem dedisset, in potestatem perditissimi hominis et turpissimi M. Antoni veniendum fure</it>
peace, which was not possible to be accomplished with oratory, all I
did was towards liberty, without which there is no peace. I came to
the conclusion that peace itself could be accomplished with war and
arms. Zeal of those demanding arms was not lacking, whose vigour
we repressed and whose flame we extinguished. Thus the situation
came to this place that, if a god had not given that idea to Caesar
Octavianus, we would have had to come under the power of a most
degenerate man and the most disgraceful M. Antonius, with whom
you see at this very time what and how great the struggle is. This
would not have been the case, if Antonius had not been spared then.

Cicero makes his opinion on the grand scheme of political events very clear in
this letter. While he connects himself to Brutus by his declaration of a shared
intention (voluntas), he immediately negates this by stating the differences in
their methodology. Cicero indicates a job unfinished, a theme which permeates
the correspondence after Caesar’s death. This is indicated with his references
to the motif of wanting to be freed from not only a king, but the monarchy itself.
In this letter, by merit of placement and association, he seems to place this
blame, amongst other things, upon Brutus’ leniency. This conviction towards
clemency, which appears as idealism in Cicero’s eyes, though praiseworthy in
itself, is the cause of not only the pain of the past (magno dolore sensimus), but
also the very present feelings of danger (magno periculo sentimus). These
elements are clearly connected through the anaphora of these phrases and the change of tenses. This movement from the perfect to the present tense suggests that Cicero saw the lack of foresight and any durable plan for transition to stable government after the assassination of Caesar as the reasons for the serious repercussions which were felt not only in the months following the Ides of March, but even after a year. He then enters into an ideological debate on Brutus’ peace versus Cicero’s liberty. In other words, the death of Caesar was not enough if the State and the citizenry were not freed. This idea of *libertas* being linked intrinsically to the political situation is pivotal in Cicero’s writings from this period. He admits the need for peace, but profoundly points out that peace currently is not achievable by oratory but rather by force. What this implies is that the oratory and idealism of Brutus was not enough, and in this case it is perhaps a reference to Brutus’ speech on the Capitoline the day after the assassination. Cicero accepts responsibility for current events through his decision that peace was achievable through war (*pacem ipsam bello atque armis effici posse arbitrabar*). In all likelihood, he was referring here to the movement of troops against the siege of Antonius at Mutina. This allows him to move onto his character depictions of Octavian and Antonius.

Octavian alone is mentioned as taking up the war against Antonius. The consuls Hirtius and Pansa are omitted by Cicero, and this fact alone points to a rhetorical element in his depiction of the event. The simplest reason for this is
the need to justify Octavian’s legal position in assuming a commanding role, despite not holding this command through official channels. In relation to Octavian, Brutus cautions Cicero on numerous occasions after this letter about giving Octavian too many honours.\(^5\) As such, Cicero also could be attempting to justify his support of Octavian to Brutus. It could also be suggested that Cicero is actually trying to convince Brutus of Octavian’s good character and intentions. This is where the rhetorical devices in regard to depictions of character become important. Cicero starts his characterisation by firstly describing him as god-inspired (*nisi Caesari Octaviano deus quidam illam mentem dedisset*), and in doing so, he elevates him to heroic status. Brutus and Cassius likewise were also described as heroes immediately following Caesar’s death,\(^6\) and this may provide a reference point for Cicero’s purpose. The mentioning of heroic status may have signposted his intention earlier through the mentioning of the undying praise Brutus received for his leniency. Thus, Cicero highlights Octavian’s importance in the unfolding events by characterising him through the omission of the consuls, through the rise to hero status, and finally through the connection of Octavian to the salvation from tyranny with the references to the positive changes which were occurring. In some way Cicero could be seen as trying to demonstrate that Octavian should be included amongst those heroes,

\(^5\) Examples of this include *ad Brut.* 1.4.4-5; 1.15.

\(^6\) Examples include *Att.* 14.4.2; 14.6.1; 14.11.1; 15.12.2. The description of Cassius and Brutus as ‘heroes’ will be discussed in full in Chapter One, esp. pp. 136-65.
including Brutus, who have saved the State. Whatever the reason, the attempts at character depiction and persuasion identify the rhetorical nature of the language being employed in this letter.

The depiction of Antonius with the disreputable superlative adjectives (perditissimi hominis et turpissimi) is fairly standard for Cicero. Any reading of the Philippics will give numerous similar descriptions. Not only does Cicero use defamatory comments to mar his character, he points to the fact that Antonius is behaving as an autocrat, and it is only Octavian who stands in his way. In doing so, Cicero sets Antonius and Octavian in opposition. This allows a diametric comparison of the god-like, heroic Octavian to the immoral, despotic Antonius. Secondly, this comparison shows to Brutus that these two heirs of Caesar - one politically, one hereditary – are disparate. This would be an attempt to ease Brutus’ mind on the dangers of trusting Octavian. One final possibility is that it allows a comparison of the unsuccessful results of the Ides, in addition to the passive and lenient approach of Brutus’ methodology, with the prospect and hope of change instilled in the positive actions that Octavian is taking through Cicero’s initiative. This is suggested by Cicero’s final statement, which could read as much as a criticism of Brutus as it is a justification of Octavian. If Brutus had finished the job by assassinating Antonius as well, then there would have been no need to employ and advance Octavian. This final suggestion is of course speculative and impossible to verify from the evidence at hand.
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However, it is undeniable that Cicero states that if, on the Ides, Antonius had been disposed of, the current problems would not exist. By extension that would mean that Octavian presently would not need to be supported. A reminder to Brutus of his shared responsibility for the crises currently unfolding is not unfeasible in this rhetoric.

This letter is a perfect example of Cicero’s use of character depiction. He portrays Brutus as idealistic in his approach to the political situation, reminding him not only of the heroism of the Ides, but also of the inability of that deed to bring about the desired benefit. Octavian is then depicted as the one who has stepped in and has taken up the fight against Antonius. By doing so, Cicero appears to use comparisons between Octavian and Antonius, and also Octavian and Brutus, to accentuate their personalities and suggest a certain perception of their actions, in an attempt to justify his support of the young man. It is through the agency of Octavian that real change may finally happen, a change that did not progress any further than hope under Brutus’ notions of leniency and peace. History reveals that Cicero’s support of Octavian would eventually lead to his death through the proscriptions of the triumvirs. Yet at this time the depiction of Octavian as a hero for the republic and an instrument of change seem clear. To what extent Cicero actually believed that Octavian’s depiction was accurate is questionable, and there are plenty of examples to
suggest that he did not in fact trust the young Caesar. Yet in spite of this, Cicero still depicts him to Brutus in this way in the correspondence. The rhetorical and literary devices clearly can be seen, and convincing Brutus to trust Octavian and to work with him towards a restored republic seems a possible motive for these attempts at persuasion.

It is the purpose of this study not only to make these depictions of character clearer, but, as has been done in the above example, to look at the method that underpins Cicero’s use of character depiction. At times it may be possible to attempt to provide a reason for these depictions, and to consider to what extent these characterisations were designed to be believed. Would Cicero’s correspondents have recognised characterisation as a standard rhetorical device? Before this can be considered, the nature of ancient correspondence, particularly in reference to Cicero, must be placed into context.

0.3: EPISTOLARY THEORY AND CICERO

The previous scholarship on Cicero is both invaluable and dauntingly large. With this comes the multitude of translations and commentaries on the letters themselves, including the seminal commentaries of Tyrrell and Purser (T&P)

---

7 A famous example is the report that Cicero stated that Octavian ought to be ‘praised, decorated, and removed’ (*Fam.* 11.20.1).
and Shackleton Bailey (SB). This thesis is greatly indebted to this wealth of scholarship. Similarly, there has been a recent revival of studies concerning ancient epistolary writings, and also Cicero himself. This thesis contributes to these trends by foregrounding an aspect of the correspondence that has often either been missed or ignored, particularly how Cicero uses depictions of character as a rhetorical device in his letters. Character depictions have long been identified in Cicero’s speeches, but the letters have not generally had the same type of scrutiny placed upon them. This seems incredible when one looks at how the ancients viewed the portraits of character in the epistolary tradition.

A sample of the books written in recent years on ancient epistolary theory include: Altman (1982); Stowers (1986); Malherbe (1988); Stirewalt (1993); Rosenmeyer (2001); Trapp (2003); Rosenmeyer (2006); Morello & Morrison (2007); Poster & Mitchell (2007); Muir (2008); Hodkinson, Rosenmeyer & Bracke (2013).


Recent books on Roman oratory and rhetoric include Berry & Erskine (2010b), Steel & van der Blom (2013). Some exploration of ‘epistolary persuasion’ and rhetoric in letters can be found in Reed (1997); Ebbeler (2007), Morello (2013).


Cole (1923) was more a panegyric of Cicero’s correspondence than a serious study of Cicero’s use of character in the letters.
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One of the more well known, and arguably the first, treatises on epistolary theory is Demetrius’ *De Elocutione* (On Style). In this work, Demetrius relates the opinion of Artemon, the compiler of Aristotle’s letters, on the general nature of letters (*Eloc. 223*):

> Ἀρτέμων μὲν οὖν ὁ τὰς Ἀριστοτέλους ἀναγράψας ἐπιστολάς φησιν, ὅτι δεῖ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τρόπῳ διάλογόν τε γράφειν καὶ ἐπιστολάς· εἶναι γάρ τὴν ἐπιστολήν οἷον τὸ ἐπερον μέρος τοῦ διαλόγου.

*Artemon, the compiler of the letters of Aristotle says that it is necessary to write letters in the same way as dialogue, for a letter is like one side of a dialogue.*

This Artemon is otherwise unknown, but it is established that the letter is similar to a dialogue, be it one sided. In this way, letters can be seen as

---

13 For commentary, text and discussions on various aspects of this work, including the rejection of Demetrius of Phalerum’s authorship see Grube (1961), Schenkeveld (1964), Radermacher (1967), Roberts (1969).

14 *RE* 2.1447. Koskenniemi suggested that he may have been a contemporary of Theophrastus, using the letter collections of Plato and Epicurus as evidence (1956: 25).

15 Demetrius does not fully agree with Artemon, thinking that the letter should be more studied than dialogue (δεῖ γὰρ ὑποκατεσκευάσθαι πιως μᾶλλον τοῦ διαλόγου τὴν ἐπιστολήν), and is in some way a gift for the recipient (δῶρον πέμπεται τρόπον τινά) (*Eloc. 224*).
INTRODUCTION

conversational. Cicero himself confirms this in a letter to Q. Cornificius (Fam. 12.30.1): ¹⁶

aut quid mi iucundius quam, cum coram tecum loqui non possim, aut scribere ad te aut tuas legere litteras?

But what is more pleasing to me than, when it is not possible to speak with you in your presence, either to write to you or to read your letters?

Thus the letter becomes a surrogate for conversation,¹⁷ and a way of bridging distance between correspondents. In the epistolary tradition, this conversational aspect of the letter was also extended to stylistic considerations. As the fourth-century Gregory of Nazianzus states (Ep. 51.4.18-19):

περὶ δὲ σαφηνείας ἐκεῖνο γνώριμον, ὅτι χρὴ φεύγοντα τὸ λογοειδές, ὅσον ἐνδέχεται, μᾶλλον εἰς τὸ λαλικὸν ἀποκλίνειν.

¹⁶ At the time of this letter, probably June 43 (SB (1977: 561)), Q. Cornificius was still in the province of Africa, and had been since Caesar’s death. He remained there refusing to cede the province to anyone without proper senate notification (App. BC 4.53-56; cf. D.C. 48.21). In 42, he was defeated and slain by T. Sextius, with the aid of the African King Arabio.

¹⁷ A link between the letter genre and oral communication is probably as early as the letter itself, with examples seen in Near-Eastern cuneiform letters (Schroeder (1938: 62); Knutson (1981: 16)). Other instances of this link in the correspondence of Cicero include: Att. 8.14.1; 9.10.1; 12.53. One particularly interesting example is the extended direct dialogue reporting of Att. 13.42.
And about clarity this is well known, that one must avoid the prosaic, as far as possible, and rather turn towards the conversational.

Seneca, prompted by an accusation of careless composition in his correspondence, uses the conversational style of letters as a defence (Ep. 75.1):

 quis enim accurate loquitur, nisi qui vult putide loqui? qualis sermo meus esset, si una desideremus aut ambularemus, inlaboratus et facilis, tales esse epistulas meas volo, quae nihil habent accersitum nec fictum.

For who speaks carefully, unless he wants to speak affectedly? What my discourse would be, if we were sitting or walking together, spontaneous and easy, so I want my letters to be, which have nothing forced nor artificial.

Thus, the conversational aspect of the letter has continuity throughout ancient scholarship. This is not surprising, with Koskenniemi previously identifying Demetrius’ On Style as forming the basis of all later theorists. It is the communicational aspect of the letter that allows the identification of personality. The earliest epistolary theorists acknowledge expressions of character as an important feature of letter writing. Demetrius states (Eloc. 227):

---

The letter, like also the dialogue, should abound in expression of character. For I dare say that everyone writes a letter as a likeness of their own soul. And whilst it is possible also to know the character of the writer from any other discourse, nothing in this way as much as from a letter.

Epistolartry theory therefore suggests that letters reveal the character of the sender like no other form of writing. Of course treatises on epistolary theory, especially those arising several centuries after Cicero’s death, do not necessarily reflect accurately actual letter writing practices in the Late Roman Republican period, let alone how they relate to the correspondence of Cicero. Fortunately, a similar sentiment can be found in the Cicero’s letters. Quintus, writing to his older brother at the beginning of 47 B.C., states (Fam. 16.6.2):

I saw you completely in your letter.

---

19 Other works not yet mentioned include Pseudo-Demetrius’ Τύποι Επιστολικοί, C. Iulius Victor’s de Epistolis (contained as an appendix to the larger work Ars Rhetorica), Philostratus of Lemnos’ de Epistulis, and Pseudo-Libanius’ Ἐπιστολιμαῖοι Χαρακτῆρες.
This is the clearest indication that the *topos* of character expression had spread to the letters of Cicero. This should not be considered unusual for the writers of the Roman world. In his moral epistles, Seneca continues this thread, further expanding on this idea (*Ep. 40.1*):

> quod frequenter mihi scribis, gratias ago. nam quo uno modo potes, te mihi ostendis. numquam epistulam tuam accipio, ut non protinus una simus … quanto iucundiores sunt litterae, quae vera amici absentis vestigia, veras notas adferunt?

*Because you write to me frequently, I thank you. For in the only way in which you are able, you are revealing yourself to me. Every time I receive your letter we are together immediately … how much more pleasant are letters which bring true traces, true signs of an absent friend?*

Thus, writers like Cicero and Seneca believed that they should construct their correspondence to represent character. However, the mirroring of personality is not restricted to the writer alone, but extends also to the recipient of the letter. The language, turns of phrase, levels of familiarity, and other factors can demonstrate whether the reader of a letter is expected to approve or disapprove of the writer’s statements. It can also show the relative status and relationship of
the reader to the writer. As such, the letter reveals the character of the recipient, informing the secondary reader of more intimate details of the life and opinions of ancient personages. Of all the types of letters, the one which most aptly demonstrates these features is the ‘letter of recommendation’. These letters are written with the recipient in mind, attempting to represent the endorsed person as having those characteristics which the addressee would see as most favourable or beneficial. Intrinsically, these features are supposed to embody the personality of the recipient, as if the writer was holding

---

20 The effect of relative status on letters was identified by epistolary theorists such as Julius Victor (Ars Rhet. 27): epistola, si superiori scribas, ne iocularis sit; si pari, ne inhumana; si inferiori, ne superba; neque docto incuriose, neque indocto indiligenter, nec coniunctissimo translatitie, nec minus familiari non amice – ‘If you are writing to a superior, the letter should not be ingratiating; if to an equal, not uncultured, if to an inferior, not haughty; nor careless to the learned, nor slack to the uneducated, nor casually written to the closest, nor less intimate to someone not close’. See also Demetr. Eloc. 234; Ps. Demetr. 1. For the role of social relationships and amicitia on poetry and patronage, an area which has many connections to letter writing as a form of literary activity in upper-class Roman society, see White (1978), (1982), (1993).


22 An amusing answer Cicero received from Caesar in April of 54 indicates that favourable depictions were a standard practice and known by all. In response to Cicero’s recommendation, Caesar wrote: M. Curtii filium, quem mihi commendas, vel regem Galliae faciam, vel hunc Leptae delega. – ‘the son of M. Curtius, whom you recommended to me, either I will make him King of Gaul or hand him off to Lepta’. (Fam. 7.5.2). It would seem that Cicero may have been a little excessive with his recommendation.
up a mirror to them. This mirroring represents the characteristics they would like the recipient to exemplify, and expect the addressee to value.

An exemplar of mirroring can be seen in the letter from M. Iunius Brutus to Cicero written in June 43. With Cicero in mind, Brutus opens his letter recommending C. Antistius Vetus by stating (*ad Brut. 1.11.1*):

> Veteris Antisti talis animus est in rem publicam ut non dubitem quin et in Caesare et Antonio se praestaturus fuerit acerrimum propugnatorem communis libertatis, si occasioni potuisset occurrere.

> So excellent the mind of Vetus Antistius is towards the State that there is no doubt that he would have shown himself a vigorous champion of common liberty in dealing with Caesar and Antonius, if he had been able to meet the occasion.

Brutus knew that there was no better strategy for endorsing Antistius than an appeal to the patriotism of Cicero, and this is demonstrated by Brutus depicting Antistius not only as a patriot in mind, but also in body, using superlative and compounded language (*acerrimum propugnatorem*) to emphasise this point. His use of a hypothetical example is enlightening. The premise of the conditional is that if Antistius had been in Rome at the time, he would have defended the State against both Caesar and Antonius. This stops short of saying he would have participated in the assassination of Caesar, and certainly does not mean
he would have supported a proposed eradication of Antonius. After all, Cicero had no direct part in the assassination and still was a loyalist to the Republic. However, this example is used by Brutus to direct Cicero’s attention back to the Ides of March and the supreme undertaking that it was. Thus this letter not only reflects Cicero’s patriotism, but also Brutus’ sense of self-sacrifice and importance. This letter clearly identifies the use of rhetorical and literary devices in order to convince and persuade the recipient towards certain viewpoints and perspectives. Brutus draws upon what he knows about Cicero and how he wants to be seen by him, so that the letter both constructs Antistius and functions to manipulate and construct the depictions of Brutus, Cicero and even their relationship.

Not only are the personalities of the sender and recipient present in correspondence, but often a third category of depiction can also be detected. The letters of Cicero are full of references to various contemporaries, and this forms the characterisation of third party personalities. This is a level of literary portraiture that has the potential to reveal extensive rhetoric in the depictions of character by the writer of the letter. How a person is depicted in passing is evidence for how the writer wants the recipient to view the writer and the person depicted, within established social relations. In the ideal world of epistolary

---

23 SB (1980: 240) made this assumption in regard to the assassination of Caesar. However, T&P (1899: 128) were more cautious, stating only that he would have been ‘an active opponent to the monarchy’.
theory these would be portraits which accurately mirror that person’s actual character. However, the correspondence of Cicero, and in fact all real correspondence,\textsuperscript{24} does not exist in this ideal world. Letters are a construct of reality and ‘not a reflection’.\textsuperscript{25} This thesis focuses on the constructs in order to understand Cicero’s methodology and political, rhetorical and social strategies.

Just as oratorical speeches of all types are designed for persuasion, so too can letters be used for the same purpose. Orators invest much time in precise phrasing and word choice to achieve maximum effect in their speeches. Some are so affected that they show signs of editing after the delivery of the actual speech. Others, although they appear as if they were presented to a captive audience, only exist on the written page. A famous example of this is Cicero’s Second Philippic. As such, the speech can bend, expand, reduce or omit the truth to suit the purpose of the orator. In the same way, personality can be augmented or diminished to aid the transmission of the orator’s argument. The highly stylised, intentional portrayal of character in the Philippics, such as the invective in the depiction of Antonius, demonstrates an example of the perception of historical figures that Cicero wanted his audience to see. An

\textsuperscript{24} ‘Real correspondence’ relates to letters which are genuinely written and sent by the actual correspondent to be read by a specific recipient as communications. This definition is intended to distinguish them from those letters which are either forgeries or literature written in epistolary style for effect, moralising and pedagogical reasons. For these types of fictional letters see Costa (2001), Rosenmeyer (2001).

\textsuperscript{25} Rosenmeyer (2001: 5).
example of this from the *Second Philippic* shows Cicero using the forensic technique of stating what he is not going to say about Antonius (*Phil. 2.19.47*):

sed iam stupra et flagitia omittamus; sunt quaedam, quae honeste non possum dicere; tu autem eo liberior, quod ea in te admisisti, quae a verecundo inimico audire non posses.

*But now let us dismiss his promiscuities and disgraces; there are some things which I cannot say with decency; you, however, are more unconstrained, since you admit in yourself those things which you are not able to hear from a modest enemy.*

Months earlier, on 26 April 44, Cicero wrote directly to Antonius concerning his request to allow Sextus Cloelius to return from exile. A copy of this letter he sent on to Atticus. Cicero was not pleased about this on a number of grounds,\(^{26}\) one of which was that Antonius had failed to appeal to Cicero in person. Despite this, Cicero writes (*Att. 14.13b.1*):

---

\(^{26}\) The proposed recall of Cloelius really annoyed Cicero. In his letter to Atticus he exclaimed to Antonius’ request itself, as well as the way it was written (*Att. 14.13.6*): *quam dissolute, quam turpiter quamque ita perniciose ut non numquam Caesar desiderandus esse videatur, facile existimabis* – ‘how depravedly, shamelessly and so dangerously, so that it might even seem that Caesar should be longed for, you will easily appreciate’. To desire the return to Caesar’s reign was not something that Cicero lightly would joke about and it emphasises his disdain for the proposal which had supposedly come from Caesar’s notebooks.
quod mecum per litteras agis unam ob causam mallem coram egisses; non enim solum ex oratione, sed etiam ex vultu et oculis et fronte, ut aiunt, meum erga te amorem perspicere potuisses. nam cum te semper amavi, primum tuo studio, post etiam beneficio provocatus, tum his temporibus res publica te mihi ita commendavit ut cariorem habeam neminem.

The business you conducted with me through a letter, for one reason I would have preferred you to have conducted in person; for not only from my declaration, but also from my expression and eyes and face, as they say, you could have seen my affection towards you. For not only have I always been fond of you, firstly motivated on account of your zeal, afterwards because of genuine benefit, but also in these times the State commended you to me in such a way that I regard no-one more dearly.

This describes a completely different relationship with Antonius than in the passage from the Philippics. Of course the timing, situation, intended audience, medium of expression, and countless other nuances are different, but this is precisely the point most of interest in this thesis. Despite being annoyed at the request, he chooses to approach Antonius in an overtly friendly manner, calling on their mutual affection in a saccharine display of friendship and harmony. Hall
has identified this letter, and Antonius’ earlier letter of request \((Att. 14.13A)\), as carefully formulated and standardised expression of politeness in politics in response to a potentially face-threatening event.\(^{27}\) In highlighting characterisation in epistolography, one must ask why Cicero chose this mode of expression here, but another in the \textit{Philippics}.

Despite Seneca’s earlier exclamation of the guileless nature of his letters, it is clear that the epistolary style is affected. The mere presence of epistolary theorists and handbooks is evidence of this fact, as is the typology of letter styles. The number of types in epistolary theories range from a few to several dozen.\(^{28}\) Cicero also distinguishes between two types of letters in regard to several different sets of criteria. Firstly he differentiates between letters that are for the communication of factual important information, which he refers to as the reason letters were invented \((\textit{Fam.} 2.4.1)\), and those which communicate the mood of the sender. The letter which demonstrate mood can further be broken down into the intimate and humorous \((\textit{unum familiare et iocosum})\), and the austere and serious \((\textit{alterum severum et grave})\) \((\textit{Fam.} 2.4.1, \text{cf.} 4.13.1)\). Cicero

\(^{27}\) Hall (2009: 94-97). He adds that Cicero’s response is an ‘arch parody of the aristocratic rituals that Antony has initiated, one written muttering and through gritted teeth. His exaggeratedly fulsome language teeters awkwardly on the edge of sarcasm.’ (2009: 98).

\(^{28}\) Julius Victor saw two types of letter styles, the \textit{litterae negotiales} and \textit{familiares}, whereas Pseudo-Demetrius’ \textit{Týpoi Επιστολικοί} lists twenty one types and Pseudo-Libanius’ \textit{Επιστολιμαίοι Χαρακτήρες} has forty one.
also makes a distinction between public and private letters (*Flac. 37*). In writing to Trebonius in 46 BC, he wrote (*Fam. 15.21.4*):

> primum enim ego illas Calvo litteras misi non plus quam has quas nunc legis existimans exituras; aliter enim scribimus quod eos solos quibus mittimus, aliter quod multos lecturos putamus.

*Firstly I sent that letter to Calvus, not expecting its circulation any more than this one, which now you read. For we write in one way what we expect only the people to whom we sent it to read, and in another way what we expect many to read.*

Cicero admits that the intended audience alters the way in which a letter is written. As a result, characterisation in a public letter should be more similar to that in a speech, since both are intended for an extended audience.\(^{29}\) The private letter, however, should contain information more relevant to the individual correspondents, and in particularly, to the status differential between these correspondents.\(^ {30}\) So if letters are written with an audience in mind, and this affects the information contained, this should also extend to include the way

\(^{29}\) It is accepted that the sort of self-presentation required with different audiences will change, and as such there is no ‘persona’ which neatly fits both a speech and a public letter.

\(^{30}\) The problem, however, is in deciding which letters are private and which are public. There is also evidence of Cicero being cautious about the confidential delivery of his letters (see Nicholson (1994) for a full discussion of the delivery and confidentiality of Cicero’s letters), and this would certainly affect the way he wrote what was essentially a private letter.
in which people are depicted, and thus how they are perceived by the recipient. Such character depictions attempt to persuade the recipient to think similarly towards the subject, and this aspect of the epistolary style demonstrates the persuasive power of the letter. In this way it mimics the intention of other forms of literature, most notably the forensic speech. In these speeches the purpose lies in encouraging the audience to identify the defendant or accuser in a particular light, and thus ‘proving’ their innocence or guilt. Even though not as forthright as a speech, the character depictions in Cicero’s letters are often of a similar nature, seeking to influence the way in which an addressee conceives a person or event.

One of the more difficult barriers for understanding Cicero’s correspondence is the intentional use of ambiguity. Cicero is particularly adept at ambiguity in language and meaning. He uses codes and nicknames, Greek words, private jokes and any number of other techniques to help disguise his intentions and targets, and to protect himself from the possible interception of his letters. This secrecy did not go unnoticed even in the ancient world, with Julius Victor directly commenting on this (*Ars Rhet. 27*):

\[
\text{lucem vero epistolis praefulgere oportet, nisi cum consulto}
\]
\[
\text{clandestinae litterae fiant, quae tamen ita ceteris occultae esse}
\]

31 Of course, often these types of expressions are used for other purposes as well.
debent, ut his, ad quos mittuntur, clarae perspicuaeque sint. solent etiam notas inter se secretiores pacisci, quod et Caesar et Augustus et Cicero et alii plerique fecerunt.

 Truly clarity ought to radiate forth in letters, unless the letters are deliberately covert, which, nevertheless, ought to be obscure to others, yet to those whom they were sent to, they should be clear and evident. For men are accustomed to agree upon fairly secretive codes amongst themselves, which Caesar, Augustus, Cicero, and many others did.

Here lies the problem for the modern scholar of Cicero’s correspondence. What was clear to Atticus, for instance, in Cicero’s letters to him was not necessarily clear to anyone else at that time, let alone in the modern era. One prime example comes from a letter to Atticus in December 50 in which grammatical conventions on the use of pronouns are strained (Att. 7.4.2):

plane illum a se alienatum cum ante intellegere, tum vero proxime iudicasse; venisse Hirtium a Caesare, qui esset illi familiarissimus, ad se non accessisse et, cum ille a. d. vii Id. Dec. vespere venisset, Balbus de tota re constituisset a.d. vii ad Scipionem ante lucem venire, multa de nocte eum profectum esse ad Caesarem. hoc ille τεκμηριῶδες videbatur esse alienationis.
[He said that] he [Pompey] not only clearly realised beforehand that he [Caesar] was withdrawing from him, but he was also certain of it most recently; Hirtius had come from Caesar, who was most intimate with him [Hirtius], but had not approached him [Pompey], and when he [Hirtius] had arrived on the evening of the December 6, and when Balbus had arranged to go to Scipio before dawn on the 7th to talk about the whole matter, Hirtius, late at night, had set out to join Caesar. This seemed to Pompey to be absolute proof of their estrangement.

Cicero’s style in this letter is confusing. His use of pronouns throughout this passage often makes it difficult to be certain whom he is referring to. In regard to this Shackleton Bailey writes:32

Atticus with his knowledge of the persons concerned could not possibly fail to understand. In such a case is need not refer to the nearest grammatically permissible antecedent... the same applies to hic... also to ille... also to qui...

Thus, Cicero’s use of pronouns was grammatically confusing, but presumably logically coherent to Atticus. By writing in this way, Cicero makes his style very guarded, and puts in place a type of code, which could be deciphered by

32 SB (1965a: 348-9).
Atticus. Others, however, who might also decipher it, could not be absolutely certain that they had interpreted it correctly. The letters abound in these codes and ambiguities, but nevertheless, there is meaning behind these. Similarly, the way he portrays people in the letters is not accidental. Real intent in his depictions are noted through the use of ambiguities, codes, sly comments or seemingly off-the-cuff remarks, some of which continue for months and through series of letters. Few comments are impromptu in Cicero. He may get excited and impassioned; he may even get things wrong at times, but he was foremost an orator. There were arguably more influential politicians than Cicero and still more who were skilled in manipulating events and people, such as Pompey and Caesar. Yet what makes Cicero stand out are his oratorical skills. One of Cicero’s particular skills was in controlling the way in which he depicts others. Throughout the correspondence, and indeed all his works, Cicero is constantly representing the people he mentions with purpose and intent. Sometimes this is blatant and easy to spot, other times it is far more subtle. In these cases, his motives need to be pieced together over time, with evidence slowly building with each new piece of information.

The purpose of this study, in identifying these characterisations, is not to find the 'real' person behind personalities. This is an unachievable goal even without

---

33 It should also be noted that Cicero is our dominant source for this period, and with this come both awareness of his life and abilities but also a cautionary note of bias.
entering into philosophical discussion of what someone’s ‘real’ personality is. Rather, it seeks to investigate the techniques which Cicero uses to depict them.\(^{34}\) This will be particularly useful for characters whose personalities, as they relate to Cicero, seem to change over time. However, to gain some understanding of why he would do so, it is important first to summarise briefly the period that this study will focus on: the Late Roman Republic.

**0.4: THE AFTERSHOCK OF THE IDES**

On the Ides of March, the Roman world was changed forever. The death of Caesar did not result in the restoration of the republic, as had been the hope of the conspirators. The republic could not recover, and instead a struggle emerged for influence, if not power, in the Roman world. Individuals such as M. Antonius, M. Iunius Brutus, C. Cassius Longinus, M. Aemilius Lepidus, and of course, C. Octavius became the obvious contenders. Others, whose contributions are sometimes underplayed by modern historians due to the weight of the aforementioned leviathans, were also crucial in the struggle. Included amongst these were the consuls of 43, C. Vibius Pansa Caetronianus and Aulus Hirtius, but also the sinister and brutally ambitious P. Cornelius

\(^{34}\) As mentioned, when possible, some suggestions as to Cicero’s motives may also be offered, but the speculative nature of such assumptions should always be acknowledged.
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Dolabella. However, above all these people, sometimes in the background, other times conspicuous to all, was M. Tullius Cicero. The significance of Cicero in the final years of the republic has long been noted, particularly through his impassioned invective speeches, the *Philippics*. However, the true impact of Cicero upon these events and during the crucial years that followed deserves further examination.

Immediately after the assassination of Caesar, one of the leaders of the conspiracy, M. Iunius Brutus, embroiled the elderly statesman Cicero in the conflict that would eventually lead to not only his death, but also the demise of the republic (*Phil. 2.12.28*):

> ‘Caesare interfecto’ inquit, ‘statim cruentum alte extollens Brutus pugionem Ciceronem nominatim exclamavit atque ei recuperatam libertatem est gratulatus.’

*Antonius said ‘When Caesar was killed, at once lifting up the bloody dagger high, Brutus called out Cicero by name and congratulated him on the restoration of liberty.’*

With this action, Cicero was implicated into the conspiracy, and was left open to criticism. It is in response to the invective from M. Antonius that Cicero wrote his *Second Philippic*. Despite it never being delivered in public, the later publication of this document effectively sealed his fate. One part of this speech is a defence
of Brutus’ impassioned cry of ‘Cicero’. Cicero himself always denied any knowledge of the assassination, yet never the historicity of this episode. Defending his position, he states that Brutus’ comment was nothing more than a comparison with his own equally bloody action over the Catilinarian conspirators (Phil. 2.12.28). All these legally unsanctioned murders were done with the intention of freeing Rome from the oppression of a single man. In Cicero’s case, it was the perception of tyranny, in Brutus’, the tyranny was arguably real.

The years after Caesar’s death saw Cicero’s participation in politics at Rome vary significantly. Within this period, two distinct phases of involvement can be noted. The first phase, from Caesar’s assassination to Cicero’s delivery of his First Philippic on September 2, is a period of inactivity in which Cicero avoided Rome and any direct involvement in politics. For months Cicero moved from estate to estate, not returning to Rome until August 31. His influence is still present throughout this time, mainly in his dealings with the personalities of this period, yet he has no real direct connection with the actual machinations. Cicero did not want to take a leading role at this stage. He acknowledges the fight which must be undertaken, offers suggestions on how this could be achieved, criticises the events and actions of the main players, but he does not see it as his fight. On May 11, writing to Atticus, he says (Att. 14.21.3):

35 Listed amongst the towns Cicero stayed at are Antium, Arpinum, Astura, Cumae, Formiae, Fundi, Lanuvium, Pompeii, Puteoli, Sinuessa, and Tusculum.
amariorem enim me senectus facit. stomachor omnia. sed mihi quidem βεβίωται; viderint iuvenes.

For old age makes me more cantankerous. I seethe about everything. But indeed I have lived my life; let the youth consider it.

Cicero thought it was unfitting for an old man to fight a war (*Att. 14.19.1*), even a metaphorical war.

It has already been mentioned that Cicero did not return to Rome during this period of passivity. This fits a pattern of withdrawal for Cicero, either physically or politically, whenever he perceived the politics at Rome had become too dangerous. Similarly, his mental anguish and procrastination over whether or not to leave Italy itself finds a direct comparison in his dilemma over whether and when to leave Italy to join Pompey in 49 (e.g. *Att. 8.1; 8.3*). At the end of May 44 he writes (*Att. 15.5.3*):

> mihi vero deliberatum est, ut nunc quidem est, abesse ex ea urbe in qua non modo florui cum summa verum etiam servivi cum aliqua dignitate; nec tam statui ex Italia exire, de quo tecum deliberabo, quam istuc non venire.

Truly I have decided, as things now stand, to be absent from this city in which not only did I flourish with the highest dignity but even in
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servitude I was with some of it; I am not as decided about leaving Italy, which I will discuss with you, as I am about not going to Rome.

There is regret here in his perception of having to leave the city, and this seems heartfelt. However, his hesitation about leaving Italy appears overplayed, since he had already, earlier in the month, begun the process of seeking a legateship which would allow him to leave Italy legitimately (Att. 14.22.2). He was allowing for further contingencies, and even after he had eventually decided to leave, Cicero continued to hesitate until he finally boarded a ship at Leucopetra on August 6 (Att. 16.7.1). His intention was eventually to depart and to return to Rome on the Kalends of January, when the new consuls had been instated (Att. 16.6.2). His return would be much sooner. As if by fate\(^36\), winds blew the ship back to Italian shores, and what appeared to be good news sent Cicero back to Rome.\(^37\) His intention, however, at this time was not to take part in politics. He

\(^36\) A pseudo-supernatural aspect to his return can be indicated in his letter to Cornificius from March 43, where Cicero describes his return through the personification of the winds calling him back to Rome as if loyal citizens refusing to allow him to leave – *cum me etesiae quasi boni cives relinquentem rem publicam prosequi noluerunt* (Fam. 12.25.3; cf. Brut. 1.15.5).

\(^37\) Amongst the news was an edict from Cassius and Brutus, as well as the appearance of stronger support from these men in that they had apparently summoned ex-praetors and consuls to be present at the meeting. Amongst the signs of better support in the Senate was Piso’s criticism of Antonius on August 1 (*Phil. 1.6.14-15*; cf. Rawson (1992: 476-477). This also would have added to Cicero’s desire to return to Rome. There was also a rumour that Antonius was about to compromise. Cicero’s last reason, however, probably held the most sway to him - people had begun criticising his absence (Att. 16.7.1). The possibility of a loss of standing was a crucial issue to him. On the events leading to Cicero’s return see Mitchell (1991: 289-301); Ramsey (2001); *Phil. 1.3.8*; *Att. 16.7*; *Fam. 12.25.3*. 34
still believed that responsibility lay with the younger generation; the ones who had started the process (Att. 16.7.7):

nec ego nunc, ut Brutus censebat, istuc ad rem publicam capessendam venio. quid enim fieri potest? .... sed abesse hanc aetatem longe a sepulcro negant oportere.

Nor do I now, as Brutus was recommending, come to Rome to participate in politics. For what can be done? .... But they say that one of my age ought not to be too far away from their grave.

The period which follows, from Cicero’s return to Rome on August 31 until his death in December of 43,38 marked a period of great activity for the now elderly statesman39. His influence steadily grew until he became arguably the most important man in Rome.40 His auctoritas was undeniable, and by his own testimony in the correspondence the impression given is that nobody moved

38 Apart from a two month departure, leaving soon after Antonius’ departure on October 9 (Fam. 12.23.2), and returning around December 9 (Fam. 11.5.1), Cicero remained in Rome for this entire period.
39 For a summary of the period immediately following Caesar’s assassination see Syme (1939: 97-192); Frisch (1946); Mitchell (1991: 289-301); Rawson (1992: 477-487); Tempest (2011: 183-208); Richardson (2012: 10-37).
40 Whilst holding no official command, Cicero mediated and effectively had a say on everything from senatorial rulings to provincial governors, and even, to a certain extent, the consuls of 43. This is evident in extant letters and references to the majority of powerful people writing directly to Cicero and asking him for advice or assistance.
without his knowledge.\footnote{The letters themselves are not necessarily an accurate indication of actual influence since they naturally contain information which directly involved Cicero, and which therefore would make his influence seem greater. Similarly, as noted throughout the thesis, these events are perhaps written in a way to accentuate Cicero's importance within the situation. Even the predominance of Cicero's works as an evidentiary source for this period and the later editing of Cicero's letters could create a further bias by depicting him as the man at the centre of activities in this period.} His \textit{amicitia} was extensive, spreading from the 'liberators',\footnote{The use of the term 'liberators' for the assassins of Caesar will be investigated in Chapter One, esp. pp. 51-86.} those who saw Caesar's death as the only way to restore some semblance of a republic back to Rome, to the 'Caesarians', the men who had supported and profited from the rule of the now dead tyrant.\footnote{It certainly can be argued that the divisions between these groups had largely dissolved soon after Caesar's death, making it difficult to assign many people to either label, but in other cases, a distinction is still visible. Cicero declared to Brutus in April 43 that the Caesarian party was active and still referred to themselves as the \textit{pars Caesaris} (\textit{ad Brut.} 2.4.5).} It is during this time that Cicero again began to consider active participation in State business, and this was spurred on by the newest personality in politics. When he was in Puteoli on November 5, he wrote about a letter he had received from Octavian (\textit{Att.} 16.11.6):

\begin{quote}
\footnotesize
\begin{greek}
εγὼ μοι, ὡς εἰπον, Πομπηιανόν οὐκ ἔβαινα, πρῶτον τοὺς ὀκτώμους τοὺς ἀταιρίους, ἀπὸ τοῦ Οκταβίαν κοτίδιο τῇσ δεδομένηι, ἐπὶ φάγειν τὰς ἱματικὰς ἐπὶ τὸν καλὸν νόμον, Καπουάμ ἐρχομένης, ἄλλομεν ἀπὸ τὴν πόλιν ἀνεκριτὸν, Ῥώμην ἀλλὰ ἐπικάρδια ἀπεκδεχόμεθα.
\end{greek}
\end{quote}

\footnote{The letters themselves are not necessarily an accurate indication of actual influence since they naturally contain information which directly involved Cicero, and which therefore would make his influence seem greater. Similarly, as noted throughout the thesis, these events are perhaps written in a way to accentuate Cicero's importance within the situation. Even the predominance of Cicero's works as an evidentiary source for this period and the later editing of Cicero's letters could create a further bias by depicting him as the man at the centre of activities in this period.}
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I, as I had written, have not removed myself to Pompeii, firstly on account of the storms, of which nothing is fouler; then on account of the letters every day from Octavian that I undertake the plan, come to Capua, and save the republic again, at any rate to return to Rome at once. ‘Durst not refuse for shame, for fear accept’.

This letter shows a shift in Cicero’s perspective of the importance of his role in the current struggle, be it solicited at this point. He was once again being called to ‘save the republic’ or at least to be at hand to do so. The Homeric quotation from Hector’s challenge to the Achaeans indicates not only Cicero’s apprehension at exposing himself to the dangers inherent in a return to Rome, but also places Cicero’s action firmly within the heroic setting (Il. 7.93). A glimpse of Cicero’s opinions and political and private standing is achieved through depictions of Octavian’s indefatigability and naïve enthusiasm. It is Cicero’s connections with the central figures of the Late Republic, like Octavian, that provide the best insight into his role in politics during this period. Due to the instability of the political situation and the struggle for supremacy by dominant

44 The same quote is used at Att. 6.1.25, but its ‘application here is inexact whichever way we understand the context’ (SB (1968: 253)), T&P (1914: 202) attempting to rescue Cicero by stating that it is ‘a modern law that a quotation should exactly suit the thing to which it is applied’. It is far more likely that the exact meaning is in some way lost to the modern reader but was perfectly logical to Atticus and Cicero.
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personalities, there is surely no coincidence that the years following Caesar’s death are one of the most prolific periods for Cicero’s correspondence.

Some 210 letters come from this period, many more are no doubt lost. The greatest loss is the abrupt termination of the letters to Atticus on November 12. This unexpected cessation, particularly since other correspondence continues into July 43, is curious. Why would the correspondence between Cicero and his trusted friend and advisor end at a time when Atticus’ political nous was in real demand and need? Cicero’s resumption of political importance may have played a role. Atticus’ Epicurean withdrawal from political affiliations may have made their friendship less tenable at this time. The sparseness of letters to Atticus before 61/60, during a time when Cicero displayed overt political ambitions, may support this. There also is some evidence of disagreements with Atticus over issues, such as the support of Octavian, but the final letter does not show an exchange so harsh that it would create a rupturing of the friendship, in fact it refers to a continued exchange of correspondence (Att. 16.15.3). Surely the most plausible explanation is that Cicero’s continuous

45 Such as the correspondence with Hirtius attested to in antiquity, or the actual letters between Cicero and Octavian, such as the one mentioned above. On the missing letters in Cicero’s correspondence see White (2010: 34-43); cf. p. 39, n. 47.

46 The Sovran Maxims vi, vii, and xiv in Diogenes are often taken to represent the Epicurean ethic advising the withdrawal from politics (D.L. 10.140, 141, 143).

47 Only 11 letters date before 61 BC: two from November 68, six from 67, one from 66 and two from 65. The next letter is not until 61, and after this the frequency of letters becomes less erratic.
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presence in Rome from early December may have made the exchange unnecessary, with the two comrades being able to speak in person. This is particularly important if one thinks of the subject matter which they would have been discussing which may have often been far too dangerous and sensitive to trust to the scrutiny of couriers. There is also the issue of selectivity in publishing of the letters of Cicero, with the possibility that these letters were written but never survived into the modern age. Whatever the reason, the loss of any letter to Atticus at this time creates a serious void in the understanding of the correspondence. The unique nature of the relationship between Cicero and Atticus often means that the letter exchange between them, despite only Cicero’s letters to Atticus surviving, provides a more candid view of the characters and events of the period. Without them, the letters to less intimate associates must be considered in isolation. This is particularly noticeable in direct letters, those exchanges between Cicero and the person he is depicting. These letters often show the mirroring already mentioned, with Cicero showing how he wishes these people to be and to act. However, without fully knowing how genuinely connected Cicero was to them, it is difficult sometimes to know how much of the letter is polite fiction, how much is genuine depiction, and how much is rhetorical character portraiture. This is a little easier when dealing with

48 On the editing of the collection of letters see SB (1965a: 59-76); Beard (2002); White (2010: 31-61); Gibson (2012).
indirect references to personalities, but still it is crucial to understand the relationship between writer and recipient before any judgement on the validity of the depiction can be considered.

0.5: MATIUS AND OPPIUS: CHARACTERS IN COMPARISON

When Cicero left Rome on April 7, 44 B.C., his first stop was on the outskirts of Rome, at the home of C. Matius, a Caesarian sympathiser. At the same time Cicero also met up with another of Caesar’s men, C. Oppius. Although these two men played relatively insignificant roles in the turmoil to follow, it is in this letter to Atticus, less than one month after the demise of Caesar, that the polarisation of Caesarian politics in Rome can still be seen. Cicero’s sensibilities are also clear. Cicero succinctly indicates the Caesarian position by reporting the words of Matius (Att. 14.1.1):

\[
\text{deverti ad illum de quo tecum mane. nihil perditius; explicari rem non posse: ‘etnem si ille tali ingenio exitum non reperiebat, quis nunc reperiet?’ quid quaeris? perisse omnia aiebat (quod haud scio an ita}
\]

---

49 The Matii, according to Tacitus, had considerable influence and power amongst the equestrian families (Ann. 12.60), and Gaius was a close intimate of Caesar (Suet. Jul. 52), having served with him in Gaul (Fam. 11.27.2). After the appearance of Octavian as a viable Caesarian heir, Matius gave his support completely over to the young man, and apparently remained close to him throughout his life. Pliny, despite calling him Gnaeus by mistake, declares him to be an intimate of Augustus (Nat. 12.6.13).
sit; verum ille gaudens) adfirmabatque minus diebus xx tumultum Gallicum…

I have deviated to the home of the one whom I spoke with you about this morning. Nothing more flagitious! He declares that the situation cannot be disentangled: ‘for truly, if that man (Caesar), with a genius such as his, did not procure a way out, who will now?’ In short, he was stating that everything had perished (which perhaps [it] is so; but that man, in truth, delights in it) and was asserting that the Gaulish rebellion will happen in less than 20 days…

Cicero grudgingly agrees that things in Rome are perilous. After all, he is also currently exiting the city, but he takes exception to the way Matius says it – verum ille gaudens (‘truly that man delights in it’). Cicero sets up Matius as the fanatical Caesarian gleefully awaiting the Gaulish sack in order to prove the error of the conspirators in the assassination of Caesar, the conqueror of Gaul. Cicero now connects Matius, and presumably his opinion, to a much more foreboding figure, M. Aemilius Lepidus. He states that Matius has spoken to no-one except Lepidus since the Ides of March. It would seem, therefore, that his opinion must be shaped by the information which Lepidus was feeding him.

Griffin (1997) explores the differing attitudes to Caesar’s death expressed here as related to the differences between Cicero’s and Matius’ idea of friendship and the extent to which loyalty to one’s friend should be upheld.
The information leaked to Matius was without doubt thick with Caesarian propaganda and scare tactics.

Lepidus was, along with Antonius, a major threat to the conspirators. As Appian points out, as Caesar’s *Magister Equitum*, he had an army under him ἐν τῇ πόλει ‘in the city’ (*BC* 2.199), and, with Antonius in his position as consul, Lepidus was the only serious constitutional threat to the conspirators.\(^{51}\) This is further demonstrated when the conspirators sent a proposal of conciliation to the Caesarians: the messenger is sent to start negotiations ἐς Λέπιδον τε καὶ Ἀντώνιον ‘to Lepidus and also Antonius’ (*BC* 2.123). It is also the children of Lepidus and Antonius who are given as assurances to the conspirators. There was no doubt to those in Rome, including Cicero, who the most powerful political figures were at this time.

Cicero is at pains to point out to Atticus that the opinion of Matius probably represents the current position as seen by the non-conciliatory faction in the Caesarians\(^{52}\). This is how he wants to represent the staunch Caesarians like

---

\(^{51}\) Appian refers to the senate fleeing, but that the assassins were confident that they would eventually side with them, since they had also been equally suppressed by the dictator. The main threat to the survival of the assassins were the people, who had not crowded them in support, and the soldiers of Caesar, either the recently dismissed and assigned lots or those who were serving as Caesar’s escort. It is only Lepidus and Antonius that are mentioned as being a constitutional threat to the republic.

\(^{52}\) The possibility of an Epicurean link between Matius and Atticus should also be considered. This could further explain the differences between Cicero and Matius given the high value which Epicureanism set on friendship (Griffin (1997: 101-109)).
Lepidus and his toady Matius. However, he pushes the image further. Not only are they savage and ruthless, they are also uncompromising. Cicero, in order to build up the image of a militant extremist, states (*Att. 14.1.1*):

> ad summam, non posse istaec sic abire

*In summary, his opinion is that these things cannot just go away.*

The threat in this line is not veiled, but clear and real. This is exactly how Cicero wants this to be shown. He foresees trouble and consequently is on his way out of Rome. He was at pains to justify his exodus, and this would be one way in which this could be achieved. With this in mind, it is clear to see why Cicero would depict not only Matius and Lepidus as obdurate, unrelenting and untrustworthy, but also the situation in Rome, with men like Lepidus in control, as desperate and despairing.

Despite these depictions, it is clear that Cicero still holds some hope, and the rest of the first paragraph of this letter demonstrates an unlikely source (*Att. 14.1.1*):

> o prudentem Oppium! qui nihilo minus illum desiderat, sed loquitur nihil quod quemquam bonum offendat. sed haec hactenus.

---

53 A defence of his departure is clearly demonstrated from the beginning in the *Philippics* (1.2.6).
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*O sensible Oppius! He misses that man (Caesar) no less, but he says nothing which may displease any good men. But enough of this.*

C. Oppius was one Caesar’s close intimates. Cicero, however, immediately paints a portrait of Oppius greatly different to his picture of Matius. The exclamation when Matius was introduced (*nihil perditius*) is set in immediate contrast to Oppius’ *prudentem*. By association, the politics of Matius, and therefore Lepidus, are anything but sensible.

Yet Cicero must point out that this ‘sensible’ Oppius is still a Caesarian, but that he is more moderate and reasonable. Here, the other side of Caesarian party politics is represented by Oppius. The portrait of this moderate Caesarian is much more friendly and polite. It is clear that Cicero has rhetorically divided the Caesarians in two. There are those staunch members who are dangerous and relish the thought that Rome is on the brink of war and ruin. It is this group which actively opposes Cicero’s *boni*. On the other side are the more conservative Caesarians who are ready and willing to reconcile the forces at Rome and seek a harmonious outcome.

The opening of this letter has been dealt with in some detail in order to indicate the techniques Cicero uses to depict characters and events. One practice

54 Suetonius even points to the tradition that it was either Oppius or Aulus Hirtius who was the author of Caesar’s Spanish, African and Alexandrian Wars (*Jul. 56*).

55 This aligns well with the standard rhetorical use of *ethopoieia.*
Cicero employs throughout the letters, drawing on established rhetorical conventions of *synkrisis*,\(^{56}\) is the use of comparisons and disparities to accentuate and contrast character portrayals. In the example given, Matius and Oppius are compared possibly to illustrate a division between the staunch and moderate Caesarians.

The usage of comparisons in Cicero is such a powerful tool in his rhetoric that it has formed the basis for Chapter Two in this study. Some of these groupings are obvious and have entered into standard phraseology of the Late Republic in such a way that one person is not usually thought of or mentioned without being associated with the other. An example of this is the pairing of Hirtius and Pansa. The pairing of Antonius and Lepidus as the major Caesarians and powerbrokers immediately following Caesar’s death is also understandable if not as spontaneous as the previous couplings. Obviously, given the scope of this thesis, the comparison which is utilised and examined most frequently is that of Cassius and Brutus.

\(^{56}\) For a definition, see Seid (1999); cf. Arist. *Rhet*, 1368a; Quint. *Inst*. 2.4.21. See also the *Progymnasmata* of Aelius Theon (10); Hermogenes (8); Nicolaus the Sophist (9); Aphthonius (10).
0.6: CICERO THE POLITICIAN

As stated, the correspondence of Cicero is crucial in understanding the position of not only Cicero, but all the major figures that emerged after Caesar’s death. By investigating this correspondence and how Cicero depicts characters, a greater insight of these people and Cicero’s intentions can be gathered. In the example of Matius and Oppius, it seems probable that Cicero was depicting two types of Caesarians, the moderates and the radicals. His purpose for this is demonstrable when one considers that Cicero played wedge politics with Antonius and Octavian in an attempt to weaken the Caesarians camps.\(^\text{57}\) It becomes increasingly clear as the correspondence is examined that Cicero’s convention of character depiction is often purposeful and is used subtly to inform and persuade.

Cicero knew how to survive in difficult and interesting times. He had, in the previous generation, lived and successfully fought for advancement of his position under the shadows of colossi like Sulla, Cato, Pompey, Caesar and Crassus. Now he sought to exist in the next generation of moralistic idealists (Brutus), militant strategists (Cassius, Antonius, and Lepidus), and dangerously ambitious young men (Dolabella and Octavian), as the republic crumbled around him. The last chance for the republic lay in 43, when Antonius laid down

\(^{57}\) Direct examples of this can be seen in the correspondence, for instance *Att.* 16.8.1; 16.9; 16.11.6; 16.14.1; 16.15.3.
the consulship, making him more vulnerable to attack. Unfortunately for Cicero, the consuls were to be two of Caesar’s intimates (Hirtius and Pansa), whose loyalty to the State was brought to question on a number of occasions.\(^{58}\) Despite this, it is here that Cicero stepped forward again ‘to save the republic’. This would not be with armies, which had never been his strength. One thing, however, had changed since his previous rise to the summit of Roman politics - he now had political connections. The correspondence indicates that Cicero’s list of associates was extensive: almost every major politically and militarily influential individual was in contact with him. Connections meant power.

One other factor played a huge role in the political boon in which Cicero currently found himself. When Pansa left Rome to join Hirtius and Octavian on March 20, Cicero became one of the most influential politicians in Rome itself. Hirtius and Octavian had already taken the field against Antonius at Mutina, Dolabella was making his move eastward, Brutus was in Macedonia, and Cassius in Syria. Even Caesar’s generals, men like Plancus and Pollio, were serving in provinces far enough away from the city that their influence was not directly felt. This left Cicero with the opportunity of gaining considerable power.

---

58 The letters from Cassius and Brutus asking to make Hirtius into a better person constitute a question over his loyalty to the senatorial cause and the optimates (Att. 14.20.4; 14.21.4; 15.6.1; 15.5.1). The difficulties which Cicero faced in the senate from Pansa’s opposition to motions put forth by Cicero to legitimise Cassius’ and Brutus’ positions in the East are another example (Fam. 12.7.1; ad Brut. 2.4.2).
As an orator, Cicero knew the power of words, and the influence these could wield over others. When Cicero gave his speeches in the courts or in the senate, everyone knew that his intention was to convince the audience to agree with his perspective. When he wrote philosophical or moral treatises, no one doubted the persuasive elements of them. Yet the nature of the letter was more subtle. Cicero had written to Curio to this effect in 53 (Fam. 2.4.1):

"epistularum genera multa esse non ignoras sed unum illud certissimum, cuius causa inventa res ipsa est, ut certiores faceremus absentis si quid esset quod eos scire aut nostra aut ipsorum interesset.

You are aware that there are many types of letters, but one type is unmistakable, the type which the letter itself was invented for, so that we may inform those who are absent if there is anything which it is important for us or for them that they know.

The innocent nature of the letter is revealed: to inform those not present of news. Yet Cicero knew that the letter was more than this: that information persuades. He could represent events and people in a particular light, and by doing so, he could persuade others towards a certain viewpoint or perception."
INTRODUCTION

Cicero always writes with intent.\textsuperscript{59} This study will investigate Cicero's use of these intentional persuasive techniques. The problem for Cicero, however, was that the higher the stakes, the more dangerous the game; and the stakes were never higher than in the final years of the Roman republic. When Cicero assumed the central role in Rome, he gambled extensively on his ability to persuade and convince those around him towards his opinion, and that these people would then act accordingly.

\textsuperscript{59} Hutchinson's detection of 'rhythmic prose' in the letters gives a strong indication of intent in the correspondence (1998: 9ff). There is also the possibility that this stylistic aspect of writing became instinctive over time.
CHAPTER ONE: COLLECTIVE NOUNS

One of the simplest ways in which Cicero portrays character is to use a nickname for individuals and collective nouns to describe groups. This technique is conspicuous in his treatment of Cassius and Brutus following the assassination of Caesar. This extreme act, as well as its polarising effect, provided a plethora of terms for the conspirators. On one side were the invective terms for assassins, murderers, and parricides (siciarii, homicidae, interfectores, parricide). On the other side were the favourable terms like liberators (liberatores), heroes (heroes), and tyrannicides (tyrannoctoni). Cicero also included in his correspondence Greek words, as well as their transliterations into Latin. Each word would seem to have its own subtle characteristics, focusing on different aspects and interpretations of the conspirators and their act of tyrannicide or political murder. The collective nouns themselves and the context they are used in will provide the first indication of not only how Cicero felt about the conspirators, but also may give an insight into Cicero’s perception of the general feeling about the political situation in Rome at this time.

---

1 An example of a nickname already described is the use of the term Calvenna or φαλάκρωμα (baldy) for Matius (Att. 14.2.3, 5.1, 9.3; 16.11.1).
2 See Welch (2012: 121-162) for a recent study on the reshaping of political factions and politics itself following Caesar’s assassination.
Studies of this period have generally accepted, without much consideration, the use of these words. There is rarely a statement made about these collective terms in commentaries, and then only to elucidate its reference to Brutus and Cassius. Sometimes these comments provide misleading insinuations concerning their frequency of use. In general, ‘liberator’ has been universally accepted as the preferred term by modern historians and commentators without ample consideration of its suitability to the ideology of the time. For instance, Elizabeth Rawson, commenting on the two opposing ancient traditions about the conspirators, writes that one side saw them as ‘tyrannicides, 'liberators’, as Cicero loved to call them who placed their sacred duty to their country before ties, demi-gods or even gods’. To be fair, the evidence for Rawson’s approach is mixed. Sometimes she refers to an anti-Liberator tradition and then indiscriminately uses the term 'liberator' throughout the text. Other times a more cautious approach is applied by placing the term in inverted commas. For those in search of a catchphrase, these collective nouns have provided a maxim to sum up what is believed to be the political undercurrent at that time.

---

3 Denniston (1926: 71); Ramsey (2003: 95).
4 Denniston states that ‘the terms liberatores and heroes are frequently applied to them in the letters, as the two leading spirits in the conspiracy’ (1926: 71-2). It may be instructive to realise that the term heroes is used in the letters only four times, whilst there is only one verifiable use of liberatores.
7 Rawson (1992: 469). Other authors, such as Smethurst (1958), do likewise.
However, without careful examination of these terms, and their use in Cicero, their suitability remains questionable. They may be convenient, but this does not make them appropriate. For instance, the acceptance of the term tyrannicide assumes that Caesar was actually a tyrant. Whereas this may have been Cicero’s belief, it certainly was not universally accepted. Evidence suggests that Cicero and his contemporaries did think carefully about these terms. They were not overarching expressions which could be used synonymously, but rather carried with them very specific meanings. Therefore, a contextual study of the collective terms used to describe the conspirators may help to reveal the subtleties of these terms in Cicero, which in turn will provide a better insight into Cicero’s depictions of Cassius and Brutus following the assassination of Caesar.

1.1: LIBERATOR

Despite the prevalence of the collective noun ‘liberators’ to describe those men who stained the floor of the foyer of Curia Pompei with the dictator’s blood, the fact remains that Syme’s ‘new party of the Liberators’, whether homogenous or not, never existed. Even putting aside theories on the level of factionalisation in

---

8 The phrase ‘new party of the Liberators’ was Syme’s introductory description of those men who assassinated Caesar (1939: 59).
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Roman Republican politics, what exactly had these liberators liberated? Caesar may be dead, but his *acta* had been ratified in the compromise. His appointed magistracies and governorships still stood, and any opportunity to re-establish a stable ‘republican’ model had all but passed. This term, on the basis of the outcome alone, was as untenable then as it is now, and it seems extraordinary that it has become the default description of the assassins in modern texts.

In fairness to the assassins of Caesar, Cicero had noticed the decline of the republican system for some time before the Ides of March. In the fragments of his *de Republica*, written almost a decade earlier, he stated (Rep. 5.2):

---

9 Even taking into account differing opinions of liberation and the varying degrees of achievement, to an ancient Roman the political situation in Rome after (and immediately before) the assassination of Caesar would not have been considered ‘free’ in any sense of the word. The connection between the *res publica* and *libertas* will be discussed in the following pages.

10 The term *liberatores* is often used to describe the assassins of Caesar. An indicator of its acceptance as the default description is the absence of qualification or limitation being applied, such as placing it in quotation marks. Examples include Smith (1966: 235-243); Scullard (1982: 155, 160); Schneider (2004: 173); Harries (2006: 225-6); White (2010: 144, 160-1); Tempest (2011: 185-6, 189, 201); Zarecki (2014: 14, 141, 158). Manuwald places the term in quotations only once (2007: 353), all other times it is without such qualification (2007: 10, 12, 72, 98, 362). At other times authors assume facts by indicating that either Cicero called the conspirators this or that the conspirators themselves preferred the term ‘liberator’ without further evidence (e.g. Allott (2002: 208 n. 50); Tempest (2011: 183)).

11 In a recent study Flower states that the Republican system had ended in 60, having moved through six different Republics, and not one continuous form of government from the Regal Period (2010: for an outline of these stages see 18-34). If this is correct, Cicero was writing this in a time which had no semblance of the Republican system, with no political system or legislation in place to allow a return to anything resembling one. Despite this, the constant
nostra vero aetas, cum rem publicam sicut picturam accepisset egregiam sed iam evanescentem vetustate, non modo eam coloribus eisdem quibus fuerat renovare neglexit, sed ne id quidem curavit ut formam saltem eius et extrema tamquam lineamenta servaret.

In truth, our generation, although it inherited the republic as a masterpiece, but one already fading with age, not only neglected to restore it with the same colours which it had before, but did not even see to it that it preserved at least its shape and, as it were, its general outline.

Restoration and conservation are the key issues here for Cicero\textsuperscript{12}, but in the political climate following Caesar’s assassination, the State would first have to be freed from the tyranny, and not just a single tyrant.\textsuperscript{13} Freedom from the threat of arbitrary interference in politics was required, and there was little doubt mentioning of the state of politics in Rome and the possibility of restoring the republic indicates that Cicero still held hope, however slim, for its survival.

\textsuperscript{12} The comparison of the State to a painting has its origins in Plato (Pl. \textit{Lg.} 796a-b; \textit{R.} 5.472d-e, 6.500c-501c; \textit{Ti.} 19b-c); cf. Asmis (2005: 387); Gurd (2012: 56-57); Gildenhard (2013: 244-245). A similar Platonic comparison is made between a painting, which needs constant repair and touching up, and the laws (Pl. \textit{Lg.} 769a-c). Cicero regularly wrote comments on the state of the republic, and his opinion is often influenced by the surrounding events. A parallel sentiment of pessimism regarding the lost republic can also be seen after Gabinius’ acquittal in 54 B.C. (\textit{Q.Fr.} 3.4.1; \textit{Att.} 4.18.2). This passage from the \textit{Republic} is included here to provide a background to Cicero’s feelings concerning the state of affairs under Caesar’s dictatorship, and to demonstrate his focus on the \textit{status quo}, as evident in his emphasis on restoration and preservation.

\textsuperscript{13} This motif was a standard for Cicero in this discussion of politics at this time.
that this goal had not been achieved by the assassination alone. It is agreed
that Cicero would have liked nothing more than to call these men ‘liberators’ in
the true sense. Just as he himself had felt like he had liberated Rome from the
foreseen tyranny of Catiline, so too had these men put country before self to rid
Rome of a more obvious dictator. This is demonstrated by his response to
Antonius’ accusation of involvement in the assassination brought about by
Brutus’ cry of ‘Cicero’.14 Ideally, they should have been liberators, but the fact of
the matter was very different. Almost powerless and forced from the political
sphere in Rome, living seemingly as fugitives and traitors, the glory of their act
had not achieved the desired outcome. The State was not liberated. It would
seem that the representation of the assassination as a benefit to Rome had
failed, and was not recognised as factual by others. As such Cicero needed
either to give up on this rhetoric, or try to persuade in another way. It is this
antithesis between the idealism and realism of the situation which seems crucial
in understanding Cicero’s use of not only liberator, but every collective noun
used of these men in his correspondence.

Investigation of what Cicero meant by res publica and libertas will help to
contextualise his use of liberator.15 These terms have been intrinsically linked in

14 Cic. Phil. 2.12.28; see pp. 31-32.
15 I am primarily interested in how these terms relate to Cicero and not the general principles,
institutions, philosophies and theories behind the Republic. Some recent studies on the Roman
Republic outline these principles and the chronology of scholarship behind it, including Flower
the writings of Late Republican and Imperial Period authors.\textsuperscript{16} The creation of what was called the Roman Republic was itself based on the liberation of Rome from the autocratic rulers of the regal period. Wirszubski succinctly sums up this relationship by the rhetorical questions ‘is not the \textit{res publica} the political expression of \textit{libertas} and, conversely, is not \textit{libertas} the essence of \textit{res publica}?’\textsuperscript{17} So, with this in mind, Cicero’s understanding of what the \textit{res publica} was may have a direct bearing on our consideration of what he means when he refers to the conspirators as \textit{liberatores}. Cicero’s \textit{de Re Publica} provides this insight with a deceptively simple formula (1.39):

‘\textit{est igitur}’, inquit Africanus, ‘\textit{res publica res populi, populus autem non omnis hominum coetus quoquo modo congregatus, sed coetus multitudinis iuris consensu et utilitatis communione sociatus’.

\textit{Africanus said, ‘Therefore the Republic is the res of the people, but when I say people it is not every assembling of mankind herding

\footnotesize{(2004; 2010); Rosenstein (2006); Hölkeskamp (2010). Similarly for \textit{libertas}, a recent study by Arena looks at appeals to \textit{libertas} (2013), whilst Wirszubski, Stylow and Brunt still remain seminal works (Wirszubski (1950); Stylow (1972); Brunt (1988: 281-350)). For \textit{libertas} in Cicero see Dermience (1957); Bleicken (1962); Dognini (1998); Cowan (2007).}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{16} A sample of writers through this period will suffice to illustrate the connection between \textit{res publica} and \textit{libertas} in Roman minds (e.g. Rhet. Her. 4.66; Cic. Flac. 25; Sal. Cat. 7.2-3; Livy 1.60.3; 2.1.1-2; Tac. Ann. 1.1.1).}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{17} Wirszubski (1950: 82).}
together in any way, but rather the assembling of the multitude, united by the agreement of law and a shared benefit’.

In his commentary of the *de Re Publica*, Zetzel identified *res publica res populi* as an etymological definition. In fact, the term *res populi* is used throughout the *de Re Publica*. Despite this definition linking *res publica* to the people, this is not an argument for popular sovereignty. As Wirszubski stated:

…the notion of *res publica* postulates for every citizen a fair share in the common weal; it postulates the participation of the people in State affairs; it postulates that the government should be for the people; but it does not necessarily imply the principle of government by the people.

A *prima facie* similarity does exist with Aristotle’s κοινωνία πολιτῶν (e.g. *Pol.* 3.1276b), but as Eder points out, whereas Aristotle looked to the individual (πολίτης), Cicero looked to the whole (*populus*). That is to say, the individual was the important element in the Greek viewpoint. In the Roman system the
individual was not politically effective by himself, but only indirectly in the role he played within the various institutions and orders.\textsuperscript{21}

It is crucial not to misinterpret Cicero’s definition of ‘res publica’.\textsuperscript{22} Obviously the term ‘Republic’ is inadequate as it insinuates a constitutional element. On the other hand, ‘public affairs’ fails to indicate the underlining institutional elements of the system. ‘Commonwealth’ seems a better choice, as long as the \textit{weal} element is more welfare than wealth. Other descriptions like ‘the traditional political order’ or ‘organisation’ are ambiguous enough, but fail to incorporate the crux of the meaning. Heinze’s \textit{alle Interessen der völkischen Gemeinschaft umfassend} is certainly close but unwieldy.\textsuperscript{23}

In the quoted passage from the \textit{Republic}, Cicero’s understanding of \textit{res publica} rests on a dual definition of \textit{populus}. These classifications are distinct, yet linked. It is not a territorial or ethnic peculiarity, but one based on unity within the law and society. However, before he describes what \textit{populus} is, he first defines what it is not. \textit{Quoquo modo congregatus} is the key to this negative definition. By this phrase Cicero rules out the corrupted form of the democratic

\begin{footnotes}
\item[21] Eder (1990: 19). Of course, Eder does not take into account fully the emphasis on both plurality and communality in \textit{Pol.} 3.1276b.
\item[22] Drexler still provides one of the most comprehensive examinations of the definition of \textit{res publica} (1957/8).
\item[23] Heinze (1960: 13). For further discussions see Stark (1966); Schofield (1995); Rudd (1998: xxxv).
\end{footnotes}
government, the ‘mob rule’, as a ‘true’ republic. Cicero has used *congregatus* for these types of random gatherings, a word which is used equally to describe the gatherings of animals or humans. Similarly the use of the indefinite *quoquo modo* removes any sense of reason or rationale from these possible ‘herdings’. This seems to stand in juxtaposition to the participle *sociatus* used in the affirmative statement of what *populus* is. Thus he assents to the significance of the people in the *res publica*, but only by the politically constructive role they play within society.

The dual definition of the affirmative statement on what the *res publica* is has been thoroughly investigated. One particular controversy is how to interpret *consensus iuris* and whether this relates to a formal or idealised notion of *iustitia*. Zetzel noted the ambiguity and gives Poyser’s ‘common idea of what is right’ as a suitable compromise. As the dialogue continues it becomes clearer that the *consensus iuris* is a decisive characteristic of a *res publica*

---

(3.45), and also plays a crucial role in the definition of *civitates* (6.13.2). This repetition of *consensus iuris* has led many to conclude that not only is it distinct from *utilitatis communio*, ‘a shared advantage’, but that it is also the more important of the two definitions. Others argue for a definite and close linking between the two concepts. The fact remains that an agreement on law and shared advantage is not only Aristotelian in nature, but Cicero also indicates this connection in *de Legibus* (*Leg*. 1.12.33). The importance of *utilitatis communio* is clear elsewhere in Cicero, where it is described as a bond to a stable society (*Fin*. 3.64). In the *pro Sestio*, Cicero makes this common benefit the pivotal moment for the formation of a *res publica* (*Sest*. 91).

So Cicero seems to indicate that a *res publica* is a ‘social’ principle which functions above governmental systems. As such, this bilateral description of a

---

29 *nihil est enim … acceptius quam concilia coetusque hominum iure sociati, quae ‘civitates’ appellantur* – ‘for nothing is more agreeable than gatherings and assemblies of men united under law which they call ‘States’’.  
30 Bächner (1962: 78-79; 1984: 124) refers to them as ‘polar’ aspects and places *utilitas* as less important. Suerbaum (1977: 25) also saw a clear separation. Dodaro stated that the two definitions were ‘held in tension’ (2004: 13). Schofield (1995: 70-1) relates *consensus iuris* to justice, whilst indicating that *utilitas* has no connection to this crucial element of *iustitia*.  
33 *tum res ad communem utilitatem, quas publicas appellamus, tum conventicula hominum, quae postea civitates nominatae sunt, tum domicilia coniuncta, quas urbes dicimus, invento et divino iure et humano moenibus saepserunt* – ‘Then (came) the constitutions for the common benefit, which we call republics, then (came) the collections of men, which afterwards were called ‘States’, then with the joining together of houses, which we call cities, and with the acquisition of divine and human law they surrounded these cities with walls’.  

res publica is not necessarily tied to a particular governmental form or institution. It seems that a res publica can exist under any form of government, be it democracy, oligarchy, or even monarchy (Rep. 3.47; Sest. 91). Initially it could even be argued to exist in the tainted forms if laws were agreed upon and some shared benefit existed. However, once justice is inserted into the definition it becomes clear that a republic cannot coexist with corrupted governmental types (Rep. 3.43-6), and this includes tyranny (Rep. 3.43):

ergo ubi tyrannus est, ibi non vitiosam, ut heri dicebam, sed, ut nunc ratio cogit, dicendum est plane nullam esse rem publicam.

Therefore where there is a tyrant, there is not just a corrupted form, as I was saying yesterday, but, as now logic compels, it must be stated clearly that there is no res publica.

Thus we can begin to see the connection between res publica and libertas. Libertas is, on the most basic level, the opposing condition to slavery.\textsuperscript{34} To the individual this meant simply one was not a slave, but to a nation or government, this meant sovereignty: a free nation. Libertas was a complex notion to the Romans, and contained within the word was a tension between its direct

\textsuperscript{34} The Digest of Justinian, writing succinctly, records that all are either free or slaves – omnes homines aut liberi sunt aut servi (1.5.3).
meaning and its manifestation politically, socially and ideologically. For instance the term was not only linked to a republic, but also to the law. Cicero writes (Clu. 53):

\[
\text{legum denique idcirco omnes servi sumus ut liberi esse possimus.}
\]

Finally for that reason, we are all slaves to the laws so that we can be free.

The notion that servitude to law was compatible with freedom is seemingly a contradiction, but only to modern ideas of freedom. In many ways, the ancient Romans consider *libertas* in relation to control and power: the freedom to control one’s affairs and to participate in politics and other public matters. This ‘political liberty’, the freedom to hold office and to participate in legislation and public affairs, must be understood as a relationship between not only the individual citizen, but also the various political bodies and orders, and the power of the State. This is *libertas* as an obligation, a duty more than a right, which

---

35 Reichardt (1998: 24); Hölkeskamp (2010: 47). Hölkeskamp also refers to *libertas* as a linguistic code or cipher for habitualised ideas.

36 A similar sentiment can be found in Livy (35.32.11) and Sallust (*Hist.* 1.55.4m).

37 Brunt states that the term is full of self-contradictions since the idea of freedom is different for everyone (1988: 283).


40 Rosenstein (2006: 378) and Arena (2013) both limit their scope to the citizens themselves, but it is clear from the above discussion that Cicero’s notion of *populus* related to its role within the various vehicles of government, i.e. the orders, assembles, magistracies, priesthoods, etc.
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goes beyond the autonomy of the individual will or its actual freedom from constraint.\textsuperscript{41} \textit{Libertas} in Cicero’s republic meant not only the freedom to participate in politics, but that this participation should be for the welfare of the people and based on an agreement of law.\textsuperscript{42} This is the exact definition of his \textit{res publica} (\textit{Rep.} 1.39, 1.43; 3.43-47; \textit{Att.} 8.11.1-2).

The next issue is relating to governmental systems, since, depending on one’s preferred governmental type, \textit{libertas} could mean many things. For instance, to the democrat, it might mean political equality,\textsuperscript{43} but Cicero was not a supporter of democratic systems. The writings above, concerning the republic, demonstrate an agreement on or an acceptance of law, though this in no way

\textsuperscript{41} Arena described \textit{libertas} as the ‘non-subjection to the arbitrary will of another person or group’ (2013: 47), with Pettit stating that arbitrary related to the degree of public good tied up in the interference (1997: 157-7). Some interference could, in other words, be seen as beneficial, however other interference was undesirable (Kapust (2011: 10)). Sage saw it as the ‘freedom to think and speak as one wishes’ (1990: 939), to pursue one’s ends (Skinner (1990: 302)). Brunt, in rejecting Schulz, forcefully agrees that freedom can be the state of doing whatever one wants (1988: 305, 309-10). These descriptions miss the distinction between modern conceptions of freedom and the ancient Roman idea. Brunt, in his attempt to refute Schulz and others, seems at times to be more fixated on the notion of something or someone being free (\textit{liber}) than on the intangible quality of freedom (\textit{libertas}) and its political nature. Cicero’s idea of \textit{libertas}, which is what is important to this study, is directed towards the latter. As Wirszubski correctly notes, the Romans conceived \textit{libertas} in terms of duty and social relations (1950: 8). Similarly Manuwald states that it is a ‘characteristic of the Roman People and an essential element of a proper \textit{res publica}’ (2007: 97).

\textsuperscript{42} A direct parallel can be seen in \textit{de Officiis} 1.85.

\textsuperscript{43} Zetzel (1995: 127).
implies radical equity, merely an equitable distribution of rights and duties.\textsuperscript{44}

Cicero believed that the \textit{auctoritas} and \textit{dignitas} of the senate led to social stability. It was the duty and obligation of pre-eminent individuals to direct policy and morals within society.\textsuperscript{45} This was fine as long as these individuals considered not only the freedom of others, but worked within the bounds of \textit{consensus iuris} and \textit{utilitatis communio}. It was when individuals began seeking power and control for the sake of their own \textit{dignitas}, and began to conduct matters according to their own views and policies that a threat to \textit{libertas} and the republic was perceived\textsuperscript{46}. This tension between the ruling personalities and the senate itself may be thought of as a separate division of freedom: \textit{libertas senatoria}.\textsuperscript{47} The abolition of tyranny required, in Cicero’s beliefs, the appreciation of senatorial authority, and thus the terms \textit{libertas populi Romani} and \textit{auctoritas senatus} are frequently combined in the \textit{Philippics}.\textsuperscript{48} In order to free the republic, and therefore re-establish the \textit{libertas populi Romani}, more

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{44} Zetzel (1995: 129).
  \item \textsuperscript{45} How (1930); Wood (1988: 90-142); Mitchell (1991: 9-62). Brunt describes the deference to a superior authority within the notion of \textit{libertas} as perverse (1988: 283).
  \item \textsuperscript{46} Arena (2013) looks at appeals to \textit{libertas} in speeches and she identifies three principal cases in which it is used: i) opposing extra-ordinary commands; ii) supporting the \textit{senatus consultum ultimum}; iii) opposing land reforms. As can be seen these all relate to the individuals or groups seeking control or power either outside the bounds of law or precedence, or over other sectors of politics, or infringing on others’ \textit{libertas}; cf. Bleicken (1972: 38); Wirszubski (1950: 80).
  \item \textsuperscript{47} Connolly sees the \textit{libertas} of the people in direct conflict with the \textit{auctoritas} of the senate (2007: 63-65), however, as mentioned above, it would seem that the key was not placing one’s own individual liberty over that of the community (Kapust (2011: 12)).
  \item \textsuperscript{48} Monteleone (2003: 67); Manuwald (2007: 97, 306).
\end{itemize}
was needed than the removal of another’s *dominatio*. Drastic reformation of institutions could not save it either. What was needed was a complete reappraisal of how the individual interacted in the areas of government, morality and civic responsibility. This obligation to the State should therefore be an essential element when assessing the behaviours of those who declared that they were attempting to liberate.

It stands to reason, therefore, that if *res publica* and *libertas* were intrinsically linked, and that there could be no *res publica* in a tyranny (*Rep. 3.43*), then *libertas* could not be achieved until the tyranny was removed. Therefore, whilst a state of tyranny existed, including after the death of Caesar as Cicero stated on numerous occasions, there could be no *libertas* as the *res publica* was not free. Of course, one could argue that the conspirators had liberated Rome from Caesar, but this is not at the heart of Cicero’s fundamental goals. There could be no *res publica* and no *libertas* whilst individuals were not able to participate freely in State business, whilst Caesar’s *acta* remained in force, and whilst

---

49 Wirszubski provides the example from Tacitus of the Armenian removal of their king resulting in the absence of a ruler for a while but without the enjoyment of freedom (*Ann. 2.4.3*) (1950: 5). Removal of autocratic rule in itself could initially create anarchy, and eventually, as was the case in Armenia and after Caesar’s death, result in the replacement of the autocrat with another.


51 Whilst Cicero’s main objection was the additional measures which Antonius attempted to push through as part of *acta*, the passing of the *acta* themselves through the Senate brought Cicero no solace. In the *First Philippic* he states that he did not approve of the *acta* themselves, but
decisions counter to the benefit of all (utilitatis communio) and the agreement of law (consensus iuris) were being made. However, this did not mean that it could not happen, and it is clear that Cicero felt passionately about the possibility of ‘restoring the republic’.

The republic was never really dead for Cicero, but could be re-established by a restoration of morality and traditional political values. Crises in the system were largely the fault of degenerate leaders. In the current situation, the wickedness of Caesar had been replaced by that of Antonius. Doubts on the moral character of Antonius were nothing new to Cicero, as the former had shown disregard for law, and sought personal gain rather than community benefit, and on these grounds he was a tyrant and thus an obstruction to the supported them in order to bring about ‘peace and tranquillity’ (Phil. 1.1.16). Other references to this goal of peace being the primary reason for his support include Att. 16.16b.2, 16.16c.3; Phil. 1.9.23, 2.39.100.

For references to an unrestored republic in the correspondence after Caesar’s death see Att. 14.4, 14.9.2, 14.3.6, 14.20.3; Fam. 12.1.


An early example of his moral degeneration was his infamous affair with the actress Cytheris (Att. 10.10.5, 10.16.5 (both from May 49); 15.22). The most aggressive of Cicero’s invectives against Antonius on moral grounds appear in the Philippics, and the Second Philippic, despite never being delivered publically, contain many of his thoughts on Antonius as an immoral character (e.g. 2.1-2, 6-10, 58).

 Examples of acts seen by Cicero as unlawful or contravening existing law include the use of Caesar’s notebooks as part of his acta, the pro-consular and provincial rearrangement, and the appointment of Antonius’ brother to the land commission.
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return to the republic.\textsuperscript{56} Despite polite fictions to the contrary,\textsuperscript{57} the relationship between Cicero and Antonius had not been overly cordial.\textsuperscript{58} It is no coincidence that Cicero was writing the \textit{de Officiis} at a time when he saw that the turmoil in the State was directly related to the dereliction of one’s duty to the State that occurred when people of power sought personal advantage.\textsuperscript{59}

Since the failure was not in the system but was due to people, the restoration of the republic could also be brought about through individuals.\textsuperscript{60} First, one had to place justice before personal glory, reaffirm Roman civil values, and align personal interests with that of the community.\textsuperscript{61} For Cicero, this was his \textit{optimus

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Direct references to Antonius as a tyrant include \textit{Att.} 14.14.4, 14.21.3; 15.21.1; \textit{Fam.} 11.5.3; 12.3.2; \textit{ad Brut.} 1.4a.3.
\item One overt example of this expression of polite expression of \textit{amicitia} is to Tiro in May 44: \textit{ego tamen Antoni inveteratam sine ulla offensione amicitiam retinere sane volo scribamque ad eum, sed not ante quam te videro} – ‘However, I truly want to keep up my friendship with Antonius, which has lasted a long time without a quarrel, and I shall write to him, but not before I shall see you’. (\textit{Fam.} 16.23.2); cf. Hall (2009: 87-99).
\item On the relationship between Antonius and Cicero see Huzar (1978: 20, 26, 37, 55-6); van der Blom (2003: 295-299); Hall (2009: 87-99).
\item Notwithstanding that Cicero essentially agreed with Greek political theory in assigning monarchy as the best of the simple forms of government, as long as it was ruled by the wisest and most just (see Brunt (1988: 506-7)), I cannot agree that this necessarily means that he accepted the notion of ‘single rule’ (Zarecki (2005: esp. 30-35)).
\item Zarecki sums up the \textit{de Officiis} with these principles (2005: 35 n. 47).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
civis, and he used many words to denote this ideal statesmen: rector (rei publicae), consilii publici auctor, gubernator, conservator, tutor and procurator.

These statesmen were not necessarily elected officials; in fact they needed no constitutional position. They were cives who guided and protected the State and fellow citizens because of their exemplary personal qualities (Rep. 2.46, 51; Tusc. 4.51). They were committed to a life of virtue and duty to the State (Rep. 1.8; 6.16), which inspired others to imitate them (Rep. 1.52; 2.69; Leg. 3.30, 32; Att. 8.11.1). For them, the continuation of the State and the safety and happiness of its people were paramount (Rep. 1.52-53; 5.8 = Att. 8.11.1; Leg. 3.8).

They were familiar with justice and the law (Rep. 2.2; 5.5 Leg. 1.57), and were studied and practised in the functions of the State (Rep. 1.33, 35; 3.5; Leg. 1.58-62). Praised above many things was their prudentia, which gave them the foresight by which they could recognise, anticipate and control circumstances, allowing them to steer through political upheavals (Rep. 1.45; 2.45, 67; 6.1; Off. 1.72). A special honour was given to them in the heavens,

---


64 Akin to φρόνησις: Aristotle’s highest intellectual virtue (EN 1140a24-b12).
from where they came and to where they would return (Rep. 6.13).\textsuperscript{65} It has been suggested that the ‘Dream of Scipio’ from Cicero’s Republic, with its celestial analogy, represents the true extent of the role this statesman played in the ideal political order (Rep. 6.17).\textsuperscript{66} The rector rei publicae is like the sun who is the ruler (dux), leader (princeps), and guide (moderator) to all the other lights. So, if Cicero believed that the republic could be restored through the abolition of tyranny and the moral exemplar of a rector rei publicae, then, given the current state of politics in Rome, this must start with a liberator.

Words such as liberare, libertas, and, of course, liberator, all derive from liber, which at its essence means ‘free’ in so far as not subject to something or someone else, i.e. the state of not being a slave.\textsuperscript{67} Despite objections by some

\textsuperscript{65} This description of the statesman is reminiscent of hero cults and will be discussed in the later sections.
\textsuperscript{67} OLD 1125-1126 s.v. liber; TLL 7.2.1280.13-1289.17. For etymologies of Latin liber and Greek ἐλευθερία see Pokorny (1959: 684-5); Frisk (1960: 490-1); Chantraine (1968: 336-7); Beekes (2010). Liber seems to derive from the Venetic *(e)leudheros, with its Indo-European root *leudh- relating to ‘a breed’ or ‘a growth group’, though as Brunt notes, this is a frequent but not universally accepted view (1988: 284). Pitkin provides a summary of the various etymological theories (1988: 529-31). Proponents of the ‘growth group’ theory include Nestle (1967: 7); Benveniste (1973: 263-5); Meier (1975: 426-9); Raaflaub (2004: 287-8). Brunt, in support of this theory, gives the example that liberi ‘children’ would therefore be the ‘natural increase of the family’ and the god Liber was ‘once a numinous power of natural growth’ (1988: 284). A second theory looks at the idea of unimpeded motion from the stem *eluth- ‘come, go’, succinctly stated by Arendt as eleuthein hopos ero - ‘I go as I wish’ (1978: 19). Other supporters of this include Curtius (1879: 496-7); Pohlenz (1966: 181 n. 4); Tucker (1976: 139). Finally Onians (1951: 472-
scholars, a link to the Greek ἐλευθερία is plausible. What this meant to the individual seems clear, but in reference to ‘free States’ the picture is more complex. One possibility is that the ‘freedom’ of the community related more to the citizens within this organisation rather than the individuals themselves. This would seem to match Cicero’s established notion of political libertas, evident in his identification of the dominus populi with the Greek tyrannus (Rep. 2.47). A tyrant, and therefore a political state of tyranny, perceived or in actuality, acted as the master over the people, placing the community necessarily in a state of servitude. This is evident in Cicero’s depiction first of Caesar (Att. 11.20.1), and then Antonius (Att. 14.14.4), as behaving as a master over his slaves.

It is now possible to look directly at the Latin word liberator. The word means ‘one who sets free’, ‘a deliverer’, ‘a releaser’. The TLL note three main uses, with the second usage, from servitude/tyranny, the attack of enemies, and similar things, being pertinent to this study. The OLD splits this usage into two
categories: *in war* and *politically*. What is immediately striking is the lack of use before Cicero, as well as its sparse use even after Cicero. Before Cicero there is only one extant example from the literary tradition, provided by Plautus in his *Persa*, where, in a particularly vitriolic exchange, the character Dordalus refers to Toxilus as a *scortorum liberator*, ‘a freer of prostitutes’ (*Persa* 419). *Liberator* in Cicero is solely for political purposes, predominantly for those men who assassinated Caesar. This is a very narrow usage, and could indicate an adoption of a colloquial word for this particular purpose, thus accounting for its use in comedy and infrequency in literary Latin.

It appears, however, that Cicero was not the first to use *liberator* in a political sense, as there is a contemporary example which may have contributed to Cicero adopting this word for the conspirators. Cassius Dio mentions that after the Battle of Munda in 45 B.C. the senate awarded Caesar with the title *liberator*

---

72 OLD 1127 s.v. *liberator*, *TLL* 7.2.1300.43-1301.22.
73 Weinstock (1971: 142-4) notes the rarity of this term in Latin literature, though he downplays Livy’s uses.
74 The *EDCS* list forty six examples of *liberator* being used in inscriptions, none date from before Cicero, with the majority from after the reign of Diocletian.
75 One reference to *liberatores* is also used after the Battle of Forum Gallorum when Cicero uses it to describe Hirtius, Pansa and Octavian (*Phil.* 14.5.12).
76 Although one use before Cicero in Plautus does not constitute proof of regular use in comedy. One contributing factor to the absence of *liberator* (and *libero* – appears in Plautus and Terence and then not until Late Republican writers) between comedy and Cicero could relate to the metric shape of *libērātōr*, and indeed many forms of *libērō*, being unsuitable for hexameters (Dr N. O’Sullivan (2014: pers. comm.)).
Weinstock comments that no man or god before had received this title: Jupiter had the title Liber or Libertas but not Liberator. This honorary title given to Caesar for deliverance from the horrors of civil war, awarded by the senate, provides a socio-political use which may have influenced Cicero. Further still, Dio states that in 45 Caesar was honoured with a statue amongst those of the kings of Rome, and that it was installed next to the statue of L. Iunius Brutus, the traditional founder of the republic (Dio 43.45.3-4; Plu. Brut. 1.1). The significance of the placement of this statue is enhanced if L. Iunius Brutus was also known as the Liberator, as Livy may have preserved in his writings. In reference to Brutus or his descendants there are four uses of liberator, either as liberator urbis (1.56, 1.60) or liberator patriae (2.7, 4.15).

There is a possibility that Livy has actually preserved a known title of Brutus, Liberator.

---

77 Dio used the Greek term ἐλευθερωτής, but it can be assumed that the Roman senate actually used the Latin term Liberator. It is true that others were said to have freed Rome, for example Cato’s statements about Pompey the Great to his son Gn. Pompeius (B. Afr. 22.2), but this study relates to the use of the word liberator specifically.

78 Weinstock (1971: 142-3).

79 Raaflaub has argued that Caesar had used libertas in his sloganising in 49, but the honours he received here were different (2003: 36). He states that Caesar did not emphasise libertas in his propaganda except for a short time before and after the civil war (2003: 37). The title liberator is unusual, and if it had never been given before, one can hypothesise overzealous advocates pushing for this title. The propaganda for Caesar to be seen as a ‘deliverer’ from the horror of civil war is just as important as Cicero’s need to use it to justify the assassination.

80 Dio also uses this as the principal reason for M. Brutus devising the plot against Caesar (D.C. 43.45.4). Ironically this statue to Caesar was mentioned in Cicero’s defence of King Deiotarus, where he uses it as a proof that Caesar was not a tyrant (Deiot. 33-34).

81 In addition to this P. Horatius receives this title (1.26), as does P. Valerius Publico (3.61). See also Livy 7.32 and 24.25.
and one which would predate our extant reference. If this is so, then the placement of Caesar’s statue, as well as the epithet *Liberator*, may have been influential for Cicero in choosing the term *liberatores* for the assassins of Caesar. In doing so, he could diminish the honours of Caesar by the transferring of this honour to those men who had assassinated him.

Cicero’s use of the term *liberator* for Cassius and/or Brutus is limited to seven references in the *Philippics*, and only one credible appearance in the correspondence to Atticus (*Att. 14.12.2*). It is not present in either the *de Re Publica* or the *de Officiis*, which may suggest that it did not belong to Cicero’s initial rhetoric concerning the ideal Roman statesman. Similarly, the terms which define the ideal statesman are infrequent in the depictions of Cassius and Brutus.\(^82\) Neither does Cicero use, or even give reference to, the title that the conspirators had given themselves: *libertatis auctores*.\(^83\) The absence of this

---

\(^{82}\) For instance there is only one reference to the conspirators as *conservatores* in the *Philippics* (2.13.31). Interesting though is Cicero’s use of a shipwreck analogy to describe the condition of Cassius’ and Brutus’ plans after the Ides, which could definitely be linked to terms for the ideal statesman like *gubernator* (*Att. 15.11.3*). This episode will be described in detail in the next chapter.

\(^{83}\) This self-appointed title/slogan is preserved in the letter from Matius to Cicero dated to September or October 44, in which he indicated that the assassins were calling themselves the *authors of liberty* – *ut quidem isti dicitant ‘libertatis auctores’* (*Fam. 11.28.3*). This also appears in two later sources: i) Suetonius refers to C. Albucius Silus who narrowly escaped punishment calling M. Brutus, whilst gesturing to his statue, *legum ac libertatis auctorem et vindicem* (*Suet. Rhet. 30.6.6*); and ii) pseudo-Quintilian’s *Declamationes Minores* indicates that the conspirators were promoting themselves as tyrannicides and linking this to the defence of the republic and the creation of liberty – *perdidimus tyrannicidam et vindicem rei publicae et libertatis auctorem*
phrase seems to be a deliberate choice, though the reason for this will remain unknown. The possibility remains that liberator could merely be a contracted form, though there is no reference to this phrase by which this connection could be made. It remains to seek other possible reasons for Cicero’s preference for liberator, which may also explain its predominance in the Philippics.

The Philippics represent not only Cicero’s invective against M. Antonius, but are a justification and a defence of the extraordinary and often extra-constitutional events that were needed to counter Antonius’ growing power and control over the political situation in Rome. As such, as an affected form of communication, these speeches are representative of how Cicero wanted others to see not only the affairs as they unfolded, but also how he wanted men like Cassius and Brutus to appear: not as assassins but as liberators in service of their country. So why not use libertatis auctores if this was the term used by the conspirators in the months following the assassination? It is possible that he may have called them this if political liberty had been restored, but since there was no freedom, a declaration of libertas would have seen premature. At best, they were tyrannicides, at worst, murderers of a patron. Therefore, Cicero may have

(329.16.2). The similarities in these passages seem to support a deliberate choice by Cicero to use liberator over libertatis auctor. Other references to the phrase libertatis auctor can be found in Livy (24.14.8; 30.45.6; 39.25.11) and Tacitus (Hist. 4.17.3). NB: Wood has paraphrased too much when stated that the conspirators called themselves ‘liberators of the Republic’ (1988: 54).

84 Thus Dante places them in the personal company of Satan along with Judas Iscariot (Inf. 34).
sought a term which connected them to the ‘liberation’ from the tyrannical rule of Caesar, but without the acceptance of *libertas*.

If this is correct, the term *liberator* becomes an abstract depiction which fixed the conspirators in the purity of their act of assassinating Caesar. Their goal was liberation, and this was arguably achieved. By using *liberator*, Cicero may have also been attempting to neutralise some of Caesar’s legacy and transfer the title from Caesar to the conspirators. The plausibility of this increases if Livy has indeed preserved correctly this title for L. Iunius Brutus, as this would again recall the exiling of the kings from Rome. This ‘rebranding’ of *liberator* also seems evident from its use in the *Philippics.* Cicero’s first use succinctly sets up the parameters of its meaning (*Phil. 1.2.6*):

> …patriae liberatores urbe carebant ea, cuius a cervicibus iugum servile deiecerant…

> …the liberators of their homeland were exiles from this city, from whose neck they had shed the yoke of servitude…

There was one difficulty which was inherent in Cicero’s defence of the conspirators. A persona had to be formulated for individuals who were no longer at hand or politically active. Slanders from detractors and the image of fugitives

---

85 Weinstock (1971: 143) correctly notes that Cicero worked hard to transfer this term to Brutus and Cassius.
on the run because of their heinous deeds were difficult to counteract. Therefore, references to the liberators predominately mention directly, or at least allude to, their absence from Rome as being unjustified or against their will. In doing so he redirects any accusation from a sign of guilt to a declaration of injustice. The focus on absence delays the use of the term liberator until after the departure of Cassius and Brutus from Rome, and this perhaps further indicates a contrived depiction and not a contracted form of the self-entitled libertatis auctores of the conspirators.

In addition to a reference to their absence, the term liberator is always linked directly to their very act of liberation, the assassination of Caesar (Phil. 2.35.89). In the above example he defines their role in the traditional terms of the slave and master relationship, describing it as the removal of the yoke of servitude. The comparison to the freeing of the Roman people from the tyranny of Caesar is undeniable and draws on significant connections to libertas as charted above.

However, it should also be noted that Cicero uses the term patriae liberatores, the plural version of the same phrase which Livy would use for L. Brutus. Is this further evidence that Cicero was reclaiming this term for the conspirators, and if

86 The Romans frequently used this as a metaphor for submission in a military context (e.g. Cic. Off. 3.30.109; Caes. Gal. 1.7, 12; Quint. Inst. 3.8.3; Liv. 1.26.13; 2.34.9; 3.23.5, 28.10, 67.5) and even in a marital or intimate context (Pl. Cur. 50; Hor. Carm. 2.5.1; 3.9.18), cf. coniunx. Its use as a metaphor for being subject to slavery goes back to Greek models (e.g. Hdt 7.8γ; A. A. 953; Th. 75; S. Aj. 944; Ant. 291; X. Cyr. 3.1.27).
so, particularly for the namesake M. Brutus? The next example, whilst less explicit in its description of the act of liberation, may contain further evidence that a connection to L. Brutus is a plausible interpretation of Cicero’s intention (Phil. 2.44.114):

quodsi se ipsos illi nostri liberatores e conspectu nostro abstulerunt,

at exemplum facti reliquerunt. illi, quod nemo fecerat, fecerunt.

Tarquinium Brutus bello est persecutus, qui tum rex fuit, cum esse Romae regem licebat; Sp. Cassius, Sp. Maelius, M. Manlius propter suspicionem regni appetendi sunt necati; hi primum cum gladiis non in regnum appetentem, sed in regnantem impetum fecerunt.

But although those liberators of ours have withdrawn themselves from sight, they have left an example of their action. They have done what no-one had done. Brutus waged war against Tarquinius, who was then king when to be a king was allowed in Rome; Sp. Cassius, Sp. Maelius, M. Manlius were killed because of the suspicion that they were aiming towards kingship; these men (conspirators) were the first to make an attack with swords on one ruling as a king, not ‘aiming’ at kingship.

---

87 For the importance of using family exempla to exert political force, particularly in regard to Lucius Brutus and Marcus Brutus, including references to sources and previous scholarship, see van der Blom (2010: 97-98).
The magnitude of their deed is put into historical perspective through what follows. Cicero’s use of the forms of *facere* moves the focus from the action of the conspirators, seen in the polyptoton of *exemplum facti* and perfect indicative *fecerunt*, to the more remote past with the pluperfect (*fecerat*). The deed of the conspirators surpasses all others because either the sanctioned political slayings were preventative, aiming at those who sought to be kings (Sp. Cassius, Sp. Mælius, M. Manlius), or from a time when kings were permissible in Rome. Three things surface from this: i) there is no doubting Cicero’s position that Caesar was an autocrat; ii) an immediate connection is made with L. Iunius Brutus; and iii) the focus is solely on the act of removing the autocrat and not on the liberation of the State. There are clear connections here to the ideology of Republican liberty and the freedom from the arbitrary will of a single ruler.

Whilst Lucius did not kill Tarquinius, he did secure his exile which ended his autocratic rule in Rome. Working off the conjecture again that Lucius was given the title *Liberator*, and knowing that his statue stood on the Capitol amongst those of the kings of Rome, near to which the statue of Caesar was later placed, the connection between Lucius’ action and that of the conspirators raises the possibility that Cicero was rebranding *liberator* away from Caesar and towards the conspirators. Not only did they both dispose of ‘kings’, one legal and one unlawful, but there are obvious links between Marcus and his
supposed illustrious descendant.\textsuperscript{88} The possibility must be considered that this reference was an attempt to rewrite the unjust positioning, and accompanying appellation, of Caesar’s depiction within a statue collection which celebrated the move from monarchy to the republic. Caesar had not liberated Rome from civil war; the conspirators depicted as in exile, even despite the amnesty contained within the compromise with Antonius, proved this. In the case of the conspirators, even though their contribution to political freedom may have been fleeting, they had liberated Rome from this false liberator and autocrat, and thus they were \textit{liberatores}.

One absence that Cicero needed to defend was Brutus’ absence from the Apollinarian Games.\textsuperscript{89} As urban praetor, Brutus was responsible for their organisation and his attendance was expected. Fortunately the Games were a success and Cicero uses the praise received as a testimony of the affection toward Brutus as the liberator \textit{in absentia} in order to counter the attacks from Antonius (\textit{Phil}. 1.15.36). In another example, Cicero draws a powerful contrast between \textit{aberat liberatoris} and \textit{libertatis aderat} that sums up his intentions of linking the absent Cassius and Brutus to the ideal and hope of freedom from tyranny which was contained in the physical act of assassination (\textit{Phil}. 10.4.8):

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{88} However, even in ancient times there were doubts over whether M. Iunius Brutus was related to the legendary figure and founder of the Republic (Plu. \textit{Brut}. 1.6).
  \item \textsuperscript{89} For a comprehensive study of the political wrangling surrounding the Apollinarian Games of Brutus in 44 B.C. see Sumi (2005: 142-8).
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
corpus aberat liberatoris, libertatis memoria aderat

The body of the liberator was absent, but the memory of liberty was present.

The emphatic nature contained in this concise statement, complete with the inverted parallelism of the chiasmic phrasing, is undeniable. The deliberate parallelism explicitly connects liberator to libertas. This creates a strong link between the two components of the statement, which mirrors all the previous links of the term liberator with both the absence of the conspirators and the glory of the deed of assassination.

One final example appears within Cicero’s attempts to counteract the slanderous terminology used against the liberators, such as assassins, murderers and parricides. His use of a reversal argument is masterful (Phil. 2.13.31):

ego, qui sum illorum, ut ipse fateor, familiaris, ut a te arguor, socius, nego quicquam esse medium; confiteor eos, nisi liberatores populi Romani conservatoresque rei publicae sint, plus quam sicarios, plus quam homicidas, plus etiam quam parricidas esse, si quidem est atrocius patriae parentem quam suum occidere.

90 These terms will be dealt with later, though clear examples of Cicero engaging with these term to counter the slander include Phil. 1.14.35; 2.13.31 (to be discussed presently); 13.10.22.
I, who am, as I myself confess, the friend, and as you argue, the ally, of those men, deny there is a middle course; I confess that, if they are not the liberators of the Roman people and the preservers of the State, they are worse than assassins, worse than murderers, even worse than parricides, if indeed it is more heinous to kill the father of the country than one’s own.

The reference to socius relates to Antonius’ accusation that Cicero himself was an accomplice to the assassination (Phil. 2.12.30). Cicero seems to be setting up a false dichotomy in an attempt to diminish the anti-conspirator invective down to a reductio ad absurdum. After a series of proofs based on the extraordinary allowances which Antonius himself has bestowed upon them,91 Cicero concludes (Phil. 2.13.31):

non igitur homicidas. sequitur, ut liberatores tuo iudicio, quando quidem tertium nihil potest esse.

Therefore (they are) not murderers. It follows then, in accordance with your judgement, that they are liberators, since indeed there can be no third term (middle ground).

91 These included: i) the respect he addresses them with; ii) Brutus’ exemption from the law which required the urban praetor to be absent from Rome for less than 10 days; iii) praise and rejoicing at the Apollinarian Games; iv) provincial appointments; and v) increase in number of quaestors and legates appointed to them.
The reference to *liberatores* here seems somewhat of an anomaly as it forms part of Cicero’s dichotomy and refutation of slander. However, examining Cicero’s premise for this argument reveals a turn of phrase which bears a striking similarity to the examples already discussed (*Phil. 2.12.30*):

> numquamne intelleges statuendum tibi esse utrum illi, qui istam rem gesserunt, homicidae sint an vindices libertatis?

*Will you never understand that you must decide whether those men, who carried out that deed, are murderers or defenders of liberty?*

In this plea to Antonius the connection to the deed of assassination is again mentioned (*istam rem gesserunt*), and its generic phrasing seems to suspend this action in neutrality awaiting the outcome of the examination of the dichotomy. The choice is between *homicidae* and *vindices libertatis*.\(^{92}\) It should be noted that when this comparison reappears the term *homicidae* remains constant, whilst *vindices libertatis* changes to *liberatores*. The conspirators are now the defenders of liberty, but still not the *auctores* of their catch cry. It is interesting that both Suetonius’ and Quintilian’s mentioning of *libertatis auctores* also contain the term *vindex* as part of the political sloganising.\(^{93}\)

---

\(^{92}\) This is the first attested use of *homicida* (*TLL 6.3.2866.14-16*).

\(^{93}\) See p. 73 n. 83. Suetonius describes them as defenders of liberty – *legum ac libertatis auctorem et vindicem* (*Rhet. 30.6.6*), and Quintilian has them as defenders of the republic – *perdidimus tyrannicidam et vindicem rei publicae et libertatis auctorem* (*329.16.2*).
choice not to use *auctores* seems deliberate. Was Cicero commenting on their contribution to *libertas*? They were certainly liberators in the sense that they removed Caesar, and in this regard they could be seen as the defenders of this liberty. However, since political freedom had not been obtained, and the freedom from tyranny itself was incredibly short-lived, he may not, in good conscience, have been able to use the term *auctores* since no liberty had been created.94

The only certainly genuine letter that contains the term *liberatores* comes from a letter to Atticus dated to 22 April 44.95 This date places it some four months before the *Philippics*, making it the first appearance of the word in Cicero.

94 Of course this does not discount the idea of an abbreviation of the slogan to a more manageable and single word catchphrase *liberatores*. Another possibility is that *auctor* was actually being used more as ‘a supporter’ than ‘a creator’ (*OLD* 224-5 §5; *TLL* 2.0.1196.44, 1198.38). If this is so, the omission of *auctor* becomes considerably less critical.

95 A possibly spurious letter from Brutus to Cicero also contains the term *liberatores* within a criticism of Cicero’s support of Octavian (*ad Brut.* 1.16.2). In it the liberator of the country (*liberator patriae*) or the city (*liberator urbis*) has been expanded into the hyperbolic *liberator orbis terrarum*. If genuine, this may be a quoting and deriding of Cicero’s rhetoric, a reminder to Cicero that he needed to be consistent in both words and deeds. If this is correct, it would suggest that *liberator* was part of Cicero’s rhetoric and not Brutus’. Alternatively, the hyperbole could indicate Brutus’ hubris and an unflattering belief in his own self-importance. However the doubtful nature of this letter makes it wise not to draw conclusions about Cicero’s or Brutus’ rhetoric from it.

For the doubtful authenticity of *ad Brut.* 1.16 and 1.17 see SB (1980: 10-15); cf. Rawson (1981: 211-2). T&P are harsh in their criticism of Brutus in regard to these letters: ‘Absolutely convincing proof on either side cannot be adduced. It is possible that the letters may be the composition of a rhetorician; but it is by no means impossible that they may have been the work of the narrow-minded, stiff, and ungracious Brutus’ (1899: 153).
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Contextually the letter refers to the news of Octavian’s journey to Rome and the threats from his entourage.\(^\text{96}\) Despite the contextual and chronological difference, the formula remains the same (\textit{Att.} 14.12.2):

\begin{quote}
\textit{quid censes cum Romam puer venerit, ubi nostri liberatores tutti esse non possunt? <qui> quidem semper erunt clari, conscientia vero facti sui etiam beati; sed nos, nisi me fallit, iacebimus.}
\end{quote}

\textit{What do you think (they will do) when the boy will come to Rome, where our liberators cannot be safe? They will certainly always be renowned and truly blessed also in the consciousness of their deed; but we, unless I am mistaken, will lie in ruins.}

Just like in the \textit{Philippics}, the conspirators are absent, but their deed lives on. The act of assassination again remains generic (\textit{factum suum}), though it is worthy of praise and remembrance. The phrase \textit{conscientia vero facti sui} is similar to \textit{memores libertatis} which appears in the \textit{Tenth Philippic} (\textit{Phil.} 10.4.8).\(^\text{97}\) However, this letter is unique in exploring Cicero’s perspective of Rome post-assassination.

\(^{96}\) Cicero famously makes the reference here that on account of his interfering associates he cannot be a good citizen (\textit{quem nego posse <esse> bonum civem}).

\(^{97}\) Note also Velleius Paterculus uses the same expression when referring to Cassius’ and Brutus’ pretext for not wanting to start a civil war, that there was ample honour in the consciousness of their act – \textit{plurimum sibi honoris esse in conscientia facti sui} (2.62.3).
As was mentioned previously, the use of *liberator* seems to isolate the conspirators in the purity of their intention to assassinate Caesar. This passage, however, extends past that point and looks to the actual situation in Rome, and in Cicero’s perception, this is one of ruin. The absence of this pessimistic opinion from the *Philippics* is expected, given the image of heroic liberation Cicero needed in that context to counter Antonius. However, to Atticus, he is usually more candid. The opening sets up the premise of this letter (*Att. 14.12.1*):

> o mi Attice, vereor ne nobis Idus Martiae nihil dederint praeter laetitiam et odi poenam ac doloris. quae mihi istim adferuntur! quae hic video! ὡ πράξεως καλῆς μὲν, ἀτελοῦς δὲ.

*O my Atticus, I fear that the Ides of March has given us nothing except gladness and satisfaction of our hatred and pain.*

What things are reported to me from where you are (Rome)! What things I see here! ‘Oh what a fine doing, but incomplete.’

Out of the twenty one letters where Atticus is addressed by the vocative, this is the only time the interjection *o* is used to give the impression of emotion. The

---

98 I am following How (1926: 484) and T&P (1915: 269) here in translating *poena* as satisfaction for an injury (*OLD 1535-6 §2; TLL 10.1.2497.61*).

99 Gildersleeve & Lodge (1895: 141 § 201); Bennett (1895: 108 §145); Allen, et al. (1903: 139 §225); Hoffman & Szantyr (1965: 26 §37e).
Greek phrase, not found in extant Greek literature,\textsuperscript{100} seems to summarise Cicero’s opinion of the situation expressed in his opening remarks. The liberation of Rome was unfinished.\textsuperscript{101}

What the evidence in the \textit{Philippics} and this letter suggests is that the term \textit{liberator} related to that ephemeral freedom from the rule of Caesar. It had few connections to the higher goals of political \textit{libertas}. This synchronises well with Cicero’s frequent motif of freedom from the tyrant but not the tyranny. As such the term \textit{liberatores} seems to have had a very narrow focus and it is unlikely to have been the all-encompassing catchphrase of political liberty that modern historians seem to represent it as. This narrow definition may help to explain the apparent avoidance of the conspirators’ phrase of self-address: \textit{libertatis auctores}. For Cicero, the conspirators should be congratulated for their removal of the tyrant, but no matter how heroic that action had been, \textit{libertas} had not been created.

\textsuperscript{100} Often this is attributed to some lost play, e.g. How (1926: 484); SB (1967: 224). T&P on the other hand doubt this attribution to some lost tragedy, thinking it more likely to be Cicero’s view of the situation put into Greek (1915: 269). It is in unlikely to be from a play due to its difficult scansion. The section on \textit{tyrannoctoni} will explore some of Cicero’s uses of Greek in the letters. In short, however, if these are Cicero’s words, then this may be a case of ‘graceful distancing’, which is used when wanting to soften a criticism; see Adams (2003: 329-35).

\textsuperscript{101} This does not necessarily have to do with the rumour of the plan to kill Antonius on the Ides.
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1.2: SICARII, HOMICIDAE, INTERFECTORES, PARRICIDAE

The concepts of liberation and freedom also function within strategies of invective. It should first be noted that when Cicero set up the false dichotomy that the assassins were either liberators or murderers and parricides (Phil. 2.13.31), he was moving into contentious grounds. The compromise following the assassination had created a logical contradiction. The ratification of Caesar’s acta implied that Caesar was not a tyrant, whilst the amnesty for the conspirators suggested that he was. This was clearly incompatible, and was difficult to reconcile. Instead, what is illustrated is the polarisation of opinions on Caesar’s legitimacy and whether the assassination was tyrannicide or murder.

Terms like interfectores, sicarii, homicidae, and parricidae are rare in Cicero’s writings about Cassius and Brutus due to his need to avoid any possible overtone of criminality or immorality.102 Only one verifiable letter to Cassius contains the terms sicarii and parricidae (Fam. 12.3.1),103 with another similar phrase in a letter to Atticus (Att. 14.22.1). In this case Cicero was dining with

102 In the Philippics, such references to the assassins of Caesar occur only seven times, in three places only: sicarii – twice (2.13.31; 13.10.22); homicidae – twice (2.13.31); interfectores – once (1.14); parricidae – twice (2.13.31). The term percussor, which could also be used, is restricted in the Philippics to one reference to Antonius and not Cassius and Brutus (4.6.17). Interestingly, parricida is much more regularly used for Antonius and his followers than the assassins: a total of nine times (4.2.4; 8.3.8; 11.9.21; 12.6.13, 8.19; 13.9.21, 19.42; 14.2.4, 10.27).

103 The doubtful letter of the Brutus collection mentioned before (ad Brut. 1.16) also contains a reference to interfectores, but due to its dubious nature I will not include it in this section.
Hirtius, who is described as connected to that one whom Brutus stabbed \((illum quem Brutus noster sauciavit)\). Cicero, through this intentional crass statement, may have been indicating his opposition to the political affiliations of the noted pro-Caesarian Hirtius, or, given the rarity of such a brutal expression, he may have been paraphrasing the conversation, borrowing Hirtius’ invective for his own rhetoric.

The first invective use of *interfectores* is in reference to whether Caesar could be *beatus* if his slaying had brought impunity and great glory to his killers \((Phil. 1.14.35)\).\(^\text{104}\) For Cicero, the *beati* were those who knew nothing but that which is good and virtuous \((Tusc. 5.28)\). In Cicero’s eyes, both Caesar and Antonius fall short. Interestingly *interfector* seems to be more morally neutral than other invective terms.\(^\text{105}\) For instance, in the defence of Milo, Cicero uses it firstly in a supportive reference to the ‘slayers’ of Tiberius Gracchus \((Mil. 72.9)\), and then in a dichotomy similar to the contrast of murderers and liberators which he would later use for the conspirators \((Mil. 79.16)\). So, when needing to mention the slaying of Caesar \((interfici possit)\), Cicero comes to a logical conclusion: if Caesar was slain, he must have had slayers. The justification of this slaying is

---

\(^\text{104}\) This may also be a not so subtle warning to Antonius who likewise had those who had called him *beatus* \((Phil. 1.13.31)\).

\(^\text{105}\) Despite a sense of neutrality, Cicero still only uses it a maximum of six times throughout his works: *Mil. 72.9, 79.16; Brut. 128.10; Red. Sen. 4.10; ad Brut. 1.16.5; Fam. 12.23.2; Phil. 1.14.35*. Apart from the reference in the *Philippics*, and the dubious letter from *Brutus*, all other usages are not in reference to Caesar’s assassination.
proven by the praise of the people and the granting of impunity. Thus, *interfectores* provides a safe option in asserting the vindication of the assassination.

The next word, *sicarii*, was actually used by Cicero numerous times in his defence speeches,\(^{106}\) often for gangs and assassins,\(^{107}\) who kill for financial gain,\(^{108}\) or who cause political violence.\(^{109}\) The context for its appearance in the *Thirteenth Philippic* is a letter from Antonius to Hirtius and Octavian in which he criticises the pronouncement of Dolabella as a public enemy for killing Trebonius, whom he calls a *sicarius*. Antonius asks whether Trebonius should be held in higher regard than Caesar who was declared father of his country (*Phil. 13.10.23*)\(^{110}\). The *ad hominem* argument from Antonius is obvious. Further

---

\(^{106}\) Fifteen times in the *pro Roscio Amerino* alone.

\(^{107}\) Its use in Josephus has created recent discussion over whether the word ‘terrorist’ would be a fitting translation, see Horsley (1979); Law (2009: 29-30); Brighton (2009: 149). The term itself derives from the curved dagger (*sica*) and dates back to at least Sulla and the *lex Cornelia de sicariis et veneficis*. This legislated against those who went around armed for the purpose of robbing or killing (Just. *Inst. 4.18.5*), see Smith (1875: 687). Quintilian supports this when he writes: *sicarios etiam omnes vocamus, qui caedem telo quocumque commiserint* (*Inst. 10.1.12*).


\(^{109}\) Cloud uses the political violence of Catiline (*Mur. 49*), Clodius (*Sest. 53, 78, 81, 95*) and Antonius (*Phil. 5.6.17-8*) for evidence on this point (1969: 276-78).

\(^{110}\) The unique nature of the *Thirteenth Philippic*, more than half of it consisting of the letter from Antonius with interjected criticisms from Cicero, is explored in Ramsey (2010). Both Lintott (2008: 445-447) and Ramsey (2010: 170-174) have reconstructed the letter of Antonius to Hirtius and Octavian.
still, through the reminder of the title *pater patriae*, Antonius signals the Caesarian intention to consider the assassination as parricide.

The crime of *parricidium* had evolved from the murder of any free citizen under the *Lex Numiae*, to the murder of one’s father, and later to relatives and special associations under the *lex Pompeia de Parricidiis*.\(^{111}\) This naturally led Antonius to use it for the death of Caesar in his role as *Parens Patriae*,\(^ {112}\) which in turn would see Cicero use *parricidium* in accusations of murdering one’s *patria*.\(^ {113}\)

Early in October, Cicero wrote to Cassius that Antonius had erected a statue of Caesar on the *rostra* on which was inscribed PARENTI OPTIME MERITO (*to the father for the best service*).\(^ {114}\) Cicero editorialises about what this would mean for the conspirators (*Fam. 12.3.1*):

\[...ut non modo sicarii sed iam etiam parricideae iudicemini.\]

\(^{111}\) The history of this word seemingly dates back to the Twelve Tables and the laws of Numa, where Festus gives the act as killing anyone *dolo malo*. For comprehensive studies on the origins, meanings and punishments of this crime see Radin (1920); Gruen (1968: 61-2); Cloud (1971); Cantarella (1991: 264-85); Robinson (1995: 13, 45-6, 67); Bauman (1996: 30-2, 70-4, 128-9).

\(^{112}\) Thus Suetonius refers to the senate voting for the Ides of March to be known as the *Parricidium* ‘The Day of Parricide’ (*Iul. 88*).

\(^{113}\) Rawson writes that Cicero used the term *parricida* ‘vaguely’, stating that ‘no one knew (or knows) what the word really meant’ (1986: 101). For instance, Cicero used it in his speeches against Catiline in various contexts, such as referring to the *parricida civium* (*Cat. 1.29.13*; see also *2.7.6, 22.1*).

\(^{114}\) Caesar had probably received the title *Parens Patriae* after the battle of Munda (*App. BC 2.106*; cf. *Dio 44.4.4*). There are coins in 44 and three inscriptions that contain this title in relation to Caesar, see Weinstock (1971: 200).
...so that you are judged not only as assassins but now also as parricides.

On face value this would seem to indicate the result of Antonius’ actions, but a more sinister tone is added if this is thought of as a purpose clause. Whatever the nuances of the meaning, the similarities with this letter and the justification of the term liberatores from the Second Philippic would indicate that they relate to the same event in October (Phil. 2.13.31):

confiteor eos, nisi liberatores populi Romani conservatoresque rei publicae sint, plus quam sicarios, plus quam homicidas, plus etiam quam parricidas esse, si quidem est atrocius patriae parentem quam suum occidere.

I confess that, if they are not the liberators of the Roman people and the preservers of the State, they are worse than assassins, worse than murderers, even worse than parricides, if indeed it is more heinous to kill the father of the country than one’s own.

As mentioned, the reminder of Caesar’s title and the erection of the statue signalled Antonius’ intention to regard the assassination as a parricide. Cicero, in his defence of this serious accusation, decided to attack this outlook head on,
just as he may have done with the epithet of *Caesar Liberator*.\(^\text{115}\) The contemporaneous *de Officiis* may provide an insight into his argument (*Off.* 3.83):

> ecce tibi, qui rex populi Romani dominusque omnium gentium esse concupiverit idque perfecerit. hanc cupiditatem si honestam quis esse dicit, amens est; probat enim legum et libertatis interitum earumque oppressionem taetram et detestabilem gloriosam putat. … potest enim, di immortales, cuiquam esse utile foedissimum et taeterrimum parricidium patriae, quamvis is, qui se eo obstrinxerit, ab oppressis civibus parens nominetur? honesta igitur dirigenda utilitas est, et quidem sic, ut haec duo verbo inter se discrepare, re unum sonare videantur.

*Look, here is a man who had desired to be king of the Roman people and master over the entire world, and he achieved it! If someone says that this desire is honourable, he is mad; for he justifies the annihilation of law and of liberty, and he regards the repulsive and detestable oppression of these as glorious… For, immortal gods, can the most foul and repulsive murder of one’s country be profitable for anyone, even if the man, who was responsible for it, has been*

\(^{115}\) See pp. 71-73.
named its parent by its enslaved citizens? Therefore utility must be
guided by probity, and in such a way that these two seem different
from each other in word, but in reality mean one thing.

Cicero attacks the notion of *parricidium* by drawing into question the
appropriateness of Caesar’s title *patriae parens*. He undermines this title by
placing onto Caesar a far worse accusation, the murder of the State itself.\(^{116}\)
Despite Rawson’s doubts over the meaning of *parricidia* in relation to the State,
it would seem that Cicero is creating a portrait of a ‘dead’ republic due to
Caesar. The use of *obstringere* generates a legalistic perspective to Caesar’s
liability.\(^{117}\)

Cicero defends his stance by references to Caesar’s disregard for the criteria
for the establishment of the State as they appeared in the *de Officiis*\(^{118}\). Caesar
had caused the annihilation of law and liberty (*legum et libertatis interitum*), but
he also questioned the level of benefit which Caesar’s actions provided the
State. In this way, despite being given the title of ‘Father of the Country’ by an
oppressed population, Caesar had brought about the death of his country
through his disregard for the *iuris consensus* or the *utilitatis communio*.

---

\(^{116}\) *OLD* 1431 §3; *TLL* 10.1.442.23-72 (i.e with *patriae*) gives the meaning of a person who ruins
or betrays his country, i.e. a traitor.

\(^{117}\) *OLD* 1350 §7; *TLL* 9.2.252.41.

\(^{118}\) Griffin & Atkins (1991: xxvi).
However, Cicero also brought this counter attack against Antonius and his followers. As perpetuators of the same hostile political environment, they too should be considered *parricidae* of the State. The success of Cicero in negating this term is difficult to assess given the lack of evidence outside of his own writing. However, the complete absence of the term from both the letters and the *Philippics*, apart from the example given, may suggest that this line of accusation against Cassius and Brutus was quickly dropped. In fact, the term *parricidae* is used more often for Antonius and his intimates than the assassins.\(^\text{119}\) Whilst it is impossible to prove the effectiveness of this as a counter measure, Cicero’s political agenda seems clear in subverting Antonius’ exploitation of the title *patriae parens*. Of course, Cicero’s interest in this may have been personal. After all, he himself had been awarded this title in 63 for his exposing of the Catilinarian Conspiracy (*Cic. Pis*. 6).

### 1.3: TYRANNOCTONI

Cicero’s false dichotomy had questioned whether the conspirators were criminals or saviours. Similarly, questions of perspective emerge for the Greek

\(^{119}\) Of the twelve uses of the term *parricida* in the *Philippics*, only three relate to the assassins and these are all in one passage (*Phil. 2.13.31*). All other references are either regarding Antonius (*Phil. 4.2.5; 12.6.13; 13.9.21; 13.19.42; 14.2.4*) or Antonius’ cutthroat followers (*Phil. 8.3.8; 11.9.21; 12.8.19; 14.10.27*).
inspired *tyrannoctoni*.\(^{120}\) Tyrannicide in itself could be figured as a noble and praiseworthy deed, and Caesar could certainly be considered a tyrant.\(^{121}\) Cicero does not use this term at all in the *Philippics*.\(^{122}\) Instead it is restricted to four references in the correspondence to Atticus and one in a letter to Q. Cornificius, provincial governor of the province of *Africa Vetus*.\(^{123}\) This may indicate a more private usage.

This contextual divergence could be explained in a number of ways. Firstly, the *Philippics* demonstrate a ‘hard-line’ approach, often aiming at the absolute and ideal. In other words, the persuasive argument called for *liberatores*, rather than tyrannicides. This can be seen as relating to the depiction that these words created. *Liberatores* looked forward to the promise of a restored republic, whilst *tyrannoctoni* cast the mind back to the bloodied floor of the *Curia Pompei*.

\(^{120}\) It is interesting to note that terms *tyrannicida* and *tyrannicidium* do not appear before Seneca and that the Romans did not use the term *regicida* (T&P (1915: 257)).

\(^{121}\) The ratification of his *acta* indicates otherwise (Wiseman (2009: 207)), but Cicero’s rhetoric never questions whether Caesar was or was not a tyrant. It is assumed as a fact. One could argue, as Cicero does, that the amnesty given to the assassins justifies the act as tyrannicide, just as the passing of the *acta* signifies it as political assassination. As mentioned before, the compromise had attempted to find a middle ground for all. The ‘tyrannicide debate’ was not only an issue in ancient times, but continued well through the Medieval and Renaissance periods, see Jaszi & Lewis (1957: 3-96); Miola (1985).

\(^{122}\) Of course, this does not mean he did not refer to the slaying of the tyrant, e.g. *Phil*. 2.46.117 (*haec non cogitas, neque intellegis satis esse viris fortibus didicisse, quam sit re pulchrum, beneficio gratum, fama gloriosum tyrannum occidere*?), but this particular collective noun does not appear in the speeches at all, presumably because of the general avoidance of Greek in speeches: see Hutchinson (2013: 155-6); Glucker (2012).

\(^{123}\) *Att*. 14.6, 15, 21; 16.15; *Fam*. 12.22.
Despite being heroic, it dwelt too heavily on the gory deed of assassination itself and spoke little of the outcome. It would be difficult enough to justify the assassination in a conciliatory manner without constantly referring back to it directly.

When considering the etymology it must first be recognised that there are two words under investigation: the Latin transliterated *tyrannoctonus* and the Greek word from which it derives, τυραννοκτόνος, with both appearing to have their origins within the literary tradition in Cicero. The Latinised transliteration only appears in Cicero, so his transferring the term into Latin seems safe to assume. The Greek τυραννοκτόνος has one rival for introduction into the extant tradition, the contemporary Greek historian Diodorus Siculus. Cicero's first use comes from a letter to Atticus in June 50 B.C. (*Att. 6.4.3*). The dating of Diodorus Siculus is less certain. Jerome in his *Chronicon* wrote that in the *Year of Abraham 1968* (49 B.C.), Diodorus Siculus became famous. This ambiguous statement cannot establish a chronology. However, the fact that all the references to τυραννοκτόνος come from the sixteenth book of the *Bibliotheca Historica* may hold the secret (16.14.4, 65.5, 65.8). Sacks and Stylianou both pointed out that when referring to the granting of citizenship to the Sicilians (13.35.3; 16.70.6), Diodorus was actually referring to the full enfranchisement

---

124 Diodorus Siculus Graecae scriptor historiae, clarus habetur.
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by Sextus Pompeius and not the previous granting of Latin rights by Caesar.\textsuperscript{125}

This then provides a \textit{terminus post quem} for books thirteen to sixteen of 43 B.C.\textsuperscript{126} If this is correct, this places not only the first known use, but all uses in extant literature by Cicero before Diodorus. In fact, there is no known example based on the compound stem \textit{τυραννοκτόν-} (\textit{tyrannocton-}) in either Greek or Latin which predates Cicero. This of course does not mean that Diodorus borrowed the work from Cicero,\textsuperscript{127} but he was not Cicero’s source.

Cicero’s use of \textit{tyrannus} is telling,\textsuperscript{128} with the PHI demonstrating ten appearances of the Latinised word \textit{tyrannus} before Cicero,\textsuperscript{129} yet 172 usages in Cicero’s writings. This seemingly sudden increase could be indicative of the importance that this word took in Late Republican political debate,\textsuperscript{130} and in

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{125} Sacks (1990: 207-8); Stylianou (1998: 20-1).
\item \textsuperscript{126} Stylianou (1998: 20-1).
\item \textsuperscript{127} If Cicero had used \textit{τυραννοκτόνος} in the speeches I would concede that Diodorus could have had access to the texts and therefore could have borrowed the word. However, the fact that they are only in the correspondence make this problematic, especially since those letters which he may have been interested in, those concerning the most famous assassination of the Roman world, had only been written a year or less before Diodorus’ \textit{terminus post quem}. Then again, with at least seven years between Cicero’s first known reference and Diodorus’ use, and without a firm \textit{terminus ante quem}, this is still possible. A common Hellenistic source is probable (Rose (1921: 112)).
\item \textsuperscript{128} Interestingly, evidence seems to indicate that \textit{tyrannos} was not originally Greek but Anatolian. See Anderson for the seminal writings on this (2005: 203).
\item \textsuperscript{129} Single use: Enn. \textit{Ann}. 1.104; Lucil. \textit{fr}. 28.742; Pac. \textit{trag}. 149; Pl. \textit{Cur}. 285; Caes. \textit{Civ}. 3.31.2; \textit{B. Alex}. 65.4.5. Multiple uses: Acc. \textit{trag}. 217, 270; Rut. Lup. 1.20.10; 2.2.11.
\item \textsuperscript{130} Pina Polo (2006: 73); Dunkle (1967: 161-4); Sirago (1956: 195-7).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
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republican discourse at the time. Cicero’s use of tyranny would be used in turn in his diatribe against Verres, Catilina, Clodius, Caesar, and Antonius.

Cicero’s ideology of tyranny was influenced by Athenian and particularly Platonic models. Sirago demonstrated how Cicero’s early rhetorical and philosophical studies would have contributed to the development of his own ideology on tyrannicide. The de Inventione in particular has two such allusions: i) the seventh topic for preparation in speeches of indignation was regarding foul, cruel, nefarious and tyrannical deeds (Inv. 1.53.100, 102); and ii) in the section on contrary laws, references are made not only to sanctioning, but

---

131 Lewis (2006: 10). Of course it could just relate to the limited pre-Cicero Latin which is extant, especially those in the political or historical genres.
132 Verr. 2.1.82; 2.3.71, 77; 2.4.123; 2.5.103; 3.31; 4.51; 5.145.
133 Cat. 2.19.
134 Mil. 35, 80; Sest. 125, 127; Dom. 110; Vat. 23.
135 Phil. 2.36.90, 2.37.96, 2.46.117; Off. 1.112; 2.23; Att. 7.20.2; 8.2.4; 10.1.3; 10.4.2; 10.8.6; 10.12a.1; 14.5.2; 14.6.2; 14.9.2; 14.14.2, 4; 14.16.2; 14.17.6; 15.20.2; 16.14.1; Fam. 12.1.2.
136 In reference to Antonius in the Philippics, Cicero in general favours dominatio and dominatus over tyrannus, e.g. Phil. 3.11.29 (dominatus), 3.14.34 (dominatio); 5.16.44 (dominatus); 8.8.12 (dominatio); 13.8.17-18 (dominus and tyrannus).
137 Sirago (1956: 3-5); Lintott (1999a: 54); Ober (2003: 229-35); Gildenhard (2006: 198-9). Essential to Greek thoughts on tyranny are Plato’s Republic section 8 on tyranny (562a-69c) and section 9 on tyrannical character (570-576b); Aristotle’s Ethics (1160a-b); and the Athenian Constitution (Arist. Ath. 1285a, 1295a, 1310b-1315b). In Plato’s Gorgias, for instance, Polus defines a tyrant as one who does whatever he wants (469c). One can certainly see this attitude in Cicero’s observations of Caesar’s actions in the civil war.
138 Sirago (1956: 5-9).
overt praising of tyrannicides (*Inv.* 2.49.144). Quotes in the correspondence also indicate a well-established viewpoint on tyranny.\(^{139}\)

In Athens tyranny was seen as antithetical to democracy.\(^{140}\) Resistance to tyranny, and ultimately tyrannicide, were considered to be a civic duty to threats on the democratic order.\(^{141}\) By the late fifth century, tyrannicides had been established in the role of liberators and saviours.\(^{142}\) One poignant demonstration of this role was the appearance of the supposed archetypal Athenian tyrannicides, Harmodius and Aristogeiton, on the Panathenaic amphora prizes.\(^{143}\)

It was the murder of Hipparchus by Harmodius and Aristogeiton in 514 B.C. which provided the model of political assassination and tyrannicide. Whilst their claim to actual tyrannicide is erroneous, and their reputations have suffered

\(^{139}\) An example of this is the citing of Euripides’ *Phoenissae* in a letter to Atticus from January 49 (*Att.* 7.11.1) - τὴν θεῶν μεγίστην ὡστ’ ἔχειν τυραννίδα – *so as to have the greatest of the gods – tyranny* (*Eur.* *Ph.* 506). Other obvious examples include the quoting of Plato’s *Epistle 7* in the letter to Atticus from March 49 regarding Caesar’s position in the civil war (*Att.* 9.13.4), as well as *Att.* 10.8.6-7; *Fam.* 6.6.8, 14.2.

\(^{140}\) The tyrant was seen to be putting down democracy, with καταλύει τὴν δημοκρατίαν being a stock phrase, see Versnel (1998: 55).

\(^{141}\) Anderson (2003: 197-211); Ober (2003: 216, 220, 224); Raaflaub (2003); Taylor (1991); Thomas (1989: 238-61). This is despite the fact that no actual tyrant was ever killed by an assassin in Athens (Ober (2003: 225)). The chorus of old men from the *Lysistrata* in giving reference to Aristogeiton and the songs of the tyrannicides demonstrate further the popularity of this ideology in Athens (*Arist. Lys.* 631-4).


\(^{143}\) Beazley (1951: 99 no. 1-2); (1956: 411 no. 4, 412, no. 1-2); Boardman (1974: fig. 304, no. 1).
from hostile sources, in the ancient world they were the archetypal tyrannicides. Most conspicuously for the Athenians, bronze statues were set up twice in the Agora to the Tyrannicides as monuments celebrating democracy. These statues of Harmodius and Aristogeiton were unusual, as they did not form a traditional sculpture type, and were posed in the cooperative action of assassination. Their placement on the Agora marked them as cult heroes and role-models, and celebrated democratic Athens, calling on citizens to embrace the tyrannicide ideology.

---

144 Thucydides dispels the myth, pointing out that Hippias was the tyrant and not Hipparchus (1.20.2). The Athenian Constitution takes a middle ground stating both took control, but that Hippias had control of the government (Arist. Ath. 1.18). Herodotus states that the Alcmaeonidae were more responsible for the liberation of Athens because Harmodius and Aristogeiton created more bloodshed without halting the despotism (6.123.2). Thucydides reduces the tyrannicide to a homosexual love triangle that got out of hand and resulted in an oppressive tyranny (6.53.3-59.1; cf. Arist. Ath. 1.18). See Meyer for an outline of seminal works on Thucydides’ depictions of Harmodius and Aristogeiton (2008: 13). For a summary of the traditions behind the murder of Hipparchus see Fornara (1968). For the predominance of the Harmodius and Aristogeiton tradition over the rival claim of liberation by the Alcmaeonid see Podlecki (1966).

145 An example of this is in Miltiades’ speech to Callimachus in Herodotus where he calls on him to create a memory greater than the one Harmodius and Aristogeiton left (Hdt. 6.109.3).

146 Wycherley (1957: 25); Lebedev (1996). The second set, sculpted by Critius and Nesiotes, were replacements for the originals looted by the Persians in 480 B.C. (Paus. 1.8.5; Marmor Parium FGrH 239 F A54).

147 Hölscher (1998: 158-160). Even after other statues were permitted to be erected in the Agora, there was still a requirement for them to be a certain distance from those of Harmodius and Aristogeiton, see Raaffaub (2003: 63).
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Rome also had marble copies of these famous bronze statues displayed at or near the temple of Fides Publica on the Capitoline.\textsuperscript{149} Theories on their origins and purpose abound, including the seemingly unlikely scenario that Athens gifted them as a grand gesture of support for the assassins of Caesar.\textsuperscript{150} However, in support of this possibility is Cassius Dio’s report that when Brutus and Cassius went to Athens in 44 B.C. the Athenians erected honorary statues of them next to those of Harmodius and Aristogeiton (47.20.4),\textsuperscript{151} seemingly verified by an inscription in the sanctuary of Amphiaraus in Oropus (\textit{IG} 7.383).\textsuperscript{152} There is little reason to doubt this account, and if so it is almost certain that Cicero would have heard about at least one if not both sets of statues.\textsuperscript{153} Yet he is completely silent about these. The blurring of these identities would have provided a powerful symbol of ‘identity politics’ for

\textsuperscript{149}Coarelli (1969: 137-9, 156-9); Stewart (1990: plate 228); Reusser (1993: 113-120); Bertoletti et al. (1999: 82-3 (II.58)). For testimony on the statues in the Agora see Wycherley (1957: 93-8).

\textsuperscript{150}Colini (1938: 282); Landwehr (1985: 42).

\textsuperscript{151}Plutarch does mention the receipt of public honours whilst in Athens, but does not specifically mention the statues (\textit{Brut.} 24.1). For information on the statue of Brutus, and presumably Cassius, see Wycherley (1957: 93, 95, 207-8); Raubitschek (1957), (1959); Brunnsäker (1971: 125-35); Di Cesare (2010). Di Cesare sees this as an attempt by Athens to be involved in Roman affairs, often picking the wrong side in these cases (2010: 236-7).

\textsuperscript{152}The Brutus inscription was found, and it can be assumed that the Cassius was also placed there, see Raubitschek (1957: 5).

\textsuperscript{153}His son was still probably studying philosophy in Athens when Cassius and Brutus arrived.
democracy,\textsuperscript{154} yet Cicero did not capitalise on this, at least in the extant writings.\textsuperscript{155}

In addition to statues, Harmodius and Aristogeiton were also given a tomb in the Ceramicus and cult honours,\textsuperscript{156} part of which included an annual offering by the \textit{archon polemarch} (Arist. \textit{Ath.} 58.1). This has led to the belief that the tyrannicides had the same honour as those who had died in the defence of Athens.\textsuperscript{157} These honours also extended to their descendants who were given meals at the Prytaneion, exemption from taxes and special seating at public events.\textsuperscript{158} These exceptional benefits are indicative of the special place the tyrannicides had in the Athenian community.\textsuperscript{159} Their cult formed part of Athenian religious-political propaganda,\textsuperscript{160} providing a fixed definition, portrayal

\textsuperscript{154} Di Cesare (2010: 236-7).

\textsuperscript{155} He may not have known about the statues, or chose not to comment on them. There is also the possibility that Cicero did write about these statues but that these letters did not survive into modern times. A date after the death of Cicero is problematic as it is difficult to see Octavian allowing a visual reminder or honouring of the murder of Caesar to be erected. Of course a culling of any favourable reference to the tyrannicides during an editing of the letters in the Imperial period is also possible.

\textsuperscript{156} A summary on the nature of the cult is given in Parker (1996: 136-7). On the location of the tomb see Paus. 1.29.15; Clairmont (1983: \textit{s.v. Harmodius}). For the heroic honours see Dem. 19.280; Podlecki (1966); Formara (1970); Rhodes (1981: 651-2); Kearns (1989: 55); Taylor (1991: 5-8); Shear (1997); Anderson (2003); Raaflaub (2003: 65); Shear (2012).

\textsuperscript{157} Raaflaub (2003: 65).

\textsuperscript{158} \textit{IG} 1³ 131; Taylor (1991: 1-5); Anderson (2003).

\textsuperscript{159} Raaflaub (2003: 66).

\textsuperscript{160} Lebedev (1996: 266).
and outcome of tyrannical rule.\textsuperscript{161} They were re-founders of democracy, a depiction strengthened by their association in imagery with the mythological ruler Theseus.\textsuperscript{162}

The depictions of the tyrannicides on pottery,\textsuperscript{163} in song and in epigrams,\textsuperscript{164} would have contributed significantly to popularity and effectiveness of the propaganda which the cult seems to have experienced.\textsuperscript{165} Legislation was introduced banning the slander of the tyrannicides (Hyp. 2.3), and forbidding their use as slave names.\textsuperscript{166} Other laws throughout the Greek world arise in support of tyrannicide,\textsuperscript{167} such as the Euocrates Nomos (337/336 B.C.) exonerating tyrant killers from prosecution,\textsuperscript{168} as well as rewards for tyrannicide.\textsuperscript{169}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{161} Berve (1967: 187); Smarczyk (1990: 57); Anderson (2003: 204-6); (2005: 213).
  \item \textsuperscript{162} Taylor (1991: 52-60); De Cesare (1997: 65-6); Castriota (1997: 209-13); Raaflaub (2003: 66).
  \item \textsuperscript{163} Beazley (1948), (1963: 257 n. 8); Versnel (1998: 55-6); Neer (2002: 180-1, fig. 90); Ober (2003: 219-20).
  \item \textsuperscript{164} Ar. V. 1224, Ach. 978, 1093; Ath. 15.695a; Page \textit{PMG} fr. 893-6; K-A 3. F444.
  \item \textsuperscript{165} Ehrenberg (1956); Formara (1983: no. 39); Taylor (1991: 85-92); Lavelle (1993: 42-58); Anderson (2003).
  \item \textsuperscript{166} Ober (2003: 221); Raaflaub (2003); O’Sullivan (2011).
  \item \textsuperscript{167} Lebedev (1996: 265); Ober (2003: 222-8); Raaflaub (2003: 69-70). Such inscriptions include the Philites inscription (\textit{SIG}³ 284; Heisserer (1979); Teegarden (2014: 173-214)). There is at least some evidence of laws on tyranny and tyrannicide existing as early as the time of Solon (Arist. \textit{Ath.} 16.10; Plu. \textit{Sol.} 19.4; McGlew (1993: 112-5); Anderson (2005: 214)).
  \item \textsuperscript{168} \textit{SEG} 12.87; Merritt (1952: 355-9); Lawton (1995: 99-100).
  \item \textsuperscript{169} Such an inscription exists in Hellenistic Ilion (OGiS 218; Frisch (1975: 25); Ober (2003: 226); Teegarden (2014: 173-214)).
\end{itemize}
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This was the background to Cicero’s own understanding of tyranny. Firstly he transferred these Greek ideas into the Roman landscape, replacing *demokratia* with *res publica*.\(^{170}\) For Cicero, the issue was the threatening of political *libertas*,\(^ {171}\) and as such, tyranny is often difficult to define within constitutional constructs,\(^ {172}\) almost more a style of rule, which constitutes an unconventional seizure and employment of power.\(^ {173}\)

Cicero’s developing idea of tyrannicide first appears in the defence of T. Annius Milo, with the published version inserting the ‘tyrannicide defence’.\(^ {174}\) Echoes to his earlier Catilinarian orations are present. However, through the introduction of words such as *belua* or *tyrannus* as justifications for violence, Cicero begins to transform a legal or political argument into a more philosophical one.\(^ {175}\)

---

\(^{170}\) Pina Polo (2006: 75).

\(^{171}\) Béranger (1935); Wirszubski (1950); White (1955: 8-9); Andrewes (1956: 7); Dunkel (1967); Brunt (1988: 281-350).

\(^{172}\) Lewis (2006: 4).


\(^{174}\) For the evidence given in Asconius that Cicero’s delivered speech differed significantly from his published speech, including the section on the murder of Clodius being *pro re publica*, see Lintott (2008: 249-251), Fotheringham (with references to recent scholarship) (2013: 2-13).

\(^{175}\) Clark & Ruebel (1985: 57-63, 69); Riggsby (1999: 110-2); Melchior (2008: 287). Clark & Ruebel point out that the animalising of Clodius (and later Antonius), through use of words like *belua* and by describing their womanising, may indicate a Stoic perspective in Cicero’s theories, as no *κοινωνία* is shared between animals and men (1985: 61-63). Cicero does use *tyrannus* once in the Catiline orations (2.14.17), but it is in reference to himself. Marek (2014) suggests that this animalising played a role in excluding individuals from the legal system and thus depriving them of its protections. Fotheringham indicates an increased proportion of words relating to politics and public affairs in the ‘Public Good’ argument section of the speech (2013: 2-13).
Essentially, killing was not necessarily murder (Mil. 82), and in fact Milo was a conservator populi (Mil. 80), who had placed the welfare of the State above his own (Mil. 6; Rab. Perd. 3). Connections to the de Re Publica also appear through the portrayal of Clodius as a tyrant, and the removal of the tyrant through tyrannicide (Rep. 2.47-51). Once the conventions of civilised existence had been contravened, it became morally acceptable to meet force with force in the ‘morality of political violence’. There was also precedence for treating tyrant-killers (Mil. 80):

Graeci homines deorum honores tribuunt eis viris qui tyrannos necaverunt. quae ego vidi Athenis, quae aliis in uribus Graeciae! quas res divinas talibus institutas viris, quos cantus, quae carmina! prope ad immortalitatis et religionem et memoriam consecrantur.

The Greeks bestow divine honours on those who killed tyrants. What I have seen in Athens and the other cities of Greece! What divine ceremonies are paid to such men, what odes, what songs! They are

---

75-6, 324, 336). For an in depth analysis of the ‘Public Good’ argument see Fotheringham (2013: 321-369).

176 May (1979). Cicero writes - rebusque omnibus pro salute rei publicae gestis (Mil. 6).

177 Heinze (1924); Büchner (1962); Dunkle (1967); (1971); Buchheit (1975).


179 For an analysis of Cicero’s rhetorical argument that the killer of a man everyone preferred to be dead should not fear punishment but in fact should be praised see Fotheringham (2013: 345-346).
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*elevated nearly to the point of immortality in both veneration and memory.*

This passage provides evidence for Cicero’s opinions on tyrannicide. At that time the cry of tyrannicide was hyperbolic, but soon this rhetoric would be used for the defence of a far more important political assassination.

Cicero’s position on tyrannicide had its complications. Even though the assassination could be justified on moral grounds, legally it was a criminal offence (Plu. *TG* 19.3; Sal. *Jug.* 31.7). As such, tyrant-slayers could also be prosecuted for their actions. Cicero himself, by executing the Catilinarian conspirators, despite considering himself the saviour of Roman and demonstrating senatorial support, was accused of tyrannical behaviour (Plu. *Cic.* 23.1-2; *Cic. Sest.* 109; *Dom.* 75). The prosecutions against Cicero reveal the dangers of tyrannicide. Clodius did not seek death for Cicero, but exile,\(^{180}\) the same punishment which L. Iunius Brutus imposed upon the tyrannical king L. Tarquinius Superbus. Cicero instead established a justification for violence as a civic value, promoting preventative civil tyrannicide as a warning to all *adfectores regni*. Cicero strengthened his argument by creating lists of tyrants, emphasising the risk of tyranny (e.g. *Catil.* 1.3; *Mil.* 72; *Rep.* 2.46),\(^{181}\) and

\(^{180}\) Pina Polo (2006: 72, 99).


Caesar's civil war provided the impetus for the fruition of Cicero's theories on tyranny. Caesar had proven himself to be a tyrant (Off. 3.82), but the nature of his tyranny was unknown. Would he be a Peisistratus or a Phalaris (Att. 7.20.2)? In some instances, the relationship between Cicero and Caesar can be seen as a comparison with Plato and Dionysius of Syracuse, with the philosopher and tyrant cast as opposing, yet complementary figures.

Cicero's understanding was well formed by the time he wrote the de Officiis: violence to safeguard the community was not a crime, but an honourable act and a civic duty (Off. 3.19). The destiny of all tyrants was a violent death (Off.

---

182 Including this perspective of Cicero’s directly, Suetonius provides extensive options for Caesar's reasons for crossing into Italy and starting the civil war (Iul. 30-35).

183 Peisistratus’ reign had been seen as mild and hardly tyrannical at all (Arist. Ath. 16.2), whereas Phalaris, the tyrant of Acragas, was infamous for his tyrannical cruelty (Gildenhard 2006: 201); Pindar Pyth. 1.95.6; Cic. Verr. 2.4.73; Rep. 3.31). Tatian’s Address to the Greeks has him the eater of breastfeeding infants (34), a mention of which is also made, according to Athenaeus, in Clearchus’ writings (Athen. 9.396). It would appear that Atticus had already branded him as a Phalaris (Att. 7.12.2).

184 Haake (2003). Cicero himself seems to have seen it also in this way at times, evident in his quoting of Plato’s Epistle 7 in a letter to Atticus on his relations with Caesar (Att. 9.10.2, 9.13.4).

185 No one was a privatus in defence of the State (Tusc. 4.51).
2.23). The tyrant was a cruel beast, not human, and was likened to an infected limb requiring amputation to save the community (*Off. 2.48, 3.32)*.

Cicero’s opinion was that since Caesar had threatened the State and political *libertas* he was a tyrant, and his assassins should be recognised as patriots and heroes. Yet Caesar’s characterisation as a tyrant was contested. The general confusion and speeches of justification in the moments after the killing demonstrate a far from unanimous feeling of liberation (*D.C. 44.20-21, 34; App. BC 2.121-2; 137-41; Plu. Brut. 18.10; Caes. 67.7*). As such, Cicero needed to portray this political murder as a justifiable tyrannicide and under these circumstances it is reasonable to see him reintroduce *tyrannoctonus* as a catch-cry for this defence. This compound word may have its origins in the formulaic phrase οἵ κτάνον ἄνδρα τύραννον found in the epigraphic tradition of Harmodius and Aristogeiton. Since no collective noun seems to have existed for the Athenian tyrannicides, it may be possible to postulate τυραννοκτόνος as a contraction of this phrase.

---

186 Essentially Cicero’s argument is that Caesar, as a tyrant, had set himself outside of the laws governing society, and therefore, outside of society itself.
189 Cicero had used the Greek version in an earlier letter from 50 B.C. (*Att. 6.4*) which will be discussed in this chapter.
190 The similarities in inscriptions from Chios and Olbia are explored in Ledebev (1996).
Cicero’s theory on tyrannicide established the criteria by which an assassination could be justified. Firstly, there should be some focus on not only the actions and attitudes of the tyrant but also the assassins. Secondly, a justifiable tyrannicide should include a benefit to the State. Unfortunately the State was not restored by the death of Caesar, despite Greek and Roman beliefs seeming to indicate that the demos was considered capable of restoring itself following a justifiable tyrannicide. The Roman Regal Period may also have contributed, with interregna held between rules, implying that the political system survived the ruler. If the system was not restored, then it was logical that one of the conditions must not have been met. Either Caesar was not a tyrant, or the assassins had not completed the task well enough to restore the State. This may be a consideration when analysing Cicero’s references to τυραννοκτόνος / tyrannoctonus.

---


192 The sparing of the country from further woe as a criterion for justifiable tyrannicide seems particularly important to later Christian writers. Thomas Aquinas writes that it was more useful to endure a mild tyranny if, by acting against the tyranny, the danger from the tyranny increased - utilius est remissam tyrannidem tolerare ad tempus, quam contra tyrannum agendo multis implicari periculis, quae sunt graviora ipsa tyrannide (de Regimine Principum 7). Similarly, the Spanish Jesuit Francisco Suarez though it right to slay an oppressive tyrant if there was no danger of further or increased hardship on the State (1944: 712-3).


194 Cic. Rep. 2.52; cf. Livy 1.17.6-9; Mommsen (1901: 316); Andrewes (1956: 21); Walsh (1961: 16); Glinister (2006: 22).
The first extant appearance comes from June 50 B.C. (Att. 6.4.3). The manuscript tradition is unambiguous, with τυραννοκτόνος appearing within an extended Greek text. This passage is introduced by: *illud praeterea μυστικώτερον ad te scribam, tu sagacius odorabere* (‘There is something else I shall write to you more secretly/privately, so that you may sniff out more shrewdly the matter’). Cicero announces his intention to codify, and here the use of Greek adds to the complexity:

τῆς δάμαρτός μου ὁ ἀπελεύθερος (οίσθα ὅν λέγω) ἐδοξὲ μοι πρώην,
ἐξ ὃν ἀλογευόμενος παρεφθέγγετο, πεφυρακέναι τὰς ψήφους ἐκ τῆς ὑπαρχόντων <τῶν> τοῦ Κροτωνιάτου τυραννοκτόνου. δέδοικα δὴ μὴ τι - νοῆσεις δῆπτου. τοῦτο δὴ περισκεψάμενος τὰ λοιπὰ ἐξασφάλισαι.195

*The freedman of my wife (you know which one) seemed to me the other day, from some casual remark he let slip, that he had cooked the books from the purchase of the properties of the Crotonian tyrannicide. I fear that something – I presume you will catch my drift.*

*Please, having looked into the matter, secure the rest!*

195 I have used the text of SB, particular in regards to the line δέδοικα δὴ μὴ τι - νοῆσεις δῆπτου (1968: 265).
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Obscurity is testimony to the sensitivity of this issue. Cicero gives no clues to the identity of the unnamed freeman. Similarly, the property in dispute is labelled as belonging to the ‘Crotonian tyrannicide’. The reason for Cicero’s discretion in this matter has been attributed to his involvement in Philotimus’ possession of this property. Κροτωνιάτης τυραννοκτόνος is an epithet for T. Annius Milo which combines both the sharing of his name with the famous sixth century Crotonian wrestler and his murder of Clodius. Of course the suppression of proper names is not unusual in coded letters, though the clues for Atticus to follow are obvious in this case. Heberden wrote that τυραννοκτόνου was ‘almost needless to add’, but this addition makes the association to Milo clear. On this ground, there is a possibility that Cicero invented this compound word to fit concisely his intended meaning: a single word to describe a person who killed a tyrant. Although Cicero’s invention of τυραννοκτόνος is pure conjecture, Cicero is known to have invented words in

196 Nicholson writes ‘in addition to the Greek, the veiled language and circumlocutions attest to Cicero’s urgent concern for confidentiality in this matter’ (1994: 44).
197 This is known to be the freedman Philotimus, see T&P (1890: 221); SB (1968: 265).
198 SB (1968: 265).
199 As has been mentioned, the rhetoric in the defence of Milo’s charge of homicide was to portray Clodius as a tyrant and that Milo was therefore acting within his civic duty. Obviously the killing of Clodius is a stretch for the term ‘tyrannicide’ but this was something which Cicero had added to the published version of his defence of Milo (Mil. 79-80).
201 Heberden (1825: 358).
202 Wiseman notes it as a ‘revealing Greek expression’ (2009: 201).
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both Greek and Latin.\textsuperscript{203} Another example from May 44 further demonstrates Cicero’s invention of compound Greek words to use as a nickname. In two letters to Atticus Cicero refers to A. Hirtius by the Greek descriptor πεντέλοιπος (\textit{Att.} 14.21.4; 15.2.5). Unfortunately, despite the fairly certain inference that it relates to Hirtius, the precise meaning of the ‘last of five’ is still unclear. However, the similarity of use with τυραννοκτόνου makes the conjecture of invention more plausible. Despite some confusion within the manuscript tradition,\textsuperscript{204} Cicero could then be said to have coined both the Greek word and its Latinised version. As the letters are investigated, a deliberate decision by Cicero to use either the Greek or Latin versions will be considered. As such, it would be profitable now to pause to reflect on Cicero’s uses of Greek in the correspondence.

The shifting between languages within a single conversation is called code-switching.\textsuperscript{205} Adams describes this ‘contrived literary practice’ as a game

\textsuperscript{203} A discussion of this and Cicero’s uses of Greek in the letters will appear presently. Of course, our ignorance of Hellenistic Greek also compounds the problems in detecting neologisms, see Steele (1900: 391)

\textsuperscript{204} The manuscript tradition for τυραννοκτόνος and the Latin version (\textit{tyrannoctonus}) is quite complex with disputes over whether to use the Greek or Latin version. However, there is one case for each version where there is no alternative tradition: for the Greek τυραννοκτόνος is this letter (\textit{Att.} 6.4.3), and for the Latin \textit{tyrannoctonus} is \textit{Att.} 16.15.3. Due to these discrepancies, the manuscript tradition will be discussed within the context of the letters themselves whenever necessary. Dubuisson (2005: 71-2) discusses the problems in studying bilingualism where philologists and editors cannot agree on whether to use a term in Latin or Greek.

\textsuperscript{205} Steele (1900: 389); Swain (2002: 128); Adams (2003: 341-4); Dubuisson (2005: 71-2).
amongst elites, indicating shared educational and cultural background, and playing the role of the *hellenophile*.206 The evidence amongst Cicero and his network of friends,207 most notably Atticus, has led to the belief that the use of Greek was to express intimacy, emotion and humour,208 though other functions are possible.209 No matter what the purpose of this ‘game’, Latin was Cicero’s primary language, and formed the basis of his understanding of language and culture however much he was also at home in Greek.210 Apart from a few occasions of extended Greek, such as the letter just quoted, the correspondence is largely in Latin, with infusions of single lines and phrases of Greek.

By far the most common suggestion to explain the use of Greek is for the borrowing of technical terms and figures of speech from those areas of study with Greek origins, such as politics, rhetoric and particularly medicine. In some ways this defines Latin from a deficient model, requiring Greek to fill needs and

206 Adams (2003: 311-2, 320-2). If the use of code-switching in the correspondence is attributed to the socio-culturally elite, then arguments concerning the levels of Greek literacy in the Latin Roman Republican era become less consequential, e.g. Jocelyn (1973: 64); Horsfall (1979); Dubuisson (1992: 194).

207 Font (1894: 41); Swain (2002: 141). In fact, at least some code-switching can be identified as quotes from the other being repeated back and/or expanded on, see Steele (1900: 390); Swain (2002: 149).

208 For the correspondence relating to personal intimacy see Steele (1900: 404); Dubuisson (1992: 193); Jocelyn (1999: 187, 194); Dunkel (2000: 128); relating to emotion and humour see Steele (1900: 404); Wenskus (1998: 31); Jocelyn (1999: 183, 193-194); Dunkel (2000: 128).


cover inadequacies in vocabulary and expressions.\textsuperscript{211} Often the preciseness or brevity of a term will decide the choice of language,\textsuperscript{212} especially for words with ‘low translatability’.\textsuperscript{213} Of particular interest is the ability of Greek to form compound words, which would have otherwise required circumlocutions.\textsuperscript{214} Τυραννοκτόνος is one such compound. With time and regular use, such words become morphologically integrated into Latin, creating loanwords which appear less obviously ‘foreign’.\textsuperscript{215} Yet with words such as Τυραννοκτόνος and 
\textit{tyrannoctonus}, where they appear more as contextual variants, the transcription into Latin of a Greek term indicates a deliberate borrowing whilst the use of the Greek is more inadvertent.\textsuperscript{216}

Confidentiality and conspiracy provide another purpose for code-switching,\textsuperscript{217} making it an act of exclusion. Cicero’s creation of puns and nicknames in Greek


\textsuperscript{212} Font (1894: 41, 77); Appel & Muysken (1987: 118); Wenskus (1995: 175-6); (1996: 239-40); Dunkel (2000: 127); Adams (2003: 337). Cicero seems to indicate these notions of the precision of Greek and the deficiency of Latin in expressing certain teachings at various points (e.g. \textit{Fin.} 2.13; 3.15; \textit{ND} 1.8; \textit{Tusc.} 2.35; 3.11). On borrowing, loan translations and coining of new Latin terminology, see Powell (1995).

\textsuperscript{213} Poplack (1980: 589).

\textsuperscript{214} Font (1894: 70-6); Steele (1900: 388, 391); Adams (2003: 338).

\textsuperscript{215} Steele (1900: 388-9); Adams (2003: 316, 338).

\textsuperscript{216} Swain (2002: 128); Dubuisson (2005: 71-72).

is an example. This runs contrary to the claim of little originality in Cicero’s Greek on the grounds that, despite words having their first or only attestation in Cicero, they are indicative of contemporary Attic expression and vocabulary. Yet one should not apply this to every Greek word in Cicero’s vocabulary, especially to those hapax legomena or words unique to Cicero.

One final reason for code-switching, and an extension of Roman socio-political politeness, was for the softening of criticism or ‘graceful distancing’. It will be shown that this explanation provides an intriguing interpretation for the use of tyrannicide which may alter significantly the modern perception of Cicero’s intentions.

The letter calling Milo the Crotonian tyrannicide is a perfect example of Cicero’s code-switching. This can be seen in the mixture of koine business terms combined with epic and tragic diction, the inclusion of the descriptively appropriate slave name of Philotimus ‘loaned’ from the Greek φιλοτιμία (=‘ambition’) and the constructed Greek nickname for Milo. Its intended

---

218 Steele (1900: 405); Adams (2003: 339). Cicero himself noted the usefulness of Greek in coining words for special occasions (Fin. 3.51).
219 Rose (1921); Frei-Korsunsky (1969: 1-2); Baldwin (1992: 2); Swain (2002: 146). Steele, in noting this perceived lack of originality, thought that if there were more writings of the New Comedy and contemporary colloquial Attic writings, then most likely all of Cicero’s Greek words would be accounted for, excluding puns based on names (1900: 391, 405).
confidentiality and recipient further coincide with accepted theories of code-switching. It is within this rich tradition that the word τυραννοκτόνος / tyrannoctonus can now be considered.

It has already been suggested that Cicero limited the term liberatores to the purity of the act and intention of assassination. It did not extend to political libertas. Tyrannoctoni is similar in this limitation, but more direct in its polarising connotation. Despite the complexities of politics, evidence suggests that Cicero often sought to categorise people into those who supported the republic and those who were hostile. Tyrannoctoni seems to serve this function, dividing the Roman world into those who believed they were ‘tyrannicides’ and those who did not. The use of tyrannoctoni seems to appear during some new or re-emerging danger or decision, often calling for a division to be made along ‘party’ lines. This division seems a primary goal of this term, but tyrannoctoni also directly reflects upon the assassins, creating a particular depiction of the conspirators.

Whereas the first extant appearance of τυραννοκτόνος dates back to 50 B.C., the next occurrences were a few months after Caesar’s assassination. The first of these letters relates to the compromise on March 17 44 B.C. which saw an

223 I am loath to use the term ‘party’ to refer to any congruent political system with influence over its members and which attempts to control governmental policy, but there are times in Cicero’s writing where he would seem to indicate at least a metaphorical political party system – a party in ideals rather than in political hegemony.
amnesty for the assassins essentially in exchange for the ratification of Caesar's *acta*, including the preferment for office and provinces.\(^{224}\) This constituted a continued hindrance to proper and free participation in politics, effectively ending any hope for a restored republic for the time being (*Att. 14.6.2*):

```
nullo modo reperio quem ad modum possim πολιτεύεσθαι. nihil enim tam σόλοικον quam tyrannoctonos in caelo esse, tyranni facta defendi.
```

*In no way do I find in what manner I can take part in politics. For nothing is so absurd than that the tyrannicides are lifted to the sky, whilst the acts of the tyrant are defended.*

The manuscript tradition is crucial in understanding this passage. Shackleton Bailey in his Cambridge Classical text contains no question over the use of the Latin version. In his earlier Oxford edition he drew attention to the fact that some manuscripts (M°d'm) had *cum tyranno et onus*.\(^{225}\) This does not dispute the use of Latin, and given the sense and context, *tyrannoctonos* seems more likely. Tyrrell and Purser, despite noting the strong tradition, threw some doubts on the veracity stating 'it is by no means certain that we should not print

\(^{224}\) As Syme points out, these measures were actually needed as many senators, including many of the tyrannicides, were amongst those included (1939: 98).
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τυραννοκτόνος, for M. [Mediceus 49.18] often gives Greek words in Latin characters’. This note of caution is justified given the mixture of Latin and Greek words in this passage, but without further evidence to the contrary, this would be considered the first use of the Latinised transliteration of τυραννοκτόνος.

The deliberate intent in transcribing tyrannoctoni is evident here amidst other Greek words which are left in their native alphabet. A political system in which Caesar’s decisions were law and Caesar’s magistrates were in power continued the infringement of his political libertas by limiting the role one could freely play in politics. The use of πολιτεύεσθαι may relate to Cicero’s purer version of politics: the ability to live and participate in a free State. It is particularly pertinent here in that Cicero combines it with σόλοικον which contextually means ‘absurd’ or ‘in bad taste’, ‘awkward’ or ‘erring against good manners’ (LSJ: σόλοικος, ov). The absurdity of the compromise with its logical contradictions on the standing of both the assassins and Caesar is clear and

---

226 T&P (1897: 231). SB also notes in his commentary for this word that ‘the MSS have the Roman script and termination (though this is nothing to go by)’ (1967: 218).

227 An argument against Latinising relates to the benefit which could be gained by transliterating a word which had little prior use in Greek. However, the recipient, both here and in the letter relating to Milo from 50 B.C., was Atticus. The rarity of the word would probably have prompted Atticus to think back to the Milo defence, and thus the Latinised version, allowing an echoing of these sentiments, while also indicating a change in perspective.

228 The preservation of other Greek words in the Greek alphabet in this letter is prima facie evidence for the reliability of the tradition here: why change τυραννοκτόνος into Latin? However, as previously stated, the MSS tradition is solid.
requires little further analysis. In this case *tyrannoctoni* creates a distinction between those who believed that Caesar was a tyrant and his death was an act of justifiable tyrannicide, and those who did not.

A more ambitious interpretation could be suggested, given the level of code-switching and transliteration. Traditionally σόλοικος meant ‘speaking incorrectly’ or ‘using incorrect or broken Greek’.229 As mentioned above, *tyrannoctoni* created a polarisation between supporters of the assassins and those of the tyrant, evidence of the criterion that justifiable tyrannicide related to the actions and intentions of both the tyrannicides and the tyrant. However, by using σόλοικος to signpost a *solecism* of τυραννοκτόνος, through transliteration into a Latin form, Cicero could have been describing the whole situation as un-Greek.230 The τυραννοκτόνοι of a purer Greek system may have resulted in a restoration of active politics and a free republic, which would relate well to πολιτεύω. These Roman *tyrannoctoni*, however, had slain a tyrant, without freeing the State. In the Attic world they may have received cult status, and this is preserved in Cicero’s *tyrannoctonos in caelo esse*. However, the reality for the conspirators in the aftermath of the assassination was one of hostility and

---

229 The story is that this word was used for the people of the colony of Soli in Cilicia who were said to have corrupted the purity of the Attic Greek language or *solecised* (D.L. 1.51; Str. 14.2.28). This is the origin of the English word *solecism* for grammatical mistakes or absurdities.

230 I apologise for using a term which in Australian culture has become a catch phrase for anything perceived to be against the mainstream culture: ‘…that is so ‘un-Australian’.’
compromise. As such they were parodies or caricatures of the ideal,\textsuperscript{231} tyrannicides in only the crucial and literal sense. Whilst this explanation is less economical and more complex than the previous scenario, it requires some consideration.

The context of the next reference to \textit{tyrannoctoni} was the punishment of the imposter and agitator Herophilus.\textsuperscript{232} After Antonius had left Rome for Campania around April 25, Dolabella had torn down the column erected on the site of Caesar's spontaneous cremation,\textsuperscript{233} and punished the degenerate elements by crucifixion and by casting them off the Tarpeian Rock.\textsuperscript{234} Cicero applauded the excellence of this action (\textit{Phil.} 1.2.5):

\begin{flushright}
\text{dicit enim tamquam in Platonis πολιτείᾳ, non tamquam in Romuli faece sententiam} (\textit{Att.} 2.1.8).
\end{flushright}

This quote will be revisited again when looking at the term \textit{heros}.

\textsuperscript{231} One may think of Cicero's famous quote about Cato from 60 B.C. in which he was said to speak in such a way as to think he was in Plato's Republic and not in the cesspool of Romulus - \textit{dicit enim tamquam in Platonis πολιτείᾳ, non tamquam in Romuli faece sententiam} (\textit{Att.} 2.1.8).

\textsuperscript{232} Herophilus, claiming to be the grandson of C. Marius had renamed himself Amatius, and had been banished from Rome by Caesar in 45. He had sought Cicero as an advocate at that time, but Cicero, tongue in cheek, had questioned the need for his help, as Herophilus' supposed relative, C. Iulius Caesar, was all-powerful (\textit{Att.} 12.49). Cicero seemed surprised when he heard that he had returned, commenting to Atticus: \textit{quem quidem ego sublatum rebar a Caesare} (\textit{Att.} 14.6.1). He had been arrested, executed and dragged by a hook to the top of the \textit{Scalae Gemoniae}, publically insulted, thrown down, and dragged into the Tiber (\textit{Att.} 14.8.1).

\textsuperscript{233} The column could be the same one described by Suetonius and Dio. This column was 20 foot high and made of Numidian marble, which Suetonius states was inscribed with \textit{Parenti Patriae} (Suet. \textit{iul.} 85; D.C. 44.51).

\textsuperscript{234} \textit{de saxo, in crucem} (\textit{Att.} 14.15.1); \textit{quis enim audeat violare proposita cruce aut saxo} (\textit{Att.} 14.16.2). In Dio (44.51.1-2) this deed is mistakenly given to both consuls, whilst Appian seems to ascribe it erroneously to Antonius alone (\textit{BC} 3.3.7).
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nam cum serperet in urbe infinitum malum idque manaret in dies latius idemque bustum in foro facerent, qui illam insepultam sepulturam effecerant, et cotidie magis magisque perditi homines cum sui similibus servis tectis ac templis urbis minarentur, talis animadversio fuit Dolabellae cum in audacis sceleratosque servos, tum in impuros et nefarios liberos, talisque eversio illius exsecratae columnae, ut mihi mirum videatur tam valde reliquum tempus ab illo uno die dissensisse.

For when unending evil was creeping about in the city and it flowed more widely day by day and when those men built the same monument in the forum, who had made that travesty of a burial, and when daily more and more degenerate men, with slaves similar to themselves, threatened the houses and temples of the city, so great was the punishment of Dolabella, not only on the audacious and villainous slaves, but also on the immoral and impious free men, and so excellent was his overturning of that loathed column, that it seemed to me remarkable how greatly the time following differed from that one day.

This action brought hope, and a benefit for all of Rome. Similar praises can also be found in the letters from the first week in May (Att. 14.15.1):
O mirificum Dolabellam meum! iam enim dico meum; antea, crede mihi, subdubitabam. magnam ἀναθεώρησιν res habet: de saxo, in crucem, columnam tollere, locum illum sternendum locare! quid quaeris? heroica. sustulisse mihi videtur simulationem desideri, adhuc quae serpebat in dies et inveterata verebar ne periculosa nostris tyrannoctonis esset.

My wonderful Dolabella! For now I call him mine, believe me, before I had my doubts! The affair has given great cause for reflection: down the rock, onto the cross, the removal of the column, the contract for paving that place! In one word, heroic! He (Dolabella) seems to me to have destroyed the affectation of grief for Caesar, which up until now was creeping in day by day and having taken root, I was dreading that it would be perilous for our tyrannicides.

Both the *Philippic* and this letter symbolised the redemption of Dolabella for Cicero. It was the first time since the compromise of March that the political balance had shifted in favour of the republicans. The *Philippics* present this with the promise of a dawning of better times, whilst the letter focuses on the clearing of obstacles and perils, particularly for the tyrannicides. Whatever the emphasis, a change was in the air and the hope was a better and safer political climate. The use of *tyrannoctoni* again indicated a polarised partisan line
dividing Rome into those who supported the conspirators and those who were hostile to them.

The manuscript tradition is less clear, with the general consensus supporting the Latinised tyrannoctonis, despite the Berolinensis manuscript having τυραννοκτονοῖς.235 Shackleton Bailey described it as ‘a lavishly corrected MS written apparently towards the middle of the [fifteenth] century’, concluding that ‘whatever their provenance, no authority can attach to these corrections’.236 The retention of the Latin must therefore be considered more likely.237

This passage again demonstrates a high degree of code-switching and transliteration in association with tyrannoctoni. Just as in the previous example, this level of coding may require a more complex interpretation. The Greek ἀναθεώρησιν here relates to Dolabella’s actions as being thought provoking,238 and are given further praise through the Greek-inspired heroica.239 Add to this the dramatic tone of the ‘rapid-fire’ staccato descriptions of the brutal actions

---

235 e.g. T&P (1915: 282); SB (1967: 42).
236 SB (1965a: 81).
237 Despite referring to Late Latin antique texts, Pelttari asks whether the likelihood is greater for a single manuscript to preserve the original text or a single copyist to transcribe the word into Greek (2011: 470 n.30).
238 LSJ Rev. Suppl. s.v. ἀναθεώρησις agrees with SB (1968: 395-6).
239 Orelli even suggested that the Greek ἡρωϊκά should be used (Shackleton Bailey (1967: 42)). It would appear that Cicero was again the first to introduce this adjective from the Greek into the Latin language (PHI); cf. TLL 6.3.2659.
(de saxo, in crucem, columnam tollere, locum illum sternendum locare), and the plausibility of a rhetorical contrivance seems greater.

In this case ἀναθεώρησις may reflect upon both the Latinised words heroica and tyrannoctoni. In Cicero’s eyes, both the actions of Dolabella and those of the assassins were worthy of praise and consideration. Dolabella, however, had achieved something which the tyrannicides could not: he had actually diminished the people’s affection for Caesar. The technicality of tyrannicide meant Caesar must be a tyrant, which was hard to establish with overwhelming posthumous popularity. Without a tyrant, there was only murder. Further still, the ‘tyrannicides’ are placed in a passive position, relying on the actions of Dolabella, a dangerously ambitious Caesarian, to secure their safety. Thus, by placing Dolabella in such a dramatically heroic and acclamatory style, Cicero seemingly vaunts his achievements and places them in direct relation to the act of tyrannicide. Both were heroic moments, but with potentially different outcomes. Could this be Cicero’s ‘food for thought’ for Atticus?

---

240 Cicero does follow this passage with an assertion of his support for the cause and particularly for Brutus - nec vero discedam, nisi cum tu me id honeste putabis facere posse. Bruto certe meo nullo loco deero, idque, etiam si mihi cum illo nihil fuisset, facerem propter eius singularem incredibilemque virtutem (Att. 14.15.2). This statement may in fact further support the idea of a solecism as Cicero may have felt the need to let Atticus know that despite his disappointment, he was not deserting the cause, which included Brutus as a symbolic figure of republicanism and liberty.
In November 44 another critical political moment arose, which seems to have led Cicero again to *tyrannoctoni* as an indicator of a partisan dichotomy. Directly it relates to questions over Octavian’s attitude toward the expected tribunate of P. Servilius Casca, the assassin who dealt the first blow (*Att.* 16.15.3): 241

*sed, ut scribis, certissimum video esse discrimen Cascae nostri tribunatum, de quo quidem ipso dixi Oppio, cum me hortaretur ut adulescentem totamque causam manumque veteranorum complecterer, me nullo modo facere posse, <nisi> mihi exploratum esset eum non modo non inimicum tyrannoctonis verum etiam amicum fore.*

*But, as you write, I see that the clearest test is the tribunate of our Casca, I told Oppius on this very matter, when he urged me to embrace the young man and the whole cause and his band of veterans, that I could in no way do this, unless it was proven to me that he would be not only not an enemy to the tyrannicides, but even a friend.*

Questions over Octavian’s political persuasions became critical when this young man provocatively and openly linked himself to Caesar with the words *ita sibi*

241 Both Publius and his brother Gaius are generally included in the list of assassins, though some confusion exists in the sources about their involvement. For a list of sources see *MRR* 2.325 C. (*Servilius*) Casca.
parentis honores consequi liceat (thus may it be permissible for me to attain my father’s honours), all the time holding out his hand to the statue of Caesar during a public address (Att. 16.15.3).²⁴² The last monument to Caesar which had been the focal point of political persuasion had been the column which Dolabella had torn down in the previous letter. It may, in fact, be this context alone that could have spurred Cicero to write tyrannoctoni. Furthermore, Octavian’s actions would dictate the direction of things to come. A continued amnesty and conciliatory spirit, through the support of and even friendship with the assassin Casca,²⁴³ would indicate that Cicero could legitimately support the young Caesar, but if he made signs of aggression, his support would be untenable. There again seems to have arisen a crisis in politics, and one where the distinction of opinions rested on support for either the assassins or for Caesar. It seems that Octavian made no move to interfere with Casca receiving the tribunate on December 10,²⁴⁴ though he did eventually see to his deposition in August 43, when Casca fled at Octavian’s approach.²⁴⁵

²⁴² The contio is mentioned in both Dio and Appian, with Appian giving the location as the Temple of Castor and Pollux (App. BC 3.41; D.C. 45.12.4-5). The location is perfect for a contio facing onto the forum, but what statue Cicero refers to here (if any) is not known or disputed, see Weinstock (1971: 365-6); Morawiecki (1983: 46).

²⁴³ If a later letter to Brutus is any indication, it would seem that Casca also had affiliations with Servilia, as he appears at the meeting which Cicero had with Servilia in late July 43 (ad Brut. 1.18.1). A family link would certainly account for this.

²⁴⁴ According to Dionysius, the tribunes took office on December 10 (D.H. 6.89.2), though Cicero indicates that the elections took place on July 17 (Att. 1.1). The letter from Antonius to
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The manuscript tradition in this case is solid with no disputes over the use of the transliterated Latin version. In the previous two letters, the code-switching provided the possibility of a complex solecism interpretation for the use of *tyrannoctoni*. The closest Greek is just before the passage quoted and immediately follows the description of Octavian’s provocative address: μηδὲ σωθεὶν ὑπὸ γε τοιούτου! (*But may I not be saved by one such as this!*). If Cicero had intended the proposed understanding, this example is powerful. Just as in the letter concerning Dolabella, the assassins’ safety was in the hands of another, and ironically those of the adoptive son of the slaughtered tyrant. In addition to this phrase, Cicero starts this part of the letter with praise of Atticus’ wisdom in political matters through another code-switch (ἐν πολιτικῷ). We recall, as well may have Atticus, that in the first example after the death of Caesar, the comparison made through the solecism was with *πολιτεύω*. Again, the complexity and speculative nature of this reading is acknowledged, but still requires consideration.

---

Hirtius and Octavian which Cicero read in the *Thirteenth Philippic* lists the permitting of Casca’s tribunate as one of the acts counter to Antonius’ Caesarian policy (*Phil. 13.15.31*).

245 DiO 46.49.1. The spurious letter of Brutus to Atticus notes that the reproach of Casca from Octavian was occurring as early as June 43 (*ad Brut. 1.17.1*). Casca is found in command of a fleet in 42 on the side of Brutus and Cassius (see *MRR* 2 366). For coinage featuring the name CASCA LONGUS see Grueber (1910: ii 478); Crawford (1974: 517-8: no. 507); Sear (1998: 125-127: no. 211-212).

246 *multa mehercule a te saepe ἐν πολιτικῷ genere prudenter, sed his litteris nihil prudentius.*
The next use of *tyrannoctoni*, written in a letter to Atticus on 11 May 44 B.C., is less a matter of crucial decisions and more about Cicero’s frustration at the situation in Rome. Here the use of *tyrannoctoni* sets up the contrast through a series of antitheses (*Att*. 14.21.3):

```
mihi autem non est dubium quin res spectet ad castra. acta enim illa
res est animo virili, consilio puerili. quis enim hoc non vidit, regni
heredem relictum? quid autem absurdius? 'hoc metuere, alterum in
metu non ponere'! quin etiam hoc ipso tempore multa ὑποσόλοικα.
Ponti Neapolitanum a matre tyrannoctoni possideri!
```

*However, for me there is no doubt in fact that the matter looks towards war. For those affairs were done with the spirit of men, and the plan of children. For who does not see this, that an heir of the kingdom remains? What is more absurd? ‘Fearing this, and not that!’ For even at this time many things might be seen as incongruent. That Pontius’ house at Naples is occupied by the mother of the tyrannicide!* 

The *animo virili* is put into direct opposition to *consilio puerili*, and the statement *regni heredem relictum* is an indirect juxtaposition continuing the leitmotif that
the tyrant may have been killed but the tyranny lives on.\textsuperscript{247} This is followed by the quote assumed to be from an unknown play \textit{hoc metuere, alterum in metu non ponere}.\textsuperscript{248} Despite the uncertainty of the source, the contrast seems clear: the act of glory in the assassination is being compared to the reversal of fortunes which followed. Cicero then describes the absurd situation that a mother of a tyrannicide was dwelling in a Neapolitan house of a certain Pontius.\textsuperscript{249} The reasonable assumption is that this is a house of a disenfranchised Pompeian given to Servilia by Caesar.\textsuperscript{250} In this context the term \textit{tyrannoctoni} re-emerged again to polarise the necessary distinction between supporters of the tyrant and those of the tyrannicides: a difficult proposition for Servilia the lover of the slain and the mother of the slayer. Here \textit{tyrannoctoni} almost has the feel of asking Servilia to choose a side as it would not have seemed logical to Cicero that the mother of a tyrannicide should profit from the dead tyrant. It could also potentially lead to rumours of personal gain, which could diminish any moral high-ground the conspirators had.

\textsuperscript{247} This, however, should not necessarily be taken as a statement about the error in keeping Antonius alive on the Ides of March.
\textsuperscript{248} SB (1966: 340). Cicero had used this quote previously, though the context, a query why he should worry about the loss of dignity for owing money whilst no one was worrying about the outstanding debts owed to him, is completely different (\textit{Att.} 12.51.3).
\textsuperscript{249} Who this Pontius was is uncertain. SB narrows down who it is not (1967: 241), whilst T&P state only that he was on the senatorial side (1915: 301).
\textsuperscript{250} T&P (1915: 301); SB (1967: 241).
If we now return to the hypothetical idea that Cicero is using a solecism with his use of *tyrannoctoni*, it becomes immediately apparent that Cicero uses ὑποσόλοικος in this passage,\(^{251}\) a softened variation of his earlier σόλοικος,\(^{252}\) and again in close proximity to *tyrannoctoni* (*Att. 14.6.2*). Tyrrell and Purser correctly identified the similarity in the Greek,\(^{253}\) but did not make the connection with the Greek transliteration of *tyrannoctoni*.\(^{254}\) If the solecism theory holds true, *tyrannoctoni* again relates to a clear choice between attachments to the tyrannicides or to Caesar, and any suggestion of a merger between these diametrically opposed poles was an absurdity and perverted the glory that should be associated with tyrant slaying.

The final example is in a letter to Q. Cornificius from after September 19.\(^{255}\) The solecism theory of the previous letters is not expected here, as this, if it is

\(^{251}\) The word ὑποσόλοικος has its earliest appearances in Cicero. Apart from this reference, Cicero had used it earlier in his correspondence to Atticus (*Att. 2.10.1*). Plutarch would be the next author to use this word, this time in its comparative form (*Plu. 2.615d*).

\(^{252}\) The addition of the prefix ὑπο- has the effect of indicating a small degree or gradual sense, i.e. *somewhat* or a *little* (*LSJ 1875 §F.II*).

\(^{253}\) T&P (1915: 301).

\(^{254}\) The manuscript tradition is curious here, seeming to indicate a struggle amongst copyists to find meaning in this compound. The tradition of *tyrannoctoni* used here is that of manuscript *s*, but the majority of manuscripts seem to try and split the words into its constituted parts: tiranno CTONEI *vel sim* (ERM); tiranno ctonei (*m*); and tyranno (*bd*). Note that there is no hint of Greek letters in these transmissions.

\(^{255}\) SB rightly states that Ganter has successfully demonstrated that *Fam.* 12.22 should be split into two separate letters, with 12.22.1-2 belonging to a date after September 19, and 12.22.3-4 dating to after December 20 (1977: 484); cf. Ganter (1894: 139-141). It is inconsequential to this study whether to include the later parts, which spell out the senatorial decision of December 20
correct, was probably part of the private repertoire between Atticus and Cicero.\textsuperscript{256} Instead, this letter is a prime example of Cicero’s rhetorical use of descriptors for persuasion. *Tyrannoctoni* still remains an indicator of partisan polarisation, and given the uncertainty of Cornificius’ loyalty towards the republican cause, it may indicate an attempt to identify whom he supported. Cornificius’ career had certainly benefited from Caesarian backing: he had served as a *quaestor* in 48, followed by governorships in Syria in 46 and Africa Vetus in 44.\textsuperscript{257} Despite this letter predating Antonius’ provincial shakeup on November 28 and Cicero’s counterattack in the senate on December 20, Cornificius was in a political hard place, and was about to be replaced in his province. Cicero would need to shore up his support before this happened.

\textsuperscript{256} As noted on p. 112, Adams suggests that Atticus and Cicero may have been involved in a ‘game’ of showing off through their use of Greek. It is also true that Cicero and Cornificius could have a bantering relationship, and thus it is possible that this ‘game’ could have also extended to them. There is one reading that has the Greek version (ς), which derives from various unreliable sources (*lectiones hic illic citatae sive ex codicibus deterioribus sive ex veteribus editionibus sive originis incertae*) (SB (1977: 28)). As would be clear, I have been cautious whenever the Greek appears in the MSS tradition as it seems that Greek preserved is more likely to have been copied directly rather than transliterated by a copyist from a Latin form, although the latter process cannot be ruled out. In this case, with no justification in the main tradition, and since there are no Greek words in this letter to Cornificius, and only one simple phrase in all the correspondence to him (*Fam.* 12.20.1 – πάντα περὶ πάντων), it is perhaps likely that this word should also remain in Latin.

\textsuperscript{257} *MRR* 2.276, 288, 297, 327-28.
Cornificius’ provincial problems had started as early as mid-October (*Fam.* 12.23.1), and the *multa intolerabilia* of this letter were the result of the legates of the previous governor C. Sabinus Calvisius,\(^{258}\) which were left in Utica after his departure in 45 (*Phil.* 3.10.26). Cicero’s cynical comment *quasi divinans se rediturum* places a question on Calvisius’ role in assuring a return in 43, although there is little possibility that a return was envisaged whilst Caesar was alive.\(^{259}\) Nevertheless, scurrilous actions from the legates of a steadfast Caesarian like Calvisius would certainly have indicated that Cornificius’ standing within the Caesarian party was vulnerable.

This loss of standing with the Caesarians is further indicated by a speech that Antonius had delivered against Cornificius (*Fam.* 12.22.1). It is in Cicero’s reassurances to Cornificius that mention is made of the tyrannicides (*Fam.* 12.22.2):

> oppressa omnia sunt, nec habent ducem boni nostrique tyrannoctoni
> longe gentium absunt. Pansa et sentit bene et loquitur fortiter; Hirtius
> noster tardius convalescit. quid futurum sit plane nescio; spes tamen
> una est aliquando populum Romanum maiorum similem fore. ego
certe rei publicae non deero et quicquid acciderit a quo mea culpa

\(^{258}\) T&P (1899 15-6); Gsell (1928: 185); Romanelli (1959: 143); SB (1977: 485).

\(^{259}\) This is supported by the comment in the *Philippics* which indicates that Calvisius’ appointment in November seemed more fortuitous than expected.
absit animo forti feram. illud profecto quoad potero: tuam famam et
dignitatem tuebor.

*All is overthrown, nor do the good men have a leader and our*
*tyrannicides are withdrawn to distant nations. Pansa both thinks well*
*and speaks courageously; our Hirtius is recovering very slowly. What*
*the future holds I do not rightly know; however, one hope is that the*
*Roman people finally will resemble their ancestors. I certainly will not*
*abandon the State and I shall bear with a brave mind whatever*
*happens outside of my control. That assuredly as long as I am able; I*
*will uphold your reputation and position.*

Cicero’s overview of the political situation moves from pessimism (*oppressa* 
*omnia sunt*) to a hope in ancestral memory (*spes tamen una est aliquando* 
*populum Romanum maiorum similem fore*). Rome’s first problem was a lack of 
leadership for the *boni*. The juxtaposition of *boni* and *tyrannoctoni* through –*que* 
rather than *et* (*boni nostrique tyrannoctoni*) may denote a closer connection 
between the lack of leadership and the absence of the tyrannicides.²⁶⁰ Perhaps 
their absence is emphasised by the addition of *longe gentium*. This combination 
indicates the conspirators are not just out of Rome, but are too far away to offer

---

²⁶⁰ Brutus had left Rome probably around late August (*Cic. Att. 16.7.5*), and Cassius in early October (*Cic. Fam. 12.2, 3*). Other tyrannicides were also absent including those governing provinces: Trebonius in Asia, D. Brutus in Cisalpine Gaul, and Tillius Cimber in Bithynia.
any assistance or benefit. In fact *longe abesse* can have the meaning of *to be far away*, but also *to be of no assistance or avail.*\(^{261}\) Leadership should have fallen to the two future consuls, but they were not leaders for the *boni.*\(^{262}\) Instead, Cicero substitutes himself in the interim, declaring himself an advocate not only for the State, but also for Cornificius.

Cicero’s scepticism in the ability of the Roman people to institute a change back to republican politics is implied in his own commitment not to abandon the State (*ego certe rei publicae non deero*) and to bear bravely everything which is outside of his ability to control (*a quo mea culpa absit*).\(^{263}\) The repetition of *absum* may indicate a link between his commitment to the cause and the absence of the tyrannicides. Further still, Cicero’s statement of resilience to events out of his control may contain an indirect criticism of the action of the conspirators in leaving, or may be interpreted as meaning that their departure was linked to their culpability. Despite this conjecture, their absence from Rome

\(^{261}\) *OLD* 1145-6 § 6a; *TLL* 7.2.1647.56-73.

\(^{262}\) Both Pansa and Hirtius owed their impending consulships to Caesar and were known to be Caesarian supporters, especially Hirtius. Cicero, throughout the correspondence to Atticus, had made his distrust of them known (e.g. 14.6.2, 9.2, 12.2; 15.12.2). In particular there is a series of letters containing the desire to make Hirtius a better republican, which would indicate that he had not been previously (*Att.* 14.20.4, 21.4; 15.5.1).

\(^{263}\) *ego certe rei publicae non deero* is reminiscent of the earlier letter where Cicero had indicated that he would not abandon Brutus - *Bruto certe meo nullo loco deero* (*Att.* 14.15.2). This is further evidence that Cicero saw Brutus as the figurehead of the republic. It would seem that Cicero still believed that he could use the ideal that Brutus represented as something to aim for.
had created leadership issues, and Cicero’s letter may indicate a solution to co-opt Cornificius into a leadership role.

Absence from Rome also featured in the depictions of the conspirators as *liberatores*. In those cases it was shown that this expression of absence was often accompanied by a statement of injustice or unwillingness. However, in the letter to Cornificius there is no such connection. This may relate to a change of purpose, and would expose the rhetorical potential of these depictions.

Cicero did not need Cornificius to feel sorry for or sympathise with the conspirators. In fact, for a moderate Caesarian like Cornificius, the absence of the assassins might be a boon for him returning to Rome as an active leader. If this is the case, even as *tyrannoctoni* continues to indicate the polarisation of support, it is used here to appeal to the other side of politics. The departure of the conspirators had not stopped the hostility towards them amongst the people and certainly sectors of the senate.²⁶⁴ As such, leadership was needed which was favourably connected to the moderate Caesarians, but would oppose the actions of Antonius and his extremists. Therefore it would seem Cicero chose his collective noun carefully. Cornificius probably would not have responded well to a laudatory word like *liberatores*. He may, however, have succumbed to the semantics of tyrannicide with its focus on the assassination. This passage

---

²⁶⁴ The popularity of Cassius and Brutus will be discussed in the third chapter.
may indicate that Cicero felt Cornificius was someone who could help ease tension in the lack of leadership and restore some normality.

Cicero seems consistently to use the term *tyrannoctoni* to indicate that a choice must be made between support for the assassins or for the tyranny. By suggesting that Cornificius take up a leadership role within the *boni*, Cicero was suggesting that it was time for Cornificius to choose a side. This choice was easier now that the assassins had departed the political scene, but a decision towards supporting the republic over the tyranny began with recognising the intention of the conspirators in the removal of Caesar. One could not have a foot in each camp, and it was this same polarising partisan decision which he sought from Octavian, Dolabella and Servilia.

In the letters to Atticus also arose the possibility of a more complex solution to the code-switching associated with the term *tyrannoctoni*. This solecism hypothesis theorises a more cynical Cicero, who saw the tyrannicide as a travesty of the purity of the act which at Athens had resulted in veneration and cult status. The idealism of tyrannicide cults relied on real reform and change and stood as a representation of civic duty and obligation to destroy tyrannical government at all costs, even to the point of martyrdom. However, Caesar's
assassination had actually made the tyranny worse. In this way they matched the reality of Harmodius and Aristogeiton. Despite being cast as the legendary slayers of tyranny, these Athenian tyrannicides had slain the tyrant’s brother and had not ended the tyranny of the Peisistratids. In fact, the political climate after that assassination was likewise more oppressive (Hdt. 5.55). Whereas the Roman conspirators had arguably slain an actual tyrant, in Cicero’s view the disastrous outcome was identical. It could therefore be argued that the use of such a grandiose Greek-based word within the private context of their relationship suggested a contrast between the ideal of the assassination and the resulting reality in Rome. Although more complex than the simple polarisation of support theory, this proposal is justified by the evidence and, given the complex nature of coding and code-switching in the letters between Cicero and Atticus, should be given some consideration.

1.4: HEROS

The final collective noun for consideration is the Greek ἥρως and its Latin transliterated version heros. Cicero’s usage sits within the broader context of

265 It is known that Cicero did at one stage express his longing for Caesar in comparison to the disingenuous and disgraceful acts of Antonius (Att. 14.13.6).
what constituted a hero in the classical world. On a basic level, the hero was paused somewhere between the divine and mortal realms, sometimes seen as an intermediate stage between the two. Sometimes they were descendant from the gods, but despite some blurring of the mortal and the divine, the ancients generally accepted that their heroes had once been living humans. Cult status brought them closer to the divine, but their connectedness to human affairs kept them grounded firmly on the mortal plane.

In the Homeric period, ἥρως seems to relate to mortal kings and nobles, and may be a title of respect. Nagy suggested that the idea of the hero was essentially framed within the concept of κλέος (glory and renown), a depiction

266 The origin of the word is controversial, with popular theories including a connection to the goddess Hera (Pötscher (1961); Hall (2002); cf. Adams (1987)), as well as possible links to the Ti-ri-si-ro-e Linear B tablet from Pylos (Py Tn 316; see Gérard-Rousseau (1968: 222-4); Ekschmitt (1969: 116); cf. Hadzisteliou-Price (1973: 131)). An exploration of the Proto-Indo-European (PIE) derivations led Adams to link heros to the PIE *yeR- meaning 'do', in which he saw a common cultural connection to a concept of vitality and youthfulness (1987). Adams closes his article with the remark that while some of this emphasis on vitality and youthfulness had been lost in the classical Greek polis, it still bore significant relevance for the heroic age (1987: 177).


268 Heroes as offspring of demigods see Hes. Op. 159f; Simon. 523, PMG, Pi. P. 4.12f; Pl. Rep. 391a; A.R. 1.548; 4.1773; Plb. 3.47.8.

269 Foucart (1918: 67). On the intertwining of gods and the dead, see Harrison (1927: 315); Nock (1944: 162).


emphasised in writers such as Homer and Hesiod. They were individuals of strength, power, as well as of good ancestry and behaviour.

An important aspect in Cicero’s interpretation of the hero was the fact that the hero belonged to the distant past, a time before contemporary societal norms. The hero was often a brave warrior, prepared to die in order to receive unforgettable glory, immortalised in song and poetry. Deeds of renown and/or virtue set them aside from the ordinary mortal. Hector’s statement of willingness to die after he has completed some great deed for later generations to hear about resonates clearly this idea (Il. 22.304-5).

One fundamental characteristic which few heroes could escape from was the paradoxical fact that immortalisation only occurred after their death. The idea

274 Hadzisteliou-Price (1973: 133). This also matches well to Hesychius of Alexandria’s dictionary entry which reads ἥρως· δυνατός, ἰσχυρός, γενναῖος, σεμνός. The last entry can be seen as turning the hero towards the divine.
276 For examples of this link between song and immortality through fame and reputation: Od. 24.196-198; Theoc. 17.5-6. See also Ekroth (2007: 101); Stevanovic (2008: 7, 15).
278 Ekroth (2007: 110); Stevanovic (2008: 13). It has been suggested that Homer also may have differentiated between the living heros and the dead hemitheos (Il. 12.23; Hadzisteliou-Price (1973: 133)).
of a heroic death is most commonly that of the warrior on the battlefield, but even civil cult heroes often had their rituals and practices associated with their tomb or remains. Thus, the link between the hero, their supernatural abilities, and their death is made explicit.

Whereas the hero of epic provided a method of constructing a past community, the rise of civic ideology changed the hero into a uniting influence on civic identity. These were the cult heroes, whose great deeds made them worthy of honour and praise after their death in a manner which differed from the gods but had elements of divinisation. Kearns called them the

279 Stevanovic (2008: 12). For Vernant, the hero faces a monstrous and unbearable foe in death, otherwise ‘there would be no merit in the hero confronting death, choosing it and making it his own.’ (1981: 288).
283 There can be some crossover between epic and cult heroes (West (1978: 370-3); Nagy (1979: 151-73); Kearns (1989: 129-131); Antonaccio (1994: 405-9); Ekroth (2007: 102)), including the tantalising possibility of hero worship in Homer, see Hadzisteliou-Price (1973). Possible examples often cited include Il. 10.414, 11.166, 371; 24.350, but the heroisation of mortals after their dead is largely post-Homeric. Hellenistic tombstones, for instance, demonstrate heroisation linked to untimely deaths, see Graf (1985: 128-35). The point at issue is the hero who emerges from cult practice is somehow distinct or different from the ‘ordinary’ dead.
‘powerful dead’,\textsuperscript{285} and these mortals in death became saviours, protectors and benefactors for the city, often focused on particular local customs and spheres of influence.\textsuperscript{286} Heroes became fundamental in the formation of cities and the establishment of social order, thus providing a link between the religious and socio-political spheres.\textsuperscript{287}

Harmodius and Aristogeiton are certainly characterised as saviours, but in their case their benefactor was more democracy than Athens.\textsuperscript{288} Kearns saw this internal Athenian political focus as unique in the heroic landscape, causing the ‘tyrannicides’ and their singular action to be less universal in its appeal, but nevertheless relevant to the civic community.\textsuperscript{289} The erection of their statues in the Agora evokes their function as protectors and founders of the community.\textsuperscript{290} It is possible to see comparisons with the republican view of the conspirators as providing a singular moment of heroism which more directly benefited, or at least was intended to benefit, the internal political system at Rome rather than family or country.

\textsuperscript{285} Kearns (1989: 1).
\textsuperscript{286} Kearns (1989: 44-46); Ekroth (2007: 110-111). This local nature provided one distinct difference from the gods, see Kearns (1989: 54).
\textsuperscript{287} Kearns (1989: 4); Ekroth (2007: 103); Stevanovic (2008: 8).
\textsuperscript{288} Kearns (1989: 55).
\textsuperscript{289} Kearns (1989: 55, 135).
One important point is that the hero is not always connected to benevolence.\textsuperscript{291} This appears in Cicero, but has precursors in Greek literature. Aristophanes’ *Heroes* has the chorus declare themselves οἱ ταμίαι τῶν κακῶν τε καὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν – ‘stewards of good and evil events’ (fr. 322 K-A), and fragments of Menander refer to some heroes who are ‘readier to harm than help’ - κακοῦν ἐτοιμοὶ μᾶλλον ἦπερ ὑφελεῖν (fr. 348 K-A). A tale from Babrius illustrates the ideology that the hero could be the provider of all the bad things that have to do with mortals – κακῶν δὲ πάντων ἀτε σύνεστιν ἀνθρώποις (Babr. 63).

Thus Cicero had much to draw upon in introducing the word *heros* into the rhetoric about the conspirators. Like *liberator* and *tyrannoctonus*, it was the act of assassination which marked them as heroes, but again, this is a perspectival judgement. Despite the absence of any tangible benefit to Rome or re-establishment of her political system, the act of tyrannicide was certainly worthy of praise and honour in Cicero’s eyes. The conspirators, apart from the fundamental characteristic that they were not dead, aligned well to the tyrannicide cult heroes.

The dramatic and epic qualities in Cicero’s use of *heros* are difficult to deny. It will be suggested that accompanying many of his depictions may have been a sense of obsolescence and idealised impracticality. Their deeds may have been

\textsuperscript{291} Ekroth (2007: 104).
pure and extreme, ideal for the songs, tales, tragedy and pottery, but the assassination had not automatically resolved all of Rome’s woes in a single moment, as it may have done on the stage. In fact it may have been these very characteristics of heroic action that made them impractical and unwieldy in the real world of Roman politics.

The retention of aspects of the Greek morphology in the Latinised heros would point towards an intended close connection to the classical Greek meaning. Cicero uses heros in both the Latin and Greek forms, in his speeches, philosophical treatises, and personal correspondence. Not only does he use heros, but also the adjectives herous and heroicus. Often herous is used for hexameter, the heroic metre of epic, and heroicus is used in connection with words like tempus or aetas to indicate the ‘heroic age’. Both of these words are essentially indicative of the hero of epic and tragedy.

Cicero’s de Natura Deorum, due to its subject matter, not surprisingly conveys the image of the hero of the mythic past, such as the connection of the Homeric heroes to the gods as companions (ND 2.166.2). A less obvious link is the description of the great Greek philosophers as ‘those heroes’ in his Republic

292 Leg. 2.68.5; de Orat. 3.182.8, 182.12, 191.1, 191.6, 193.3; Orat. 192.5. de Orat. 2.194.5 also uses heros in the genitive to describe the language of epic – language of the bygone misfortunes and legendary grief of heroes.

293 Tusc. 5.7.11; N.D. 3.54.12; Div. 1.1.1.

294 quae ratio poetas maxumeque Homerum inpulit, ut principibus heroum, Ulixi, Diomedi, Agamemnoni, Achilli certos deos discriminum et periculum comites adlungeret.
(Rep. 3.12.6). However, at the start of the book, he describes these sages of philosophy as those (3.4):

quorum animi altius se extulerunt, et aliquid dignum dono, ut ante dixi, deorum aut efficere aut excogitare potuerunt.

...whose minds bore them up higher, and, as I said before, were able to execute or think up things worthy of a gift of the gods.

This connection to the divinity again draws the ‘heroes’ away from the realm of mortals to the divine sphere.

A slightly different use of heros appears in his de Oratore. The great orator M. Antonius, commenting on the use of pathos in forensic speeches, uses the example of his defence of Manius Aquilius (2.194):

qua re nolite existimare me ipsum, qui non heroum veteres casus fictosque luctus velim imitari atque adumbrare dicendo neque actor sim alienae personae, sed auctor meae, cum mihi M. Aquilius in civitate retinendus esset, quae in illa causa peroranda fecerim, sine magno dolore fecisse.

Therefore do not suppose that I myself, who do not want to imitate and represent the ancient calamities and fictional lamentations of heroes in my speech, nor am I an actor of someone else’s character,
but (I am) the originator of my own, when M. Aquilius needed to retain his citizen rights by my counsel, I did that which I did in the pleading of that case without much anguish.

Heros here relates again to a previous age, but it is a depiction of the heroic characters of the stage (personae), whose calamities and lamentation are the themes of tragedy. These are exactly what Antonius would like to avoid. This reference to the farcical, sensational, caricatured depictions, having no place in Roman rhetoric is an element which must be considered in Cicero’s uses of heros.

Another example of dramatic heroes from the de Natura Deorum will confirm that the Roman interpretations of heroes maintained the Greek belief that the hero was not necessarily benevolent (3.71.13):

Medea modo et Atreus commemorabantur a nobis, heroicae personae inita subductaque ratione nefaria scelera meditantes.

We just mentioned Medea and Atreus, heroic ‘characters’ planning their atrocious crimes with cold calculation of the profits.

Medea and Atreus, both heinous villains due to their cold-blooded crimes against their relatives, are described as heroic characters (heroicae personae).

---

295 TLL (6.3.2662.77-81) confirms the meaning of characters in pictura sim. and in scaenico ludo, and cites this passage specifically.
CHAPTER ONE: COLLECTIVE NOUNS

This use again suggests tragedy, reinforcing a reading in Cicero of heros as the unreal, mythological figures of drama, stark and hyperbolic in their depictions and actions. The crimes of these monstrous individuals reach beyond the real world, and Cicero conveys these atrocities through the inflated depiction contained in the pleonastic nefaria scelera.

It will be suggested that Cicero’s depictions of real people as heroes can also contain characteristics of the extreme personae of epic and tragedy, who existed in a time before contemporary societal norms. That is not to say that any age would consider the crimes of Medea or Atreus to be typical, but their extremes are only fit for a mythological time and place. One should not assume the word heros is automatically complimentary, particularly if dramatic overtones can be identified. In these cases, a caricature of events may be the intended interpretation and hidden within this could be a concept of immoderation, impracticality, and single-mindedness, representative of actions suitable for the stage and song and not the contemporary Roman world.

There are possibly ten references to either heros or ἥρως in the correspondence of Cicero, 296 and all but one fragment appear in the letters to Atticus. 297 Four letters predate the assassination of Caesar and these will be

---

296 At least two of these letters have problematic manuscript traditions (Att. 7.13.1; 9.18.2).
297 The fragment …at statuam nescio cuius Clodi, quam tum restitui iussisset Ancone †cum hero† deiectam esse ex senatus consulta… (ep. fr. 4.20.2) is also problematic for a number of
investigated first in an attempt to establish any possible reoccurring contexts for this term. Three of these are recorded with the Latin transliteration. The fourth reference is controversial and has severe problems with the manuscript tradition.

The context of the first use in a letter of heros is one of the significant events of republican history due to its contribution to the formation of the so-called ‘First Triumvirate’. This was the senatorial debate over the request to renegotiate the contract for the Asiatic taxation bid. Cato was trying to delay any debate over the matter, by which Cicero referred to him as heros ille noster Cato – ‘that hero of ours, Cato!’ (Att. 1.17.9). Earlier in the letter Cicero indicated that he had supported the request, despite thinking that it was completely unreasonable:

invidiosa res, turpis postulatio et confessio temeritatis

An invidious business! The demand was disgraceful and a confession of recklessness.

---

reasons: i) only two lines of text are preserved by Nonnius (p. 288, 25), so context is difficult to ascertain; ii) there are deep corruptions in the text, particularly surrounding the word heros, with at least four emendations offered up by different commentators to fix it; iii) it would be the only reference outside of the Atticus volumes; and iv) the proposed recipient is the younger Caesar, Octavius. These problems outweigh the possible benefits which could be made in investigating its use, and as such the reference will be omitted from this study.

298 A similar begrudging acceptance of a disgraceful proposal is Cicero’s support of the ratification of Caesar’s acta for the sake of ‘peace and tranquillity’ (see p. 66 n. 51)
The depiction of Cato as ‘our hero’ seems antagonistic, given Cicero’s opposition to his stance. Cicero readily admitted the rightness of Cato’s opinion. However, it was single-minded, and such idealistic and unswerving resoluteness would provide no benefit to the State. In other words, there was no forethought for how this course of action would play out. This detrimental obdurateness of Cato is again emphasised (Att. 2.1.8):

nam Catonem nostrum non tu amas plus quam ego; sed tamen ille optimo animo utens et summa fide nocet interdum rei publicae; dicit enim tamquam in Platonis πολιτείᾳ, non tamquam in Romuli faece sententiam.

For you do not admire our Cato more than I; but the fact remains that with all his good intentions and integrity he is sometimes a political liability. He speaks as though he were living in Plato’s Republic instead of the cesspool of Romulus.

The obsolescence of Cato’s attitude seems more appropriate to those heroes who by their very nature were dead people from a previous generation. However, Cato was still alive, and as such this may be the earliest depiction of a living man as a hero. It is without doubt the first in the extant Latin tradition. A quick glance at the PHI indicates that Cicero may in fact be the only writer in Latin to apply the word heros to a living person (TLL 6.3.2663.49-57), but this requires further investigation.
character and the purity of his cause, but saw his opinions as uncompromising and unviable in the world of actual politics. They were causing division and not benefit.\(^{300}\)

The next example redefines T. Annius Milo, who previously in this thesis was shown to have been depicted as a tyrannicide in the published version of the *pro Milone*, as another living Roman hero. This letter is dated to 23 November 57, and relates to the pending case against Clodius for his lawless conduct in the vicinity of Cicero’s house. The case was meant to be held before the elections for *aediles*, however, the consul Metellus Nepos had declared that unless Milo gave evidence of ominous portents the elections would be held. The danger was that, if elected, Clodius could escape the charges. Thus Milo sets about to watch the sky continuously in the Campus Martius,\(^{301}\) avoiding all attempts to contravene his right to stop the election and thus ensure Clodius is brought to justice (*Att. 4.3.5*);\(^{302}\)

\[
ante diem viii Kal. haec ego scriebam hora noctis nona. Milo
campum iam tenebat. Marcellus candidatus ita stertebat ut ego
\]

\(^{300}\) This was a key issue for Cicero. A defining element of his ideal republic was the gathering together of the *populus* in an agreement of law and common advantage.

\(^{301}\) This may be the first recorded evidence for the right of *spectio* by a tribune, see Bleicken (1955: 26), SB (1965b: 177).

\(^{302}\) It leads to the somewhat farcical and unsuccessful actions of Metellus Nepos scurrying through the back roads of Rome to avoid Milo so as to hold the elections before the tribune could declare the ban.
vicinus audirem. Clodi vestibulum vacuum sane mihi nuntiabatur: pauci pannosi sine lanterna. meo consilio omnia illi fieri querebantur, ignari quantum in illo heroë esset animi,\textsuperscript{303} quantum etiam consili. miranda virtus est. nova quaedam divina mitto, sed haec summa est: comitia fore non arbitror; reum Publium, nisi ante occisus erit, fore a Milone puto; si se in turba ei iam obtulerit occisum iri ab ipso Milone video. non dubitat facere, prae se fert; casum illum nostrum non extimescit. numquam enim ciusquam invidi et perfidi consilio est us<ur>us nec inerti nobili<tati> crediturus.

\textit{On the night of the 22\textsuperscript{nd} I was writing this at two o’clock. Milo was already positioned in the Campus. Marcellus, the candidate, already was snoring so loudly that I, his neighbour, could hear. I was informed that the porch of Clodius was almost deserted: a few ragged men without a lantern. They were complaining that everything which has happened was by my plan, they are unaware how great the spirit and judgement of that hero is. His courage is something to marvel at. I pass over some recent divine things; but here is a summary: I do not believe there will be elections, Publius will be brought to trial, if he is not killed beforehand, and I think that this will be done by Milo; if he now puts himself in his way in a rabble I can

\begin{footnote}
\textsuperscript{303} I am following SB (1965b: 80) in the use of heroë.
\end{footnote}
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see that he will be dispatched directly by Milo. He does not hesitate to act, he has indicated this; he does not fear that calamity of mine.

For he is never going to make use of the advice of any envious and treacherous man, nor will he put his trust in an inactive nobility.

This passage has been included in detail as it is pertinent to an understanding of the depiction of the hero in Cicero and can be used in comparison for the portrayals of Cassius and Brutus. Cato was heroic in regard to his integrity and resoluteness, qualities which had ultimately led to uncompromising morals and ethics which could run contrary to societal benefit. These qualities can also be found in Milo, but in this passage there is no hint of negativity. Milo’s heroic qualities focus on his courage (*miranda virtus est*), fearlessness (*non extimescit*), godlike deeds or characteristics (*quaedam divina*), and he is a man of action in the pursuit of what is right (*non dubitat facere, prae se fert*). He is not only a hero because of his great passion and spirit, but because of his great judgement (*quantum...animi, quantum etiam consili*). He is active when others neglect their obligations (*Milo campum iam tenebat. Marcellus candidatus ita stertebat, inerti nobili<itati>*), and he is not a puppet of an individual or the system (*numquam enim cuiusquam invidi et perfidi consilio est us<ur>us nec inerti nobili<itati> crediturus*). He acts by what is right and what is beneficial.
There are obvious connections here with the Greek hero cults, in particular those involving the tyrannicide cult of Harmodius and Aristogeiton. These *heroes* had been mortals, and their greatness had come from their civic obligation. In this way they were commemorated like those who had fallen in war. These were once ordinary men, who took their obligation to the State to extraordinary levels. Cicero’s *heros*, however, is alive, and this may relate to the potential for immortal praise after death: a hero in the making. Even Cato himself had the potential for this, if he could soften his inflexible moral stance.

The final reference to *heros* is a mangled piece of text which led Tyrrell and Purser to state, ‘we believe the corruption lies very deep here’. It was Lehmann who made the suggestion of *heros Celer*, though there are at least three versions in the manuscript tradition. Shackleton Bailey has the Latinised *heros* in his Oxford edition, but ἰρώς in his Cambridge. Given that the emendations all rest around what seems to be a confusion in Latin, this letter has been included amongst the Latinised versions of this word. However,

---

304 Taylor 1991 5-8. The *Athenian Constitution* mentions the offerings to Harmodius and Aristogeiton being associated with the offerings to the dead of those fallen in war - καὶ τοῖς τετελευτηκόσιν ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ καὶ Αρμοδίῳ καὶ Αριστογείτονι ἐναγίσματα ποιεῖ - …and he makes the offering to those fallen in war and to Harmodius and Aristogeiton (Ath. Pol. 58.1).

305 Ford writes that Harmodius and Aristogeiton were the first mortals to be immortalised in statues (1985: 27).


307 SB (1961: 41): eros celer Z¹; ero sceler O¹R [-rum]; (a)ero [eo s] sceleri Δ.

given the unusual morphology of *heros* and the obvious connection with *νέκυια*, the Greek would not be unexpected and could have, at least in some respects, contributed to the scribal confusion. If this corrupt passage can be relied on, it creates an ironic depiction of the *heros*. Comparisons to the fiendish characters of drama, such as Medea and Atreus, can certainly be seen in the depictions of Caesar’s entourage, made up of the malefactors which Atticus had called *Νέκυια* or the ‘Rabble’ (*Att. 9.18.2*):  

reliqua, o di! qui comitatus, quae, ut tu soles dicere, νέκυια! in qua erat heros Celer. o rem perditam! o copias desperatas!

*For the rest, good god! What an entourage, the Rabble, as you are accustomed to call them! Amongst them was the hero Celer. What an appalling affair! What a band of miscreants!*

The *hero Celer* is probably the same Pilius Celer whom Cicero depicts in *ad Brut. 2.5.3*. In this passage he is directly referred to as part of the *Νέκυια*, the term which Atticus had applied to the entourage of Caesar. *Νέκυια* was both the ritual by which ghosts were called up from the underworld to be questioned (Plu. *Mar. 11.6*), as well as the name of the eleventh book of the *Odyssey* (D.S.  

---

309 This is essentially SB’s reason for his change from the Oxford to the Cambridge editions (1968: 392).

310 *LSJ* (1166 s.v. *νέκυια* § III) cites this passage to mean ‘rabble, used contemptuously of Caesar’s entourage’.
As such Celer is a living hero represented as the Homeric dead summoned to prophesise the future to the living. At the core of this depiction is Atticus’ joke of calling them the Νέκυια, but a link to the malevolent characteristics of some mythological heroes cannot be dismissed, especially considering the overtly negative tone surrounding the depiction (o rem perditam! o copias desperatas!).

Cicero is the only extant source who used the Greek ἦρως in the Latin literary tradition. Unfortunately, the only letter which predates the assassination has considerable doubts concerning it. In response to the unknown Vennonius affair, Cicero describes another living man, T. Atius Labienus, as a hero (Att. 7.13.1):

Labienum ἦρως iudico. facinus iam diu nullum civile praecelarius, qui,

ut aliud nihil, hoc tamen profecit, dedit illi dolorem

I consider Labienus a hero. No political action has been finer for a long time. If nothing else comes of it, however, he has achieved this, he has inflicted anguish on Caesar.

ἵρως was an emendation suggested by Hervagius, with the archetypal Ω manuscript tradition having ΠΡΩΑ. Assuming that the emendation is correct,

311 LSJ 1166 s.v. νέκυια.
312 This is according to a PHI database search. Varro (Men. 357.2) and Gellius (8.7.4.5) both use the adjectival form ἦρωικός.
Cicero’s usage is similar to that for Milo. Labienus has acted boldly in defecting from Caesar’s camp, and to Cicero, opposition to Caesar would be seen as opposing tyranny. As such, Labienus fulfils his civic obligation of the classical cult heroes, but his description as a hero is more likely to relate to the shock of Labienus’ defection. Labienus and Caesar had been tightly connected since Labienus, as a tribune of the plebs, had paved the way for Caesar’s election as Pontifex Maximus in 63 (D.C. 37.1). A praetorship in 59 is likely, and from 58-49, he was considered one of Caesar’s most reliable and competent generals, serving in Gaul as a legatus pro praetore and eventually being installed as the public administrator in Gallia Cisalpina in 50 (Hirt. Gal. 8.52). His defection in 49 was completely unexpected, especially if the rumours of an upcoming consulship were true (Hirt. Gal. 8.52). The potential propaganda and civic benefit that a commander like Labienus could attract to the republican cause would more than justify Cicero including him as another potential benefactor and saviour of the Roman political system.

313 NP Labienus [3]; MRR 2.578.  
314 MRR 2.252-3  
315 Labienus’ defection from Caesar was unexpected and shocking also on the grounds that this homo novus would be expected to be even more loyal to his patron Caesar than a nobilis with alternative support networks.  
316 Labienus is depicted as extremely headstrong, arrogant, brutal and bearing a great hatred and resentment towards his old patron in Caesar after 49 (Caes. Civ. 1.15; 3.13, 19, 71, 87; B. Hisp. 18, 31).
Therefore it seems clear that Cicero used this term *heros* in a particular way which largely echoed the classical Greek uses. In all cases a sense of extremes is implied, and whether this was deemed as good or otherwise largely related to the benefit which it could have on Roman society. The uncertain reference to Celer was clearly ironical from its context: he and the other ‘Underworld’ figures were no value to society. On the other hand, Milo’s nocturnal vigils and Labienus’ defection demonstrated real benefits to Rome, justifying their title as *heros*. Cato’s context is more obscure. Whilst his integrity and resoluteness earn him this laudatory descriptor, they were also so extreme that he could be a political liability. The sense of him being old-fashioned and his opinions being obsolescent permeate his depiction and are almost certainly tied up with the term *heros*. The hero was a dead man from the past whose opinions and actions were often more fitting in that era.

It is in this aspect that Cicero differs from classical models. All his heroes in the correspondence are living men, and there may be two reasons for this. Firstly, as suggested above, it may be to demonstrate the temporal and cultural dissonance between the actions and intentions of the bygone hero compared to the practicality of heroism in reality. This is what provides the sense of being old-fashioned. Another aspect which differs is that Cicero’s heroes are not

---

317 There appears to be a difference between Cicero’s published oratory, where the word relates to dead figures from the past, and the letters, where it always refers to the living.
warriors, but politicians, praised for the actions within the political sphere and not for their prowess on the battlefield. With these characteristics of Cicero’s heroes in mind, it is now possible to turn to those depictions of the conspirators as heroes.

On 10 April 44 Cicero wrote to Atticus from Lanuvium about the situation in politics as he saw it. In this letter he provides the first extant use of the term ἥρωες in reference to the conspirators (Att. 14.4.2):

But although everything may collide together, the Ides of March are a source of comfort. Our heroes accomplished most gloriously and magnificently what was able to be achieved through them; yet the remaining matters require wealth and troops, of which we have none.

One of the leitmotifs throughout Cicero’s correspondence is his pleasure in the contemplation of the Ides of March coupled with despair over the lack of change. In this letter the blame is focused on the lack of money and soldiers,³¹⁸

---

³¹⁸ This excuse is reminiscent of Cicero’s despair when he finally joined up with Pompey. In a letter to M. Marius in 46 BC, he states that Pompey had nothing except a cause - nihil boni
revealing that power in Rome was still firmly in the hands of the Caesarians.

Cicero depicts the assassins collectively by the Greek title ἥρωες (heroes), due to their heroic acts (gloriosissime et magnificentissime). The superlative adverbs emphasise this heroism, whilst the polyptoton of conficio directly comments on how the heroic acts completed were all which could be completed by these heroes (per ipsos). This praise, however, is surrounded by criticisms. Cicero starts this depiction with a concessive, sed, emphasised by the addition of licet, and the verb concurro here carries the sense of collision, contest, struggle, strife and conflict. On the other side of the praise is the lament over the lack of troops and money needed to effect a change. There seems to be a sense of frustration that this heroism, noble in thoughts and deed and pure in intention, had created such chaos that order could now only be restored by money and soldiers.

The depiction of the conspirators as heroes seems to have created a conflict for Cicero, the same discordance that can be noted in Cato’s depiction. There is no doubting that Cicero saw the assassination itself as a bold and noble act, worthy of the title of hero. However, this act alone had not changed the situation, but had made it worse. Worse still, as shall be seen throughout the correspondence, the conspirators were not proactive in their plans after the

praeter causam (Fam 7.3.2). Cicero knew from experience that if civil war erupted without such resources, all would be hopeless.

319 OLD 430-1 § 3, 4; TLL 4.0.108.75.
assassination, a fact which was exasperating for Cicero. They were looking more like the real Harmodius and Aristogeiton, rather than the idealised cult heroes that were created from their legend.

If this was an isolated depiction, little could be made of it except for the frustration that Cicero felt. Yet a pattern is discernible. Whenever Cicero refers to the conspirators as heroes, his pleasure at their heroism is always accompanied by a statement of limitation, such as this letter written on April 12 (Att. 14.6.1):

Antoni colloquium cum heroibus nostris pro re nata non incommodum. sed tamen adhuc me nihil delectat praeter Idus Martias.

Antonius’ meeting with our heroes, given the circumstances, is not unfitting. Up until now, however, nothing delights me except the Ides of March.

Nothing is known about this meeting, however, Cicero saw a spark of hope in it, evident initially by the phrase pro re nata (‘under the present circumstances’). More notable is the literary litotes of non incommodum, instead of the more succinct commodum. A litotes is used to create a strong positive through the

---

320 SB (1967: 217). T&P speculate that it was to discuss the authorisation for Brutus to contravene the requirement that the urban praetor not be absent from Rome for more than ten days (1915: 257).
use of understatement, often combining emphasis and degrees of irony.\textsuperscript{321} Cicero uses this understatement to highlight the need for such a meeting. Lausberg also notes that the relationship between the speaker and the listener can determine the intended message, and since degrees of irony can play a role, the use of \textit{heros} must be carefully considered. Firstly, it is noted that there is little context for its use in this passage.\textsuperscript{322} A possible explanation may be contained in the wavering between cynicism and hope which emerges in Cicero’s depictions of the conspirators. Cicero has made it clear to Atticus that apart from the Ides he had not been satisfied with events. Here at least the conspirators were meeting with Antonius, and given that irony may be expressed through the \textit{litotes}, this may be less about Antonius allowing a meeting, but rather about the conspirators finally doing something positive to better the situation. This would tie well with the heroic sense of the civic responsibility which the conspirators needed to live up to if they were to maintain their title of heroes.

\textsuperscript{321} Lausberg (1960: 304-305 §586-588). For the use of \textit{litotes} in Cicero see also Parzinger (1910: 13-7); Porstner-Röser (1931: 76-82); Hoffman (1987).

\textsuperscript{322} Amongst the items immediately preceding this statement are news on the rumours of the legions on the march, an ambiguous piece on Octavius, and a reference to the pseudo-Marius. None of these provide a necessary connection for this reference.
While the above passage is subtle in its possible irony and meaning, the next reference to the heroes, written on April 21, is less restrained in its expression (Att. 14.11.1):

sed memento, sic alitur consuetudo perditarum contionum, ut nostri illi non heroes sed di futuri quidem in gloria sempiterna sint sed non sine invidia, ne sine periculo quidem. verum illis magna consolatio conscientia maximi et clarissimi facti; nobis quae, qui interfecto rege liberi non sumus? sed haec fortuna viderit, quoniam ratio non gubernat.

But remember, in this way the custom of pernicious speeches is nourished, so that those, not just heroes, but gods of ours, indeed will be in everlasting glory but not without hatred, nor indeed without danger. But to those men there is a great consolation in the consciousness of the greatest and most illustrious deed; what is there for us, we who are not free when the king is slain? But fortune will see to these things, since reason is not governing.

Cicero again mentions the great and illustrious deeds but now relegates them to collective consciousness (conscientia maximi et clarissimi facti). There is a striking resemblance in this statement to Cicero’s only use of liberatores in the
correspondence, as discussed earlier. There, Cicero had described the ‘liberators’ as clari and beati in regards to the consciousness of their deed - quidem semper erunt clari, conscientia vero facti sui etiam beati. The similar sentiment of these two passages is striking. That deed of assassination, whilst indeed worthy of everlasting glory (gloria sempiterna), had not brought the necessary and/or expected change, and had now become a mere consolation. Furthermore, this consolation was not for Cicero or even the citizens of Rome, but instead lies in the consciousness of the assassins, who can be proud that, at that time, they had acted excellently and most illustriously.

The superlative adjectives maximus and clarissimus accompany the far-ranging adjective sempiternus, which immediately follows a crescendo which projects the conspirators from heroes (heroes) to gods (di). The excessiveness of this passage, heavy with dramatic techniques, marks Cicero’s rhetorical intentions clearly. The hyperbolic praise invokes the characteristic of the ἥρως as demigods and worthy of divine worship and praise. To Cicero the act of tyrannicide was indeed worthy of such praise, but the juxtapositions in this passage give a sense of unease and personal struggle in coming to terms with the current situation. The everlasting glory which a hero should receive is contrasted to the hatred and danger which the conspirators have earnt by this.

---

323 Att. 14.12.2; see pp. 84-86.
very act.\textsuperscript{324} Similarly, the consolation felt by the assassins because of their deed is placed in striking contrast to the dissatisfaction of the ordinary Roman citizen. The cause of this dissatisfaction leads to the last of these comparisons: the motif and paradox that the slaying of Caesar had not led to freedom. This draws the reader’s attention immediately back to the tyrannicides and what benefit their act of heroism had for most Roman citizens. His final statement that matters are left in the hands of fate (\textit{quoniam ratio non gubernat}) is crucial. Firstly, the personifications of both \textit{fortuna} and \textit{ratio} add to the dramatic elements. However, the point of the passage is that Rome lacks a steersman to guide her out of despotism.\textsuperscript{325} The assassins, satisfied with their singular heroic contribution, have been ineffectual in this. They had their consolation, the knowledge that they had acted as heroes, and Cicero could not deny them this. However, there had been no benefit to society, and the outcome of this heroism was hatred and danger: a worse situation than before. Atticus’ thoughts must have again turned to the Athenian tyrannicides and the Peisistratid oppression following the death of Hipparchus.

\textsuperscript{324} This relates clearly to the concept of \textit{κλέος} which surrounds the hero, as well as the search for glorious deeds which will lead to immortality.

\textsuperscript{325} It should also be noted that \textit{gubernator civitatis} was one of the terms Cicero used for the ideal statesman in \textit{de Re Publica} (2.51.1). Of course the analogy of the ‘ship of the State’ has Greek precedents. Cicero’s direct influence was probably Plato’s \textit{Republic} (6.488e-489d), but other notable examples include Aeschylus (\textit{Th.} 2-3), Alcaeus (fr. 6, 208, 249), Archilochus (f. 4, 106), and in the \textit{Theognidea} (667-82). For a recent work on the ‘ship of the State’ analogy see Bork (2011).
The hope for political *libertas* that was initiated with the assassination had offered up to the conspirators the prospect of hero status. The assassination met all the criteria for heroism: it was bold, extreme, and potentially provided a significant benefit for the community. However, this benefit had not happened as expected, and in fact the situation in Rome had become worse. It must have soon become apparent that the assumption that a single act of heroism could effect a change had been naïve. The assassination of Caesar was certainly worthy of immortality and entry into the community conscience, and this was reminiscent of the characters of epic who sought glory and for their deeds to be remembered by future generations. As such, this series of letters leads to a possible reassessment of Cicero’s reference to the assassins as heroes, and increases the likelihood that when Cicero used this term it carried with it a sense of dissatisfaction. Cicero considered the assassination of Caesar an important and praiseworthy act, this is clear, and in this regard, the title *heros* was fitting. The absence of a plan beyond this, however, was not something he could comprehend, and it seems he saw within this the reason for the failure of the Ides.\(^{326}\) This led to the dilemma that the conspirators could be both worthy of heroism and blame, and the struggle to reconcile these facts seems evident

---

\(^{326}\) van der Blom writes that the ‘conspirators had obviously not planned what to do after the assassination, other than to make a rather chilly speech’ (2003: 290).
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in Cicero’s writings. This dichotomy is clearly seen two months later as Cicero discusses Octavian’s attitude towards the assassins (Att. 15.12.2):

τάν δ’ αἰτίαν τῶν Βρούτων τις ἔχει. In Octaviano, ut perspexi, satis ingenii, satis animi, videbaturque erga nostros ἥρωας ita fore ut nos vellemus animatus.

‘One of the Bruti bears the blame’. In Octavian, as I perceived, is enough character, enough intellect, and he seems to be disposed towards our heroes just as we would like.

Again a criticism accompanies the reference to heroes, though unlike the other times, this censure is more directed. Despite the obscurity of exact culpability, Cicero is at least explicit to the family, though he maintains some ‘graceful distancing’ in the use of the Greek, particularly with the ambiguity of τις. In this passage, the use of the Greek ἥρως makes a direct link to the Greek phrase blaming a Brutus. The purpose seems again to emphasise Cicero’s struggle with the idea that a hero of the republic could have some responsibility for the subsequent disasters that had befallen Rome since that most heroic assassination.

327 See p. 115.
328 SB (1967: 260).
One further possible explanation for the use of both ἥρως and the Greek phrase τάν δ’ αἱτία τῶν Βρούτων τις ἔχει is that Cicero was providing the cryptic clue that it was M. Iunius Brutus who was the source of blame. Whenever the references to heros is specific to individuals after the assassination of Caesar, there is little doubting that it relates to Cassius and Brutus. Further still, the use of the Doric article (τάν) is curious and may contain another key to identifying Brutus. Brutus’ property at Lanuvium is the brunt of a joke with Cicero where he refers to it as a ‘Sparta’ (Att. 15.9.1), complete with a ‘Περσικὴ porticus’, like the one at Sparta which commemorated the victory at Plataea (Vitr. 1.1.6; Paus. 3.11.3). As such Cicero may not have been as ambiguous as many believe in pointing out a culprit for blame. This would hold especially true in a letter to Atticus.

In all depictions of the assassins as heroes, Cicero’s purpose was double-sided: it flattered the act, whilst criticising a lack of completion. Through his cynical portrayal of the conspirators as hyperbolic heroes, Cicero was attempting to reconcile an image of those who deserved praise and distinction for a single action, yet needed to accept some responsibility for their inability to foresee the necessary continuance of a plan for restoration. This is characteristic of his need to assign blame, and much of the correspondence immediately following the assassination is geared towards this compulsion. He wanted heroes who

saw it their civic duty to continue the fight against all that threatened the republic, not those who were satisfied with their great deeds, whilst letting matters unfold for themselves. In this way, Cicero aligns the depictions of the conspirators as ‘heroes’ with the traditional hero. In both cases, their great deeds were in the past.

1.5: CONCLUSION

Moreover even if that offspring of future men should desire from here on to hand down the praises of any one of us which they have heard from their fathers, yet on account of the inundations and incinerations of the earth, which must happen at a certain time, we are not able to obtain not only eternal, but not even long-lasting glory.
These words put into the mouth of Scipio at the end of the *Republic* seem to caution against the vain pursuit of glory (*Rep.* 6.23). Whilst the pursuit of glory may not have been the intention of the conspirators, Cicero’s writings would seem to indicate that the glory of the deed was actually all that they received or indeed achieved. Whether he used the term *liberatores*, *tyrannoctoni* or *heroes*, the focus of all these words was frozen in the moment of the assassination.

*Liberator* seems to look towards an idealised picture of the conspirators. It was a grand, sweeping word, heavy in interpretation and perspective. Therefore it was more suitable for the language of oratory rather than personal correspondence. The problem which presented itself to Cicero was how could they be liberators if the State was not free? So the term *liberatores* was associated directly with the ephemeral freedom from Caesar’s rule. In other words, Cicero seems to set the word in limitation, with few implications for the higher goals of political *libertas*. They had freed Rome from the tyrant Caesar, this could not be disputed, and as such, whenever *liberator* is used it is accompanied by the direct reference to the deed of this form of liberation. In this way Cicero could maintain his paradox that there was freedom from the tyrant but not from the tyranny.

---

330 See also *Rep.* 6.15, 22-25.
The second major issue for Cicero was the conspirators’ absence from Rome. The motive for their absence is likely to have been speculated on by the people, and one possible reason may have been the shame and guilt of murdering a patron. Cicero needed to turn this around, and he did this by juxtaposing the idea of the liberator and the unjustly exiled. He could thus make the conspirators appear as victims, prejudicially and unwillingly sent from Rome after completing an act of benefit for the Roman community.

Finally the most speculative of possibilities is that Cicero used liberatores to counter the legacy of Caesar, and remove honours unjustly given to him. The term liberator allowed Cicero the opportunity to wrestle this term back from the man who had caused civil war, not ended it. It could be then returned to the conspirators, and particularly to Brutus. This theory is based on possible links to L. Iunius Brutus, which relies on the accurate recording in Livy of titles such as liberator urbis or liberator patriae being assigned to L. Iunius Brutus.

The word tyrannoctoni was in itself a reference to the assassination. Its predominance in the letters illustrates the general need to keep this word in the private sphere, since regular public reminders of Caesar’s death, even justifiable political murder, would not be desired amongst the general
population\textsuperscript{331}. It has been suggested that \textit{tyrannoctoni} really symbolised a need for polarity, the absence of middle ground in support for or opposition of the conspirators. Of course, the point of focus for this polarity was the opinion towards the assassination, aptly referenced in this word.

The Greek tradition of tyrannicide influenced Cicero heavily, but the lack of result and change from Caesar’s death no doubt frustrated him. The possible identification of \textit{solecism} throughout references to \textit{tyrannoctoni} suggests this frustration, but could also represent mild criticism and an indication of the travesty of this terminology.

Ideally, tyrannicide brought real reform and change. It represented one’s civic duty and obligation. However, in the case of the conspirators, Caesar’s assassination had not freed Rome from the oppression of tyrannical rule. Therefore a link to the reality of Harmodius’ and Aristogeiton’s murder of Hipparchus is plausible. Whereas the conspirators had at least slain an actual tyrant, that action of tyrannicide, just as it had for Athens under the Peisistratids, had only made the tyranny more oppressive.

Interestingly, only one reference to Harmodius and Aristogeiton exists in the extant writings of Cicero, in a list of those who have sacrificed their lives for their

\textsuperscript{331} The appearance only in the letters could also be because it was either a neologism or it in Greek. It has already been mentioned that Cicero, in general, avoids Greek in his speeches (p. 95 n. 122).
country. For the Athenian tyrannicides this consists of just a few words: *Harmodius in ore <est> et Aristogeiton* (‘Harmodius and Aristogeiton are eulogised’) (*Tusc.* 1.49.). The lack of any reference or comparison that would link these Athenian and Roman tyrannicides is in itself reason to pause. This is one of the clearest indications that Cicero’s use of terminology such as liberators, tyrannicides, and heroes is not as obvious as it seems on first glance.

The tension of *heros* seems most accurately to reflect Cicero’s mixed feelings about the conspirators, their deeds, planning and the outcome in general. The term praised the act as heroic, but this is usually undermined by questions regarding the benefit of this heroism to Rome. As such, the conspirators became akin to the dead heroes from a bygone era whose actions were glorious and produced immortality through fame. Yet these deeds contained a sense of obsolescence because the community had failed to receive a benefit from them. The republic had for Cicero always been about the agreement of law (*consensus iuris*) and a benefit for all (*utilitatis communio*), and this had clearly not been achieved. It is the interplay of the antithetical ideas that the conspirators could at one time be both heroes, as well as sharing a responsibility for the failure of the political system to correct itself, which is depicted in Cicero’s portraits of the conspirators as heroes.
What has become clear in this chapter is the need to reconsider how these collective nouns are used by modern scholars, particularly if they are to reflect accurately either Roman public opinion, or even just Cicero’s. The immediate assumption that these words are automatically honorific or complimentary should be dispelled and the individual context must speak for itself. Signs of rhetoric, manipulation and dramatics all point towards a more affected form of communication. If in fact Cicero did think carefully about which term to use, which the study suggests he did, then it is imperative that these purposes be investigated. The presence of these seemingly flattering terms in connection with sometimes subtle, sometimes explicit censure, suggests that Cicero’s use of these terms may reflect something more than pure praise and panegyric.

The final words for this chapter come from Cicero’s letter to Atticus from late April 44. The letter itself is typical of the correspondence at this time, praising the act of assassination accompanied by a lament because of a lack of change. It is also an excellent example of the findings of this chapter, including the continued belief that libertas had not been achieved, and that the conspirators, if indeed they were heroes, had not provided a benefit for Rome. First there is sublato enim tyranno tyrannida manere video – ‘for I see that after the tyrant’s removal the tyranny remains’ (Att. 14.14.2). Then, talking about Ides, Cicero wrote quae quidem nostris amicis, divinis viris, aditum ad caelum dederunt, libertatem populo Romano non dederunt – ‘which indeed gave admission to the
heavens for our friends, the divine men, but did not give freedom to the Roman people’ (Att. 14.14.3). This image culminates in a summary of the general feeling of frustration in Cicero’s writing following the assassination of Caesar (Att. 14.14.5):

ne nos et liberati ab egregiis viris nec liberi sumus. ita laus illorum est, culpa nostra.

*Truly we have been freed by illustrious men, but we are not free.*

*Thus the praise is theirs, the blame is ours.*
CHAPTER TWO: COMPARATIVE PORTRAITUDE

The previous chapter dealt with the ideological and rhetorical use of various collective nouns used to describe those men who assassinated Caesar on the Ides of March. Of the sixty odd conspirators according to Eutropius (6.25),¹ only a handful are known, and of these, Cassius and Brutus stand out not only as leaders, but as an inseparable pair.² The pairing in itself is not surprising given the fame or notoriety of being declared the chief instigators in the assassination of Caesar. For later writers, these links became stronger through their joint defence at Philippi and their ultimate demise which ushered in the triumviral period. Appian frequently has the two names in close proximity, and Plutarch’s Brutus has been described as a dual life of Cassius and Brutus.³ The connection was so great for Dante that he chose not to break up the pairing of Cassius and Brutus who, together with Judas Iscariot, enjoyed the direct hospitality of Satan (Inf. 34).⁴ This tradition reaches fruition under Chaucer who can be seen to amalgamate the two into a single entity.⁵

Pairing is certainly not a new concept (consider, for example, the long tradition of writing parallel lives), though the connection between these two men

¹ Eutropius then goes on to name as the chief conspirators the two Bruti, C. Cassius and Servilius Casca.
² Clarke (1981: 33).
⁴ I thank Emeritus Professor John Scott for his assistance and insights into Dante.
⁵ Silverstein (1932).
sometimes seems strained. Plutarch, and later Shakespeare, seemed infatuated by this comparison of characters.⁶ Cassius and Brutus seem to have been very different individuals. For instance, philosophically Cassius was a recent convert to Epicureanism,⁷ whereas Brutus was an adherent of the Old Academy.⁸ Velleius Paterculus, writing some 50 years later, seems to capture this strange contradiction between their contrasting, yet inherently linked, characters (2.72):

\[
\text{fuit autem dux Cassius melior, quanto vir Brutus: e quibus Brutum amicum habere malles, inimicum magis timeres Cassium; in altero maior vis, in altero virtus: qui si vicissent, quantum rei publicae interfuit Caesarem potius habere quam Antonium principem, tantum retulisset habere Brutum quam Cassium.}
\]

\textit{However, Cassius was a better leader, as much as Brutus was the better man; on account of which you would have preferred Brutus as a friend, yet you would have feared Cassius more as an enemy; in one was the greater force, in the other the greater virtue: who if they

---

⁷ His conversion to Epicureanism was at least from 46 B.C. Cassius’ Epicureanism will be discussed at the start of the next chapter. On this and an attempt to align this philosophical movement with the assassination, see Belliotti (2009: 110-4).
⁸ Sedley (1997) is an informative article on the philosophical slants of Cassius and Brutus, in particularly Brutus’ placement within the philosophical movements of the Old and New Academy and Stoicism.
had triumphed, as much as it was in the interest of the State to have Caesar (Augustus) rather than Antonius as Princeps, so it would have been important to have Brutus rather than Cassius.

This juxtaposition of character has also had a huge impact on modern accounts of Cassius and Brutus. For instance, Clarke refers to Cassius as ‘a hot tempered man with a sharp tongue and without wit’, whilst Bossier says of Brutus that, being ‘slow and serious, he advanced step by step in everything’. The image which is created is of two very different characters who were required to work together, not just in the slaying of Caesar, but also in surviving the aftermath of that action. Cicero’s comparison of Cassius and Brutus is no less rhetorical than the rest of the tradition – no less bound up with the questions of political perspective and ideology we have seen in his deployment of terms like liberator, tyrannoctonus and heros. As the chapter progresses, it aims to situate Cicero’s characterisation of Cassius and Brutus within such discourse. In the process, we may construct a richer picture of how Cassius and Brutus could be understood by contemporaries in Republican Rome. It will prove useful to examine briefly their careers prior to the Ides of March to provide a context for Cicero’s representation of them.

---

10 Bossier (1897: 309).
11 For general biographies of Cassius and Brutus see Radin (1939); Clarke (1981).
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Much of Cassius’ career had been military. He had escaped the slaughter at Carrhae whilst serving as a quaestor under Crassus in Syria in 53.\(^\text{12}\) He was then credited with the regrouping of survivors and the organisation of the defence of Syria. This would have been a contributing factor towards the good reputation he seems to have earned in the East.\(^\text{13}\) Cassius continued to act as the proquaestor in Syria until the arrival of M. Calpurnius Bibulus in 51.\(^\text{14}\) During this time he had fought back Parthian incursions, including a major conflict near Antioch in 51.\(^\text{15}\) He is also said to have put down an insurrection in Judea in 52.\(^\text{16}\) Siding with Pompey in the civil war, Cassius served as an anti-Caesarian tribune of the plebs,\(^\text{17}\) and was the commander of the Syrian contingent of Pompey’s fleet.\(^\text{18}\) In the following year he made successful attacks against Caesar at Messana and Vibo.\(^\text{19}\) After Pharsalus he sought pardon from Caesar,\(^\text{20}\) and became a legate in his service.\(^\text{21}\) Rumours were apparently

\(^\text{12}\) Vell. 2.46.4; J. AJ 14.119; Plu. Crass. 20-9; D.C. 40.25.4-5; Eutrop. 6.18.2; Oros. 6.13.5.
\(^\text{13}\) Cic. Phil. 11.14.35.
\(^\text{14}\) Cic. Fam. 15.14.1.
\(^\text{15}\) Cic. Att. 5.20.3, 21.2; Fam. 15.14.3, cf. 4.7; Vell. 2.46.4; Fron. Str. 2.5.35; Justin 42.4.5; D.C. 40.28-29; cf. Cic. Att. 5.18.1; Fam. 2.10.2; 15.1.2, 2.2-3; Phil. 11.14.35; Cael. in Cic. Fam. 8.10.2; Liv. Per. 108; Ruf. Fest. 17.4; Eutrop. 6.18.2; Oros. 6.13.5.
\(^\text{17}\) Cic. Att. 7.21.2-5, 23.1, 24, 25; Auct. Vir. Ill. 83.4.
\(^\text{18}\) Caes. Civ. 3.5.3; Auct. Vir. Ill. 83.5.
\(^\text{19}\) Caes. Civ. 3.101.
\(^\text{20}\) Cic. Fam. 15.15.2; Att. 11.13, 15.2; cf. App. BC. 2.88, 111 (cf. MRR 2.283).
\(^\text{21}\) Cic. Fam. 6.6.10, 15.5; Att. 11.13.1, 15.2; D.C. 42.13.5; Auct. Vir. Ill. 83.6; App. BC 2.111, 146.
circulated that Cassius had first plotted to kill Caesar whilst in Cilicia in 47.\textsuperscript{22} However, despite not being put into the field, he continued to hold a legateship until 44 when he was apparently overlooked for the office of praetor urbanus.\textsuperscript{23} Instead he received the office of praetor peregrinus which he held at the time of Caesar’s assassination.\textsuperscript{24}

At the time Cassius was fighting the Parthians in Syria in 53 BC, Brutus is said to have refused to serve under Caesar in Gaul. Instead he accompanied his father-in-law Appius Claudius Pulcher to Cilicia.\textsuperscript{25} Throughout 52 it appears that Brutus was advocating against Pompey and the idea of sole consulships,\textsuperscript{26} and writing a pamphlet in favour of Milo after the death of Clodius.\textsuperscript{27} When civil war broke out, Brutus sided with Pompey, and in 49 BC he served as a legate in Cilicia under Publius Sestius.\textsuperscript{28} After Pharsalus he was pardoned by Caesar, possibly through the intervention of his mother,\textsuperscript{29} and worked in Asia Minor. In 46, Caesar appointed him a commander in Cisalpine Gaul, where he governed

\textsuperscript{22} Cic. \textit{Phil.} 2.11.26. This story is only mentioned in Cicero. For a possible confusion with the lesser known L. Cassius see Ramsey (2003: 202).

\textsuperscript{23} Plu. \textit{Brut.} 7.1-3; \textit{Caes.} 62.2; App. \textit{BC} 4.57. Velleius Paterculus also states that a promissory consulship was put on hold (2.56.3).

\textsuperscript{24} Cic. \textit{Fam.} 11.2, 3.3; Vell. 2.58.1; Plu. \textit{Caes.} 57.3; \textit{Brut.} 14.4; App. \textit{BC} 2.112; 4.57; D.C. 44.14.2; 47.20.2; Zonar. 10.11.

\textsuperscript{25} Auct. \textit{Vir. Ill.} 82.3-4.

\textsuperscript{26} Quint. \textit{Inst.} 9.3.95.

\textsuperscript{27} Asc. 41C.

\textsuperscript{28} Plu. \textit{Brut.} 4.2.

\textsuperscript{29} Plu. \textit{Brut.} 5; App. \textit{BC}. 2.112.
until the spring of 45. At the time of Caesar’s assassination, Brutus held the office of praetor urbanus, the leading praetor in Rome. Caesar had also designated for him a consulship for 41.

2.1: CICERO, CASSIUS AND BRUTUS IN THE EAST (51 B.C.)

Apart from one extant letter in 59 BC, both Brutus and Cassius begin to appear in the correspondence of Cicero from around 51 BC. At this time, Cicero was begrudgingly taking up his governorship in Cilicia. The coincidence of Cassius and Brutus being in the same area as Cicero at this time is fortuitous for this study. However, both were living very different lives. As mentioned, 

30 Cic. Fam. 6.6.10; 13.10-14; Brut. 171; Att. 12.27.3; Plu. Brut. 61.6-7; App. BC 2.111; Auct. Vir. Ill. 82.5; cf. Cic. Orat. 34; Suet. Rhet. 6; Plu. Comp. Dio and Brut. 5. Broughton surmises this was a legatus pro praetore (MRR 2.301).
31 Cic. Fam. 7.21; Phil. 10.3.7; Att. 15.12.1, 18.2; 16.1.1, 2.3, 4.1; Vell. 2.58.1; Plu. Caes. 57.3, 62.2; Brut. 7, 14.4-5; App. BC 2.112; 4.57; D.C. 44.12.3, 15.4; 47.20.2; Zonar. 10.11 (confused with Cassius); cf. Auct. Vir. Ill. 82.5.
32 Evidence for designation for 41 of Brutus as consul is primarily based on Plutarch (Caes. 62.4), but can also be deduced from numerous other sources, including some that may indicate a joint consulship with Cassius (e.g. Cic. Phil. 8.9.27; Fam. 12.2.2; 12.2.9; Vell. 2.56.3).
33 This letter has passing references to Brutus, mentioned by his adoptive name Caepio, mixed up with the Vettius affair, a plot of the young Curio to murder Pompey according to the unreliable informer L. Vettius (Att. 2.24.2, 3); for a summary of events see Gruen (1974: 95-96). As a passing reference over a decade before the period in focus it has no bearing on this study.
34 Of course it is anachronistic to regard the coincidence as significant and based on the later pairing. Both Cassius and Brutus had valid reasons for being in the East at this time, as will be made clear. Ironically it is the fact that they are not paired and have different roles in the East that make them important to this study. Since they both appear in Cicero’s correspondence at
Cassius had been commanding forces in Syria as a proquaestor following the disastrous defeat of M. Licinius Crassus at Carrhae in 53. Meanwhile, Brutus was accruing wealth by collecting on high interest loans he had recently made, such as the loans to King Ariobarzanes III of Cappadocia and to the town of Salamis on Cyprus, which was amassing compound interest of 48 per cent.

Cicero, on the insistence of Atticus, tried to look after Brutus’ interests at that time. Unfortunately, he found Brutus rude and arrogant, as well as unsympathetic and unethical in his attitude to debt collecting (Att. 5.17.6; 6.1.7, 6.3.7). Cicero felt that Cappadocia was already a bankrupted kingdom (Att. 6.1.4), and that the terms for Salamis were unreasonable. Cicero was especially unimpressed when he discovered that Brutus was hiding his interests through the use of agents (Att. 6.1.5). Despite all this, he still assisted Brutus, although he felt as if he had been taken advantage of (Att. 6.2.9):

---

35 Cassius was essentially governing the province awaiting the arrival of the new pro-consular governor M. Calpurnius Bibulus.

36 See Att. 5.18.4; 5.21.10-13; 6.1.2-7; 6.2.7-10; 6.3.5-7.

37 The connection of Brutus to Atticus was through Atticus’ associations with Cato, as Brutus was his nephew. During his time in Cilicia there are numerous references which tie Cicero’s assistance for Brutus to Atticus’ requests to look after him (e.g. Att. 5.18.4; 5.20.6; 6.1.2-3, 7; 6.2.7, 9; 6.3.5f.).

38 See Att. 5.21.10-13; 6.1.2-7; 6.2.7-10; 6.3.5-7
nimis inquam in isto Brutum amasti, dulcissime Attice, nos vereor ne parum.

*Dearest Atticus, you have cared far too much for Brutus in this matter, and not enough, I fear, for me.*

This is not to say that Cicero did not develop a closer relationship with this young man.\(^{39}\) When Tullia died and Cicero was inconsolable, he was touched by Brutus’ concerns (*Att. 12.13.1; 12.14.4*).\(^{40}\) The two men kept in close touch throughout 45, and Cicero even dedicated numerous works to Brutus including the *Brutus*, *Orator ad M. Brutum*, *de Finibus*, and *de Natura Deorum*. The extant letters of Cicero indicate that the two men had a close relationship, meeting when they could, and writing frequently. Unfortunately the only surviving direct record of their literary exchange derives from the final period of Cicero’s life, starting from around April 43.

Cassius, on the other hand, had been successfully defending Syria against Parthian incursions when Cicero took up his role in Cilicia in 51.\(^{41}\) The

\(^{39}\) Cicero and Brutus developed a friendship over the years based largely on their philosophical and oratorical interests. No less than six treatises were dedicated to Brutus during Caesar’s dictatorship. The *Brutus* and the *Paradoxa Stoicorum* even cite Brutus as their main inspiration. It would seem that Cicero saw in Brutus a great talent that could be nurtured. For a discussion of Cicero and Brutus’ oratorical and philosophical relationship see Grabarek (2013).

\(^{40}\) For Cicero’s grief at the death of Tullia, see Baltussen (2013).

\(^{41}\) Plutarch seems to describe Cassius as the rational military advisor to Crassus’ erratic and militarily foolish command (Plu. Crass. 18-29). The usual account is that Cassius took over after
relationship between the two seems cordial, with Cicero sending a note of congratulations to the conquering general (Fam 2.10.2; 15.14.2-3). Despite these praises and intimate knowledge of the events, on account of his close proximity, Cicero seems to have misrepresented them to some correspondents. For instance, after Cicero had received a letter from M. Caelius Rufus in which Cassius’ accounts were disputed,\(^42\) he wrote to Atticus that Cassius’ account of his success was exaggerated and that nobody in Rome believed it (Att. 5.21.2).\(^43\) Cicero states that it was because of his arrival that Cassius gained the courage to storm forth out of Antioch where he was holed up (Att. 5.20.3).\(^44\) The overwhelming consensus from the ancient sources, however, is one of outstanding generalship on the part of Cassius.\(^45\) By painting Cassius as a man

\(^{42}\) Caelius insinuated that Cassius, in order to cover up the destruction which he himself had caused, had let a band of Arabs run around the province causing mayhem, and that it was this easily controlled group that he was passing off as an invasion from the Parthians (Fam. 8.10.2).

\(^{43}\) Interestingly, even the death of the Parthian general Osaces is taken away from Cassius, as Cicero reports that he died a few days later of a wound received in his flight (in fuga), not in a fight.

\(^{44}\) Cicero depicts Cassius as being shut up in Antioch, besieged by Parthians (Att. 5.18.1; 5.20.3; 5.21.2; Fam. 15.1.2, 15.4.7).

\(^{45}\) In addition to those accounts cited above (p. 180, n. 41), other positive accounts of his generalship include Fron. Str. 2.5.35; Just. Epit. 42.4.5; Liv. Per. 108.
whose bravery was dependent on the arrival of Cicero, and who publically overstated his achievements, Cicero would make his own contribution in the conflict more pronounced. However, a very different depiction was delivered in 43. At that time Cicero found it useful to emphasise Cassius’ brilliant generalship and military prowess against the Parthians back in the early 50’s (Phil. 11.14.35):

paratum habet imperatorem C. Cassium, patres conscripti, res publica contra Dolabellam, nec paratum solum, sed peritum atque fortrem. magnas ille res gessit ante Bibuli, summi viri, adventum, cum Parthorum nobilissimos duces, maximas copias fudit Syriamque immani Parthorum impetu liberavit.

The State has against Dolabella a general prepared, conscript fathers, in C. Cassius. Not only is he prepared, but skilled and brave. That man achieved great things before the arrival of Bibulus, that excellent fellow, when he routed the most distinguished commanders and the innumerable forces of Parthians, and freed Syria from the ruthless onslaught of the Parthians.

The purpose of this speech provides a justification for the change in portraiture. This speech was essentially a proposal to place Cassius officially as governor of Syria, in order to wage war justly against the now public enemy Dolabella.
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The argument is based on Cassius being the most effective man to govern due to his connections and familiarity with the East, and due to his successful command of the Syrian legions back in the 50’s. When this speech is compared to the letters, a change in the depiction of Cassius’ character to suit different purposes is evident.

Despite the negative portrait of Cassius by Cicero in 51, and the references to Cassius being one of Caesar’s men after his defection following the defeat at Pharsalus, Cicero and Cassius also seem to have maintained some connection throughout the civil war period. In July of 46, Cicero mentions acting as a critic for both Cassius and Dolabella in their studies (Fam. 7.33.2). The most significant indication of a connection, however, comes from a series of letters between Cicero and Cassius from 52 to 45 B.C., with letters from 47 onwards predominantly asking for any news concerning the civil war (Fam. 15.14-19). Obviously there was some reciprocal arrangement during this time, suggestive of at least a polite amicitia.

---

46 Broughton lists him amongst the Anti-Caesarians in 49 (MRR 2.259), and summarises his commands throughout 48 (MRR 2.270, 283). After Pharsalus he travelled to the East to secure Caesar’s pardon (Att. 11.13.1, 11.15.2; cf. App. BC 2.88).

47 The letters from 44 and 43 B.C. consist of the first twelve letters in book 12 of the ad Familiares collection.

48 Despite the majority of this series being from Cicero to Cassius, Fam. 15.19 is from Cassius to Cicero and has Cassius, currently at Brundisium, asking about matters in Spain (Fam. 15.19.4).
These brief summaries of Brutus’ and Cassius’ connections with Cicero in Cilicia suggest the possibility of manipulation in Cicero’s character portrayal in the letters. In both instances, Cicero’s depictions of Cassius and Brutus do not necessarily match his actions. Although Brutus’ haughtiness and ruthless pursuit of debts were being derided to Atticus, Cicero was helping him where he could on the request of Atticus. At the same time, despite acknowledging elsewhere that Cassius successfully defended Syria, Cicero was at least partially responsible for the spreading of popular rumours which diminished the importance of Cassius’ actions.

In both cases a reason for these depictions could relate to the control of political power. By helping Brutus, Cicero could maintain and develop the amicitia of both men. By diminishing Cassius’ accomplishments in the letters, Cicero was possibly seeking to increase his own popular support and build a military reputation. Both relationships are framed by the special relationship of acknowledged equality of status between Cicero and Atticus, although they are not free of strategies to build Cicero’s own power through his correspondence.

Reductive reports on Cassius’ achievements produced an opportunity for Cicero to present his own version of events. The result was an embellishment of his own self-portrait. Later, when the circumstances had changed and a strong, ratified (or at least justified), martial force was now needed in Syria to counter
the rampaging of Dolabella, Cicero returned to the portrait of Cassius in Syria in 51, this time, with a sense of his outstanding generalship.

This quick survey of the early associations with Cicero demonstrates that Cassius and Brutus had very different career paths, opportunities and associations. Putting aside the evidence for Roman belief in fixed personalities, these different experiences would probably account for some differences in character. They were both individuals and it would, therefore, be expected that some difference should appear in their depictions as they appear in Cicero’s writings. Yet, at times, their differences seem to be amplified and exaggerated by Cicero. One way in which he could do this effectively was by placing the two men in comparative portraiture. When Cicero casts the two men together, he often does so in stark contrast, resulting in an exaggeration of both characters. This suggestion has possible implications for the depictions of the conspirators in ancient and modern sources.

2.2: CICERO, CASSIUS AND BRUTUS AT ANTIUM

The proposed issuing of the corn acquisition commissions first mentioned on 2 June 44 brought with it an important decision. It gave Cassius and Brutus a legal and sound reason to leave Italy, yet its purpose was unmistakable: the

quiet removal of the conspirators from Rome. Through the reactions to this event, it will be suggested that Cicero used comparative portraiture in his depiction which had the effect of emphasising and exaggerating their character traits, almost to the point of stereotype: the bellicose Cassius and the submissive Brutus. Cicero’s rhetorical reporting of their reactions to this event suggests an attempt to construct and accentuate their personalities. If this is so, Cicero’s purpose needs to be assessed. Close attention to Cicero’s characterisation of Cassius and Brutus may mean that standard representations of these two men also may need to be re-examined.

Around June 7, Cicero attended a gathering at Antium. This meeting was essentially an advisory conference on the next course of action, and was prompted in response to the above-mentioned corn commissions proposed for Brutus in Asia and Cassius in Sicily. Cicero arrived just after midday, and

---

50 A meeting of the senate had taken place on June 5, which Cicero found out about in a letter from Balbus on the evening of June 2 (Att. 15.9.1). In this meeting the decision had been made to offer Cassius and Brutus commissions in Sicily and Asia for the purchase and shipment of grain back to Rome (Att. 15.9.1). This commission was extraordinary and outside the standard provincial governorship appointments which around August 1 saw Cassius receive Cyrene and Brutus receive Crete pro consule (Mommsen (1893: 601-603); MRR 2 320-321). There is little doubt that the need to settle tensions in Rome regarding the future of the conspirators was too important for Antonius to wait for due processes (Sumi (2005: 138)). This commission would effectively allow Antonius to get Cassius and Brutus out of Rome and Italy, and hopefully out of the public eye. The extra advantage that this would provide is that it would give Antonius the appearance of being reasonable and conciliatory towards the conspirators (cf. App. BC. 3.1.6; pp. 197-8). Various aspects of this commission will be discussed in the following pages.
immediately gives the impression of a largely unenthusiastic welcome, except from Brutus (*Att.* 15.11.1):

> Bruto iucundus noster adventus. deinde multis audientibus, Servilia, Tertulla, Porcia, quae rere quid placeret. aderat etiam Favonius. ego, quod eram meditatus in via, suadere ut uteretur Asiatica curatione frumenti; nihil esse iam reliqui quod ageremus nisi ut salvus esset; in eo etiam ipsi rei publicae esse praesidium.

My arrival was agreeable to Brutus. Then with a large audience, including Servilia, Tertulla, Porcia, he asked what should be decided. Even Favonius was present. I urged what I had deliberated upon along the way - that he make use of the Asian corn commission; that there was nothing left for us to do except make sure that he was safe; that in him also was the protection of the Republic itself.

Cicero immediately draws attention to the people in attendance, including a remark which relegated them to mere onlookers (*audientibus*). Cicero would seem to place them in passivity, possibly relating to an inability to offer a viable solution. It could also demonstrate his need to summon all his skills of

---

51 *OLD* 1524-5 §5 – use with historical tenses, often impersonal – *to be resolve or agreed on (by)*; *TLL* 10.1.2264.39.
persuasion to convince the attendees. Whatever the reason, by placing himself in this light, he seems to present himself as an authority, which would add weight to his credentials. Ironically, this also foreshadows the frosty reception his advice is about to receive, and will introduce his use of comparative portrayal and oppositions in this passage: firstly, in comparing his active involvement with the passive viewing of his assembled ‘audience’; and then, between Cassius and Brutus themselves.

When the names of the audience members are examined, it is apparent that these are all members of Brutus’ family: his mother, half-sister and wife respectively. It would seem to Cicero that he had walked in on Brutus surrounded by his female relatives. Notwithstanding that Tertulla was also the wife of Cassius (not to mention that Servilia was also Cassius’ mother-in-law), the rhetorical devices used link them all with Brutus. Tertulla is surrounded in this passage by Servilia, Brutus’ mother, and Porcia, Brutus’ wife, and this would indicate her inclusion amongst the family of Brutus. The use of the diminutive form of Tertia (Tertulla) also would be more appropriate for Cicero to use in relation to the sister of Brutus than for the wife of Cassius. If these reasons alone do not suffice, Cicero completes the audience with a special

52 SB (1967: 258) likewise connects them all with Brutus, with no mention of Cassius in connection to Tertulla.

53 The use of this diminutive here (also Att. 14.20.2) suggests an endearing name used in the family circle, see SB (1967: 239). This would support the connection with the Brutus.
mention of M. Favonius, the ill-respected imitator of Cato. In doing so he links this audience to the *familia Catonis*: a direct connection through Servilia to Brutus.

What Cicero essentially depicts here is a family conference despite the evidence that it could have been more than this. The political nature of the meeting, as well as its significance for state affairs, may insinuate that this was more than a family gathering. The fact that Cicero prepared a response on his journey may also contribute to a picture of an important *consilium*, as does the insinuation of an extensive audience (*multis audientibus*). Despite all of this, what Cicero presents here is a family conference. The only personalities mentioned are the *familia Catonis*, the only people who contribute to the discussion are the family members. It is conceded that Cicero may have missed the start of the *consilium* and so others may have contributed earlier, but Cicero’s omission of this, if it is in fact true, adds to the identification of an intentional rhetorical construction regarding this meeting. He has reduced it to an intimate family discussion.

54 Suetonius and Dio mention Favonius’ attempts to imitate Cato (Suet. *Aug.* 13; D.C. 38.7.1). Plutarch’s portrayal of Favonius, however, is more hostile (Plu. *Pomp.* 60). It probably draws from the near contemporary attitude contained in the Pseudo-Sallustian ‘Letter to Caesar’ (Sal. *Rep.* 9.4). In this passage the writer first compares Favonius to an inscription which provides nothing but a famous name, and then to superfluous loads (*supervacanea onera*) on a ship, possibly useful after a journey, but the first thing to jettison in a disaster because they are of the least value (*pretii minime*).

55 Lintott (2008: 348) also called it a “family conference”.
The connection to Cato may also allude to the presentation of an *exemplum* of the behaviour expected to be displayed at the meeting.\(^{56}\) As this letter was written *post eventum*, the outcome was clear. If a connection to Cato is accepted, this association may reflect a sense of irony and disappointment, especially given the poor imitation of Cato represented in Favonius. The resolute, ethical defiance which defined Cato's political career and death can be seen in others, such as Servilia and Cassius, but is not apparent in Brutus, who appears indecisive and cautious, readily deferring his opinions and actions to others. Cicero, therefore, may be foreshadowing this characterisation through the connection to Cato. In addition, Brutus' supporters consist of three women and a sycophant.\(^{57}\) The portrait cast is not flattering for the man to whom the protection of the Republic was often said to be entrusted.

Brutus' appearance of deference and indecision may also be explained by simple politeness. The nature of the *consilium* would have required him to ask the advice of those assembled, and in some cases, seek further advice and information. Therefore, in isolation, many of the techniques and phrases which appear in relation to him may relate to social nuances and expected

---

\(^{56}\) van der Blom (2010) contains extensive information on Cicero's use of *exempla* in his political strategies.

\(^{57}\) How (1926: 494) describes this ‘participation of women in an important political conference’ as ‘a striking novelty’, though he is too ambitious in linking this to a foreshadowing of their influence in Imperial times.
politeness.\textsuperscript{58} However, given the emphasis Cicero places on these expressions, particularly by reporting the conversations of this selective account in the way he does, utilising so many of these expressions in succession, leads the reader to consider that he seems to be depicting a lack of resolve from Brutus.

Cicero introduces his ‘presentation’ with two historical infinitives indicating the link between these two structures. The subject of \textit{quaerere} is Brutus, in what Rosén called ‘context-conditional ellipsis’.\textsuperscript{59} The inclusion of these historical infinitives reveals a narrative structure, indicating indirect discourse, in this case a question and an answer. The use of the historical infinitive here gives the verb a more vigorous and impetuous feeling. By introducing Brutus’ immediate questioning through an infinitive, a feeling of unrestrained emotion and reactionary, uncontemplated thought is given to him.\textsuperscript{60} Cicero’s response, also given as a historical infinitive (\textit{suadere}), confirms his role as orator and the need to be persuasive in his delivery. It also creates a rapid succession from questioning to answering. Perhaps this represented the tension and anxiety present in the room.\textsuperscript{61}

\textsuperscript{58} For politeness in Cicero’s letters see Hall (2009).
\textsuperscript{60} Schlicher (1914: 279-81, 286-7) cited this letter amongst those use of the historical infinitive which seek to demonstrate desire and impulse towards an end which completely absorb the agent in the action.
\textsuperscript{61} It may also have signposted to Atticus that his intention was only to report the outline of the conversation, and not the details: see Kühner (1914: 103 §34); Gildersleeve & Lodge (1895:}
In stark contrast to the rapidity of the historical infinitive is the subordinate deponent verb meditor, indicating a decision not easily reached but well considered. By the use of this verb Cicero seems to withdraw himself from the chaotic and highly charged scene. The effect is to demonstrate that he had considered the decision closely and had arrived at a conclusion based on logic and not emotion and reactionary principles. Despite this reasoned argument, one can still picture Cicero giving the advice to take up the commission through a tightly clenched jaw.

A short digression is required on Cicero’s opinion of the commission and his decision to advise accepting it. His initial response on hearing from Balbus about this senatorial decision was one of undeniable disgust – o rem miseram (Att. 15.9.1), and, as the days passed, his resentment seemed to grow (Att. 15.10.1):

413 §647 n. 1). This is also evident in the text as Cicero proceeds to use a series of indirect statements to summarise the main points of his presentation.

62 OLD 1199 s.v. meditor, TLL 8.0.574.79-580.32. The list of meanings illustrate this reasoned and considered contemplation of events and careful advice, e.g. §1. pertinent ad cogitationem, i.q. deliberare, considerare §2. pertinent ad consilium, fere i.q. consiliari, consilium capere; §3. pertinent ad praeparationem §4. pertinent ad effectum §5. i.q. praefigurare.

63 Ferrero’s thought that Cicero had been calmed by Dolabella’s legatio is not supported given his obstinacy towards the commission (1909: 3.67). A far more likely scenario is that Cicero saw no other option at this time (T&P (1915: 332)), and it was better to do something than nothing.
ut beneficio istorum utantur? quid turpius? ... quid foedius? frumentum imponere! quae est alia Dionis legatio aut quod munus in re publica sordidius?

That they should make use of the favour of these men? What is more disgraceful? …What is more atrocious? To be assigned to grain acquisition! This is another embassy of Dio or rather what office in the State is more degrading?

Cicero’s disgust is clear. However, the reference to the appointing of the corn commission as a Dionis legatio (an embassy of Dio) is puzzling. The proverbial nature of this expression has long been assumed, though a precise meaning has eluded scholars. Traditionally it is thought to relate to the exile of Dio from Syracuse by Dionysius II, though an alternative identification may be

---

64 There may be a prior reference to this appointment as an embassy, with Cicero calling it hanc legatariam provinciam (Att. 15.9.1). There is little consensus on what this word should be as the MSS tradition renders two possibilities, legatorius or legatarius, which do not occur elsewhere, see SB (1967: 256). Other emendations include Orelli’s locatoriam (1845: 717), Boot’s nugatoriam (1866: 316), and T&P’s legatorum (1915: 329). The Dionis legatio letter, written a few days later, may have provided to Atticus a point of reference or further explanation of Cicero’s expression hanc legatariam provinciam.

65 T&P (1915: 331-2); SB (1967: 257); Beaujeu (1988: 281); Ryan (2000). There is, however, no mention of it anywhere else in extant literature. It was left out of Otto (1890).

66 Whilst associating this phrase to this event, most commentaries relate the difficulty in this as there is no evidence that his exile took the form of an embassy (T&P (1915: 331); SB (1967: 257); Beaujeu (1988: 281)), using Plutarch (Dio 15) and Nepos (Di 3) as support.
the Dio sent by Arsinoe II to Ptolemy Keraunos. Either way, it is thought to relate to a wasteful or useless endeavour, or a task which appears honorific yet is designed to remove the person from public focus.

Another possibility put forth has been the hundred-strong Alexandrian embassy to Rome in 57 B.C. Their mission was to stop the return of Ptolemy XII Auletes (C.D. 39.12-14). In this case, it would indicate an embassy not meant to return, as its leader Dion and many other envoys were killed either on the way to or at Rome. Bringmann rightly points out that the relatively contemporary nature of this event would have made the context easy for Atticus to understand. However, Cicero makes no mention that he expected this commission to be a deadly trap for the conspirators, but rather the issue is the degrading nature of this minor office for senior praetors like Cassius and Brutus.

Despite his outrage at the proposal, two days later Cicero suggested that the commission should be accepted (Att. 15.11.1). His assessment seems to be that it was better to do something than nothing. Inactivity since the assassination has already been suggested as a reason for Cicero’s frustrations, and now there was an opportunity to do something. Besides, as the praetor

---

68 Bringmann (2003).
69 The earlier suggestion of irony contained in the *litotes of non incommodum* in the letter reporting the meeting with Antonius matches well with the idea of the conspirators finally doing something which could be seen as constructive or beneficial (pp. 159-160).
urbanus, Brutus would need legal authorisation to depart from Rome.\textsuperscript{70} This ostensible change of heart need not be thought of as hypocrisy. One need only think back to the request for an annulment to the lease for Asiatic tax collections back in 61. Cicero had supported the equestrians, despite his personal thoughts on their request, as obstinacy in one’s moral stance and opinion, such as has been identified with Cato, could have had dire consequences.\textsuperscript{71} Not agreeing with something, but seeing it as the best option available was not hypocrisy in Cicero’s eyes. Nor was it something that came easy. Cicero’s deliberation and use of \textit{meditor} has already been mentioned, but there are other indications that his decision had been more arduous than the journey to Antium.

Despite the indignation of the previous letter written around June 5, Cicero inserted a short personal contemplation which foresees his eventual acceptance of the commission (\textit{Att.} 15.10.1):

\begin{quote}
\textit{ut moliantur aliquid? nec audent nec iam possunt. age, quiescant auctoribus nobis; quis incolumtatem praestat? ...}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{70} The \textit{praetor urbanus} was not permitted to be absent from Rome for more than ten days (\textit{FIRA} 1 116); Brennan (2000: 468). It can be assumed that this restriction was not as important to Cassius as the \textit{praetor inter peregrinos}, though permission to leave Italy may have been required. Whatever the case, Cicero only refers to Antonius’ proposal to release Brutus from this law (\textit{Phil.} 2.13.31).

\textsuperscript{71} This letter (\textit{Att.} 1.17.9) has already been discussed when investigating Cicero’s depiction of Cato as a hero (p. 147).
That they should undertake something? They do not dare to nor now are they able to. Well, if they are inactive on my advice, who is responsible for their safety?

It would seem, despite the insult it would entail, the choice between inactivity and the corn commission was perplexing to Cicero. The conspirators, through their inoperativeness, had created a situation where there was no way out (neceudent nec iam possunt). Cicero, therefore, was contemplating that just doing something might be more productive or beneficial. A connection can be made with this expression *ut moliantur aliquid* and a previous letter from Hirtius which Cicero had reported to Atticus around June 2 (Att. 15.6.3):72

*tantum si quid timent caveant, nihil praeterea moliantur.*

*If they are afraid, let them take some precautions only, and let them plan nothing further.*

The verb *molior* seems to generally convey effort or struggle, and while Hirtius was advocating for as little as possible, Cicero seems to envisage that this lack of effort may have created the current troubles in Rome. The letters seem to point to a growing frustration with the inactivity of the conspirators and may well justify his support of the corn commission. Another contemporaneous letter to

---

72 T&P (1915: 331); SB (1967: 257). For the dating of this letter, see SB (1967: 311-2).
Atticus, immediately after his lament and criticism of the gall of the corn acquisition duty, further indicates the dangers of inactivity \( (Att. \ 15.9.1): \)

\[
\text{atque haud scio an melius sit quam ad Eurotam sedere. sed haec casus gubernabit. ait autem eodem tempore decretum iri ut et iis et reliquis praetoriis provinciae decernantur. hoc certe melius quam illa \( \Pi\epsilon\rho\sigma\iota\kappa\iota \) porticus; \( \dagger \)nolo enim Lacedaemonem longinquo quo in Lanuvium existimavit.}\]

\begin{quote}
And yet I contemplate whether this would be better than sitting by the Eurotas. But fate will govern these things. He said, however, it will be decreed at the same time that the provinces are decreed to them and the other praetors. This is certainly better than the Persian Stoa; …
\end{quote}

Cicero’s gradual consideration for the commission as a viable option is demonstrated here. Despite its despicable nature it would provide an official political authority, albeit minor, and with it would come some benefits.\(^73\) As such, Cicero sets up in this letter an image of sedentariness and inaccessibility with three references to Sparta. Firstly, that acceptance of the commission may be better than to sit at the Eurotas, and then that it was certainly better than that

\(^{73}\) It is interesting that what was essentially a \textit{cura annonae} was treated with such contempt despite being used to such popular ends by men such as Pompey and Augustus, even featuring in the latter’s \textit{Res Gestae} (5.33). Ernesti put this down to the absence of a \textit{maius imperium} and the confinement of the position to very specific provinces (T&P (1915: 331-2)).
Persian portico.\(^{74}\) It is the last statement, left untranslated due to the breadth of the corruption, which may identify the culprit of inactivity as Brutus.\(^{75}\) The letter suggests that Brutus was spending his time sitting idly around the Spartan-named landmarks on his property at Lanuvium.\(^{76}\) Most commentators, despite this corruption, see this last line as a reference to a Sparta which is no further than Lanuvium, i.e. that Brutus was so cut off at his estate at Lanuvium that he might as well have been overseas in the real Sparta.\(^{77}\) Whatever the meaning of this tangle, what is presented is a portrayal of Brutus as idle and unresponsive in face of the crisis. The focus remains on Brutus, despite the corn commission affecting both him and Cassius, and would suggest that Cicero is again setting up a portrait of Brutus as cautious and directionless. The re-emergence of the verb form *gubernare* places control of the State in the hands of chance, and no longer being steered by a worthy statesman. This image seems congruent with

\(^{74}\) This is actually Orelli’s emendation, as the MSS has *persice* or similar variations. The Στοὰ Περσική was a monument erected in Sparta to celebrate the victory over the Persians at Plataea (Vitr. 1.1.6; Paus. 2.11.3).

\(^{75}\) This corrupt portion has offered many conjectures, such as i) *nolo enim Lacedaemonem longinquiorem quam Lanuvium existimari* (Müller (1898); Schmidt (1898: 225); Reid (1902: 156)); and ii) *nolo enim Lacedaemonem longinquiorem Lanucio existimaris* (T&P (1915: 330) following the emendation of Gronovius). Shackleton Bailey’s version is presented here, though he also conjectures the possibility of *nullam enim Lacedaemonem longinquiorem quam Lanuvinam existimaris* (SB (1967: 94, 256).

\(^{76}\) The established belief that Brutus named building and landmarks around his properties with Greek names is further supported by *Att.* 13.40.1. There Cicero refers to a certain artwork, a family tree drawn up by Atticus displaying Brutus’ descent from Brutus and Ahala, which Brutus had displayed in his ‘Parthenon’.

\(^{77}\) T&P (1915: 330); SB (1967: 95, 256).
Cicero’s other depictions of Brutus throughout the post-assassination correspondence.

We may note another reason for Cicero’s acquiescence to the commission. In Appian’s account, the decision to grant the commission was from a sympathetic senate who were attempting to provide Cassius and Brutus some safety from a hostile population at Rome (App. BC 3.1.6):

καὶ ἡ μὲν οὕτως ἔπραξεν, ἵνα μὴ ποτε Βροῦτος ἢ Κάσσιος φεύγειν δοκοῖε· τοσάδε αὐτῶν φροντίς ἦν ἁμα καὶ αἰδῶς, ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις σφαγεύσι διὰ τούσδε μάλιστα συνελάμβανον.

And so (the senate) passed this so that at no stage would Brutus or Cassius seem to flee: such was the concern and respect for them that the senate continued to give assistance to the other murderers chiefly because of them.

The sentiment here is very different from Cicero’s exclamations of contempt. At no point does Cicero mention any supportive or affable aspect to this appointment. Although it may be dangerous to elevate Appian’s claim above that of the contemporary Cicero, an intentional omission from Cicero is not impossible. The omission of a helpful or conciliatory aspect would allow for a greater sense of indignation to be placed upon the issuing of the commission. It would also turn the focus away from what was essentially a legal necessity for
Brutus to leave Italy. Cicero’s consideration of and later support for the appointment, as well as it being linked to the appointment of the other provincial commands,\(^7\) may also indicate some element of truth to Appian’s account.\(^8\) If this is so, Cicero could be seen as omitting details from his report. In this case, an exposé of the inactivity of the conspirators, particularly Brutus, may be his intention in order to support his argument that it was time to do something. Outrage at the suggestion not only demonstrated his empathy to the plight of the conspirators, but could also cast aspersions on the motives of the Caesarians.

The indication is that, by the time he had arrived at the meeting at Antium, Cicero saw the grain commission as the best course of action for the moment, as there was no further action possible (\textit{nihil...relinqu}) except preservation. Cicero, in placing paramount importance on Brutus, both for his and the republic’s survival, not only mollifies the undesirable position with a polite flattery, but adds a reminder of the obligation that the conspirators still had to

\(^{78}\) \textit{ail autem eodem tempore decretum iri ut et iis et reliquis praetoriis provinciae decernantur} (\textit{Att. 15.9.1}). I have repeated this quotation here for convenience.

\(^{79}\) Of course the account could just be another hostile tradition which attempts to put Cassius and Brutus in an ungrateful light, i.e. not taking up a position which was given to them by a caring senate.
the republic.\textsuperscript{80} Brutus’ reaction to Cicero’s address is postponed, for it was at this time that Cassius joined the meeting (\textit{Att.} 15.11.1):

\textit{quam orationem cum ingressus essem, Cassius intervenit. ego eadem illa repetivi. hoc loco fortibus sane oculis Cassius (Martem spirare diceres) se in Siciliam non iturum. ‘egone ut beneficium accepissem contumeliam?’ ‘quid ergo agis?’ inquam. at ille in Achaiam se iturum.}

\textit{After I had commenced this speech, Cassius came in. I repeated those same things. At this point Cassius certainly with a courageous look (you would swear that Mars breathed) said that he would not journey to Sicily. ‘Should I have taken an insult as a favour?’ ‘What will you do then?’ I replied. And he said that he would head for Greece.}

The use of the main verb \textit{intervenio} may be significant in understanding this passage, since there were many choices which Cicero could have used to indicate Cassius’ arrival.\textsuperscript{81} In juxtaposition with the \textit{ingredior} of Cicero’s speech,

\textsuperscript{80} This obligation to the republic will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.
\textsuperscript{81} This, surprisingly, seems to be counter to general thoughts, which do not consider this verb to be significant in the meaning. SB (1967: 97) translated it as ‘walked in’, with no mention of it in his commentary, and How (1926: 494) specifically chose ‘entered’, adding the note ‘he only interrupted Cicero when he had repeated his remarks’. T&P (1915: 333) thought that the significance of \textit{intervenit} lay in it meaning ‘came in’ rather than ‘took part in the conversation for
Cassius' *intervenio* seems more forceful than just ‘walking in’ or ‘entering’.\(^{82}\) On the surface, his arrival required Cicero to repeat his advice, and in this way could certainly be seen as an interruption. Yet the question of why Cassius was not present at the beginning of the meeting must be asked. Was he expected, and if so, why did those present not wait for him? Was he late? Was this meant to be a meeting to discuss Brutus’ future? All of these hypothetical scenarios would justify the use of *intervenio*. Further still, the depiction of Cassius throughout this letter would be consistent with a more spirited entry than ‘walked in’ or ‘entered’.

Throughout this letter, Cassius is presented as defiant and aggressive. He is depicted not only as a man of action, but as the epic warrior hero of mythology, akin to the god of war himself.\(^{83}\) He sees the corn commission for what it is: an insult disguised as a favour. This appears to echo Cicero’s own opinion on the disgraceful nature of the matter. Cassius is direct and assertive, strong and

---

\(^{82}\) *OLD* 1045 §1. arrive during the course of activities, drop in; §2. intervene; §5. to occur by way of a hindrance or interruption. *TLL* lists amongst its meanings *vi praeverbii vigente i. q. se interponere, intercedere* (7.1.2297.42) and *ex improvise* (7.1.2299.74-5). Another example in Cicero where the verb form of *intervenire* carries the meaning to interfere or interrupt is *Att.* 16.11.1. In saying this, *Att.* 16.4.1 seems to indicate an arrival during a conversation. Perspective and interpretation seem to be at question here, and there is at least the possibility, given Cassius’ general depiction in this letter, that a more forceful interruption was intended.

\(^{83}\) Appian also describes Cassius as πολεμικώτατος ‘having a most war-like spirit’ (*App. BC* 2.88).
proud. It is Cassius who provides the first glimpse at that defiant spirit which Cicero may have hinted at earlier with his setting up of the Cato references. Further still, whilst Cassius’ hard-line may have been inexpedient, its intention and rectitude was unimpeachable in Cicero’s presentation. This was a characteristic of heroic depiction,\textsuperscript{84} and, on some level, was something that Cicero had to admire.

Immediately following Cassius’ emphatic entrance and response, Brutus’ reaction is accentuated by its polarity (\textit{Att.} 15.11.1):

\begin{quote}
\textit{‘quid tu’ inquam ‘Brute?’ ‘Romam’ inquit, ‘si tibi videtur.’ ‘mihi vero minime; tuto enim non eris.’ ‘quid? si possem esse, placeretne?’ ‘atque ut omnino neque nunc neque ex praetura in provinciam ires; sed auctor non sum ut te urbi committas.’ dicebam ea quae tibi profecto in mentem veniunt cur non esset tuto futurus.}
\end{quote}

\textit{‘What about you, Brutus?’ I asked. He said ‘To Rome, if you are agreeable.’ I said ‘Certainly I am not! For you will not be safe.’ ‘Well, what if I could be safe? Would you approve?’ I said ‘Absolutely, and as well as that I would advise you not to go into a province, neither now nor after your Praetorship; but I do not suggest that you entrust

\textsuperscript{84} In particular the reminiscence of the depiction of Cato the hero would fit well within the scene playing out. The irony of the non-relative displaying these traits of the noble Cato would not have been lost on Atticus.
yourself to the city.’ I went on to say those things, which no doubt
spring to mind for you, as to why he would not be safe.

The cautiousness of Brutus is immediately apparent, as he looks for the
guidance and approval of others. His circumspect nature is evident through the
ostensibly verbatim recording of the conversation in a series of questions and
hypotheticals. Brutus answers Cicero’s question with a logical conditional
expressed through his use of indicatives,\(^{85}\) indicating his desire to return to
Rome should Cicero be in agreement. The impersonal use of \textit{videtur} seems to
add to the atmosphere of deference and compliance as Brutus is shown to be
relying on the opinion of others. When Cicero’s response is emphatically
negative (\textit{mihi vero minime}), using Brutus’ safety as the contributing factor,
Brutus attempts to set up a hypothetical assuming the negation of this threat.
The use of imperfect subjunctives, however, in both the apodosis and protasis,
creates an unreal conditional, which could suggest impossibility.\(^{86}\) Another
impersonal verb (\textit{placeret}) again places Brutus’ reaction as reliant on the
judgement of others. Cicero’s immediate response is simpler with his
confirmation being expressed by \textit{atque}.\(^{87}\) He further validates this answer

\(^{85}\) Kühner (1914: 919-20 § 212.4, 212.8a); Gildersleeve & Lodge (1895: 380). The indicative in
the apodosis is assumed to accompany the terminal accusative \textit{Romam}.

\(^{86}\) Kühner (1914: 920 § 212.7, 212.8c); Gildersleeve & Lodge state that ‘the notion of
Impossibility comes from the irreversible character of the Past Tense.’ (1895: 385).

\(^{87}\) Kühner (1914: 647-8 § 153.10); Gildersleeve & Lodge (1895: 301 § 477 n. 1).
through the continuation of the imperfect subjunctive (*ires*) in an indirect command. The general feeling of this series of conditionals, impersonals and hypotheticals is one of impossibility. This seems confirmed in Cicero’s next statement *sed auctor non sum*, setting up this complementary final sentence of warning. The sudden introduction of the indicative breaks the hypothetical feeling, and in doing so, Cicero removes himself from any advice to return to Rome. The possibility that this is the misguided advice from someone else can be conjectured. This may be verified by his need to provide proof of why it was not safe, even if this reasoning was not explicitly stated to Atticus in the letter. By not being explicit, Cicero knew that Atticus would also see this danger as apparent, set up by the particle *profecto* indicating affirmation and declaration. Literally it would be something which would just ‘come into his mind’ (*in mentem veniunt*). One may ask the question then: why could Brutus not see this danger?

Whatever the answer, Cicero appears, through his reporting of this conversation, to present a depiction of a cautious Brutus. This portrait agrees well with previous criticisms of the inaction of the conspirators after the Ides. In

---

88 A similar expression appeared when Cicero was contemplating whether to leave Rome if Pompey left back in March 49 - *ego quidem tibi non sim auctor, si Pompeius Italiam relinquit.* (*Att. 9.10.5*) In this case, the use of the subjunctive places it firmly in a conditional, whereas in the above example the indicative makes the advice not dependent on events and circumstances (*Att. 15.11*).
a letter to Atticus in late April, Cicero had succinctly stated that he counted the faults of the circumstances and not of the men - *rerum ego vitia collegi, non hominum* (Att. 14.14.2). At the end of that same paragraph he introduced a word play on the cognomen *Bruti*:

"Istā culpa Brutorum? minime illorum quidem, sed aliorum brutorum, qui se cautos ac sapientis putant; quibus satis fuit laetari, non nullis etiam gratulari, nullis permanere.

*Was that the fault of the Bruti? Not at all of these ones, but of the other brutes, who think themselves cautious and wise; to whom there was enough to rejoice, for some even to congratulate, but for none to endure.*

The denial of an *argumentum ad hominem* seems somewhat defensive and questionable given the ambiguity of the statement that it was not ‘those Bruti’, but rather ‘the other brutes’ who were to blame. On a basic level, Cicero seems to be presenting a statement that having the cognomen *Brutus* did not make one at fault. However, those unnamed idiots who sought a policy of inaction and a self-congratulatory attitude under the pretence of cautiousness and wisdom were certainly blameworthy. In light of this, Cicero’s depiction of Brutus at Antium, needing approval and advice on seemingly every course of action, may seem to place him more with the *bruti* than the *Bruti* in this instance. Similarly
the image previously created of Brutus idly lolling around his Spartan themed Lanuvium property is also congruent with this depiction. Furthermore, when Brutus tries to be assertive, his choice is ill advised. The use of unreal conditionals and the comment to Atticus regarding the conspicuity of the dangers in Rome have already suggested this. Further still, Cicero calls Brutus out on this, by referring to his stance as nothing more than false bravado (Att. 15.11.2):

...et noster Brutus cito deiectus est de illo inani sermone <quo se Romae>\textsuperscript{89} velle esse dixerat.

....and our Brutus was quickly dislodged from that empty talk by which he had said that he wanted to be in Rome.

Brutus' words are called useless or empty (\textit{inani sermone}), and something which Brutus needed to be literally 'cast down' or 'dislodged' from.\textsuperscript{90} The impression is one of unconvincing, unserviceable, and empty posturing. Furthermore, through the use of yet another passive voice (\textit{deiectus est}), and continuing the theme of compliance with others, Brutus does not come to the

\textsuperscript{89} The addition of \textit{Romae} here has had fairly universal support following Boot, with T&P (1915: 334) having \textit{quo Romae} and Shackleton Bailey (1967: 98, 259) further inserting the \textit{se}, combining Boot's \textit{se Romae} and Tyrrell & Purser's \textit{quo Romae}; see also How (1926: 495).

\textsuperscript{90} T&P (1915: 334) see the military reference in \textit{deiectus} – i.e. to be 'dislodged' from a position.
decision by himself, but rather is discouraged from this position by Cicero. This characterisation of obsequiousness will continue throughout the letter.

It is important, however, when looking at the reactions of Cassius and Brutus at this meeting at Antium, to look not only at their individual responses. What will prove crucial in understanding Cicero’s account of this event and his modus operandi in general, is how he creates in his accounts a portrait of these Republican characters. This can be identified by carefully examining factors such as where he positions the events, how much emphasis or how many details are provided about the events, and authorial comments. In this case, Cassius’ single line of direct speech, presumably from a longer exchange, compared to the expansive rambling dialogue in a series of questions with Brutus, characterises Cassius as direct, confident, and impulsive, whereas Brutus appears unsure, hesitant and in need of advice\(^\text{91}\). Cicero’s rhetorical use of comparative portraiture results in distinctive characterisations.

Cicero continues to use Cassius as a counter to Brutus’ compliance later in the letter, projecting both men into the extremities of personality. Cassius again is revealed as the source of fiery resistance (Att. 15.11.2):

\(^{91}\) The frustration with the indecision following the Ides is perfectly summed up later in this letter when Cicero writes nihil consilio, nihil ratione, nihil ordine (Att. 15.11.3).
CHAPTER TWO: COMPARATIVE PORTRAITURE

Thereafter they complained with much discussion, especially Cassius, about missed opportunities and they accused Decimus heavily. To this I kept denying that there was need to dredge up the past, however I agreed.

Despite the use of the third personal plural indicating a general criticism, Cicero makes the position of Cassius in this statement very strong, insinuating that he is the driving force behind the disapproval. Firstly, Cicero creates an emphatic phrase through the particular use of *atque*, in its capacity to add a more important part to its complement, followed by the emphatic adverb *quidem*, and the superlative *maxime*. In doing so, a near pleonastic structure is created which places Cassius as foremost in the criticism of missed opportunities. By

---

92 Gildersleeve & Lodge (1895: 301 § 477). *OLD* 216-7 §1-2 emphatic; §9 ‘slightly adversative’; *TLL* § II (2.0.1054.44-45) *vi propria imminuta atque conexiva tantum particula est. saepissime autem alteri membro gravius aliquid additur velut; § III B (2.0.1077.15-16) sensu fere adversativo.

93 How (1926: 494-5) made the observation, which was supported by Shackleton Bailey (1967: 258), that the two phrases concerning the complaints should be taken together, i.e. that they were assigning the lost opportunities to Decimus and his failure to use efficiently the legions at his disposal. He goes on to say that ‘it was probably left for Cicero to point out the opportunities M. Brutus and Cassius had missed’. T&P (1915: 333-4) add the insinuation of personal interests in Decimus pursuing a triumph amongst Alpine tribes instead of pursuing Antonius, and that a
conveying it in this particular way, Cicero not only indicates who is the main instigator, but also places the characters in a comparative light. Cassius rises above all in an atmosphere of heated debate and blame, and again is positioned as the aggressor. A deliberate choice of expression by Cicero in order to develop a particular depiction of Cassius should be considered.

Cicero’s insistence on leaving things in the past seems somewhat disingenuous given his statement that he agreed with the criticisms (adsentiebar tamen). He advances this duplicity through the tirade of missed opportunities following the Ides of March, directly and indirectly censuring Cassius and Brutus. His defence of his opinion is based on facts which are presented as the general consensus of all (nec vero quicquam novi sed ea quae cottidie omnes). His findings, however, are interrupted by Servilia (Att. 15.11.2):

....exclamat tua familiaris, ‘hoc vero neminem umquam audivì!’ ego <me> repressi. sed et Cassius mihi videbatur iturus (etenum Servilia pollicebatur se curaturam ut illa frumenti curatio de senatus consulto tolleretur) et noster Brutus cito deiectus est de illo inani sermone <quo se Romae> velle esse dixerat. constituit igitur ut ludi absente

94 The overwhelming evidence in the manuscript tradition is for the singular accusabat rather than accusabant (accusabant Z: -bat Ω). If correct, this would squarely place the lead role in the accusations on Cassius.
se fierent suo nomine. proficisci autem mihi in Asiam videbatur ab Antio velle.

...your female friend exclaimed, ‘Indeed I never heard anyone say this!’ I restrained myself. But both Cassius seemed to me to be about to leave (for Servilia was promising that she would take care of it so that the corn commission would be removed from the senatorial decree), and our Brutus was quickly dislodged from that empty talk by which he had said that he wanted to be in Rome. Therefore he decided that the games should happen under his name in his absence. He looked to me, however, to want to depart to Asia straight from Antium.

The *tua familiaris* is understood to be Brutus’ mother Servilia, and this phrase places her and Atticus in close association. This connection is explained through Cornelius Nepos’ elucidation that Atticus took care of her no less after Brutus’ death than in her prosperity (*Att. 11.4*).\(^{95}\) Whilst not contested here, this evidence does not explain why Cicero chose to refer to her in connection with Atticus and not with her son Brutus. There are several possibilities including a reference to Atticus’s assistance to Servilia, or a tongue-in-cheek comment which relates an acquaintance in closer familiarity than actuality. Another

\(^{95}\) *qui quidem Serviliam, Bruti matrem, non minus post mortem eius quam florentem coluerit* (cf. T&P (1915: 334); How (1926: 495); SB (1967: 258).
possibility is that it creates a contrast with an epithetic expression for Brutus (*noster Brutus*) in the correspondence. Some credence may be given to this explanation since *noster Brutus* appears in the next sentence. A contrast of *noster Brutus* with *tua familiaris* for Servilia would be congruent with the disdain which Cicero seems to have for the matriarch, and by this expression he can maintain his distance.

Servilia’s response would appear to be one of astonishment and outrage at Cicero’s liberality of opinion. There may, however, be a slight problem with this reporting of this direct speech. As Shackleton Bailey points out there is a comparison point in the *Philippics* where Cicero writes *hoc vero ne P. quidem Clodius dixit umquam* (*Phil.* 2.7.17). Even though the subject and object have changed, and the verb has moved from *dixit* to *audivi*, the construction seems comparable. Not only is the construction consistent, but the sentiment is also similar. The context of the phrase from the *Philippics* is following the accusation that Cicero had refused to release the body of Antonius’ stepfather for burial, to which the response is ‘*that (charge) not even P. Clodius ever said.*’ A search on the PHI reveals that only Cicero uses the combination of *hoc vero…umquam*, and only in these two passages. Both manuscript traditions seem sound. So how does such a similar fiery phrase end up in both the direct speech of Servilia in the letters of Cicero and in one of his written speeches within four months of each other? A few scenarios are possible. Firstly, this is idiomatic Latin, but
without a single extant use outside of Cicero this would be difficult to confirm. Secondly, Cicero was inspired by Servilia’s turn of phrase in June and decided to replicate a similar expression for his *Second Philippic* three to four months later. In this case, he would have adapted this phrase in what would be a more suitable or appropriate forum and medium. The final possibility is that this was not actually what Servilia said, but rather a rhetorical device to appropriate her general demeanour and opinion at the meeting. In this case, Cicero would have used his representation of Servilia’s words to accentuate an image of her as confrontational and adversarial. In other words, it sought to capture the spirit rather than the letter of her response.

This image of Servilia is continued into the next phrase, together with a small controversy. The MSS undisputedly read *ego repressi*, which would seem to render the meaning ‘I checked her’. Many have thought that this sudden interjection by Cicero is out of place. Shackleton Bailey rejected it on two grounds: i) the tone of the letter is ‘plaintive, not militant’; and ii) he thought that Cicero would not have challenged her ‘formidable personage on her own ground’. As a result, the addition of *me (ego <me> repressi)*, originating with the conjecture by the early commentator Malaespina, has been added by Shackleton Bailey97. By doing so, Cicero now appears to restrain himself at

96 SB (1967: 259).
97 SB (1967: 98)
Servilia’s interjection, which effectively swaps the antagonist of the interruption. How offers both suggestions and Tyrrell and Purser identify that both alternatives in meanings are possible, though they do not explicitly add the me. Shuckburgh, on the other hand, has Cicero checking Servilia.

Whilst it will be agreed that the tone of the letter is certainly not militant, it probably should not be considered completely conciliatory either. Cicero had just begun a summary of what should have been done following the assassination, and Servilia’s interjection may have been enough for him to remind her of the situation at hand. It is known that Cicero was less than happy with Servilia’s interference with Brutus, as the letter from June 5 indicates (Att. 15.10):

frustra vero quid ingrediar? matris consilio cum utatur vel etiam precibus, quid me interponam? sed tamen cogitabo quo genere utar litterarum; nam silere non possum.

Indeed why should I step in futilely? When he makes use of his mother’s advice, or even her entreaties, why should I interfere? Still,

---

98 Boot (1866: 319); T&P (1915: 334); How (1926: 495). Le Clerc (1827: 445) also states that this could go either way. These emendations are largely based on the evidence of Boeckel who conjectured quae dicturus eram, citing similar expressions in the pro Sest. 133 (Süpfe & Boeckel (1893: 419)).

99 Billerbeck (1836: 136); Shuckburgh (1900: 69).
however, I will consider what sort of letter I will use; for I am unable to remain silent.

If this response is taken into account, it is not unbelievable to think that Cicero would have silenced Servilia at this time. The question of her political influence will be dealt with presently when considering her solution to the corn acquisition decree. For now, however, it will be sufficient to state that her level of influence was not a certainty. The above letter also hints at some hostility between Cicero and Servilia. On certain issues, and in light of this detectable tension, it can be conjectured that Cicero silencing Servilia is not as implausible as commentators think. Whether me is included or not, whether Cicero held his own tongue or rebuked the matriarch for interjection, her strong personality was something which Cicero could use to his advantage. By accentuating this aspect of her character, Cicero could use her to help to heighten his portrayal of Brutus. If me was included, he could also show his own self-control in the face of Servilia’s offensive. Either way, Servilia seems inappropriate and unreasonable, Cicero seems prudent and under control, and Brutus appears passive in relation to his dominant mother.

100 Though it is impossible to prove with any certainty, there is the possibility that the advice to return to Rome had come from Servilia. It would explain not only Cicero’s aggressive stance in this letter toward Brutus taking his mother’s advice, but also explain the hostility underlining the meeting at Antium. It may also provide support for an antithetic position between tua familiaris and noster Brutus.
Cicero now reports on the different responses from his active participants: Cassius, Servilia and Brutus. There seems to have been some ambiguity or confusion about this for Atticus since Cicero explained himself again a few days later, around June 10 (Att. 15.12.1):

*de nostris autem Antiatibus satis videbar plane scripsisse, ut non dubitares quin essent otiosi futuri usurique beneficio Antoni contumelioso. Cassius frumentariam rem aspernabatur; eam Servilia sublaturam ex senatus consulto se esse dicebat. noster vero καὶ μάλα σεμνῶς in Asiam, postea quam mihi est adsensus tuto se Romae esse non posse...*

*However, about our friends at Antium, I thought I had written plainly enough, so that you would be in no doubt that they were intending to keep quiet and make use of the insulting favour of Antonius. Cassius was despising the corn commission job; Servilia was saying that she would remove it from the senate decree. Our friend truly ‘and exceedingly solemnly’ said he would go into Asia, after he had agreed with me that it was not possible for him to be safe at Rome*

Cicero tries to clarify the intention of Cassius and Brutus to make use of the corn commission. In this statement of intent, Cicero seems to align himself subtly with Cassius’ opinion. When Cicero had asked Cassius his opinion at the
meeting in Antium, his direct response had been *egone ut beneficium accepissem contumeliam?* ('Should I have taken an insult as a favour?'). Now, in describing the corn commission, Cicero paraphrases this in expressing his own opinion to Atticus: *usurique beneficio Antoni contumelioso* ('and be about to make use of the insulting favour of Antonius'). The similarity of expression is noticeable, but becomes more prominent when a third response is added. Coming from around June 5 Cicero had written *ut beneficio istorum utantur* ('that they should make use of this favour from them?') (*Att. 15.10.1*). These three statements, aligned in order, reveal a pattern which suggests that Cicero’s response was actually a combination of his earlier response and Cassius’ assertion.

Cicero (*Att. 15.10.1*)

\[ut beneficio istorum utantur\]

Cassius (*Att. 15.11.1*)

\[egone ut beneficium accepissem contumeliam?\]

Cicero (*Att. 15.12.1*)

\[usurique beneficio Antoni contumelioso.\]

Brutus may also have held this same internal revulsion, yet if he did, Cicero omitted any trace of it. This may again indicate an attempt at characterisation and rhetorical purpose.
In the second letter to Atticus, Cicero adds some details to his account in order to help Atticus understand. He also repeats the order of events from the previous letter. The similarities in structure and meaning would indicate a connection between the two letters, and therefore these new details should inform the actions contained in the original letter. In both accounts, Servilia takes it into her own authority to remove the corn commission from the senatorial decree, though her method for this removal remains unknown. Nevertheless, Cicero reports in both letters this comment as Servilia’s contribution to the discussion at Antium. A two-fold reason for this can be suggested. Firstly, it could express Cicero’s surprise at the boldness of this woman who thinks she can just undo a senatorial decree. Secondly, it continues the portrait of Brutus as being passive in comparison to his apparently politically active mother. Although Brutus will submit to Cicero’s advice, ostensibly contrary to his mother’s will, this does not diminish his passivity in politics here. This perceived reversal of gender roles would have revealed to Atticus an unflattering image for the apparent saviour of Rome.

This statement from Servilia has often led commentators and historians to assume Servilia’s great influence.\textsuperscript{101} Few have questioned her ability or available resources to realise this promise. Bauman’s comments will suffice to

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{101} e.g. Marborough (1909: 185); Wieand (1917: 428); Syme (1939: 116); SB (1967: 259); Clark (1981: 207); Skinner (1983: 285); Fantham (1994: 272); Staples (1998: 163); Ramsey (2001: 260); Brennan (2012: 361).
\end{footnotesize}
illustrate this: she was ‘the most accomplished female politician ever produced by the Roman Republic’ and ‘ought to be the greatest political strategist of the later Republic’. Notwithstanding that Servilia’s influence at various times over certain men is accepted, the extent of this power should be questioned. A short exploration of her influence may help put her personality, and Cicero’s attitude towards her, into some perspective.

Servilia was the daughter of Q. Servilius Caepio and Livia, and was the maternal half-sister of M. Porcius Cato. The gens Servilia traditionally claimed descent from the Regal Period with their migration to Rome from Alba Longa under Tullus Hostilius (Livy 1.30.2; D.H. 3.29.7). The Servilii Caepiones in particular drew lineage from the Servilii Ahalae side of the family, and in the third and second centuries could boast seven consulships. They had, however, begun to diminish in importance in the first century BC. The importance Servilia placed in her heritage can be established by the adoption of her son M.

---

103 Skinner’s theory that Servilia’s influence should be accepted due to Cicero failing to attack her statement on removing the corn acquisition is unfounded (1983: 285 n.31). The fact that both Cassius and Brutus decided to take up the position shows her words to be empty, as this would not be necessary if either of them thought that she could actually do this. Her statement is included in both letters to add to the character depictions and prove a point of comparison.
104 On Servilia see J. Fündling, Servilia, in NP.
105 On the Servilii see J. Bartels, Servilius and Servilii Caepiones, in NP.
Iunius Brutus into her direct *gens*.\textsuperscript{106} Servilia no doubt used such a prestigious family to influence matters, taking advantage of the fact that in powerful aristocratic families blood line could transcend gender.\textsuperscript{107}

Marcus was Servilia’s son to a father of the same name who died in 77. Her second husband was D. Iunius Silanus, with whom she had three daughters. These three girls allowed Servilia to exhibit another aspect of her influence: her use of beneficial political marriages.\textsuperscript{108} The marriages Servilia arranged for her daughters are indicative of the power and astute nature of this matriarch. Her sons-in-law were M. Aemilius Lepidus, P. Servilius Isauricus and C. Cassius Longinus, all, as Gruen writes, from ‘families of great esteem in the late Republic’.\textsuperscript{109}

Of all of Servilia’s associations, it was the relationship with C. Iulius Caesar which brought with it the most benefit, but also brought great infamy and shame

\textsuperscript{106} Münzer (1920 427) saw this as an attempt to revive the fortunes of the Servili Caepiones. Of course it is impossible to prove categorically Servilia’s direct influence in Brutus’ adoption. Bauman, on the above suggestion by Münzer, gives as an example for her family orientated ideology “her decision, after the death of her first husband, to have her son Iunius Brutus adopted by her full brother, Q. Servilius Caepio” (1992: 76). For the controversy on whether this is the correct uncle, see Hallet (1984: 50).

\textsuperscript{107} Hallett (1993: 62).

\textsuperscript{108} Servilia was also involved in Cicero’s search for a suitable marriage for his daughter Tullia in 51 BC, suggesting the younger Servius Sulpicius Rufus (*Att*. 5.4.1; 6.1.10).

\textsuperscript{109} Gruen (1974: 104).
Plutarch insists that Brutus was singled out to be spared after Pharsalus because of Servilia (Plu. Brut. 5; App. BC 2.112). Cicero also illustrates Servilia’s influence with Caesar in relating to Atticus the story of the plot to assassinate Pompey in 59. The informer L. Vettius had specifically named M. Brutus amongst the conspirators. The next day, however, when Caesar questioned Vettius on the rostra, his story had significantly changed. Cicero writes (Att. 2.24.3):

hic ille omnia quae voluit de re [publica] dixit, ut qui illuc factus institutusque venisset. primum Caepionem de oratione sua sustulit, quem in senatu acerrime nominarat, ut appareret noctem et nocturnam deprecationem intercessisse.

*Here that man said everything he wanted about the affair, as one who had come there primed and trained up. First he removed Caepio from his discourse, whom he had named so fiercely in the senate, so*

---

110 These are not light accusations but ones which could severely damage the reputation of an aristocratic woman, see Garlick & Dixon (1992: 53).


112 The others mentioned in the initial accusation include Bibulus, two Curiones, two Lentuli, and Aemilius Paullus.

113 I am following SB here (1965a: 268).
that it was apparent that night and nocturnal supplication had interceded.

Although Cicero is restrained here in not mentioning Servilia by name in the ‘nocturnal supplication’, it is very clear whom he is referring to. He signposts this firstly by referring to Brutus by his adoptive name, thus connecting him to his mother’s family. Similarly, later in the same letter he refers to an indirect accusation Vettius made against Cicero himself, in which he apparently had said that a Servilius Ahala or a Brutus was needed. By these references he reduces the ambiguity for Atticus over who this midnight visitor to Caesar might have been. Servilia may have had some influence with Caesar before his death, yet it should be pointed out that in 59 he married Calpurnia, despite Servilia possibly being available at this time for marriage.\textsuperscript{114}

The relationships she exhibited at the meeting at Antium are based on her \textit{materna auctoritas} which was essentially an extension of the traditional domestic roles,\textsuperscript{115} and which allowed her to have real influence over Brutus, and even Cato to an extent. The evidence for her influence over Cato is largely anecdotal and based on the supposition that she had been partially responsible for raising him after the death of his parents. One reference in Asconius’

\textsuperscript{114} One reason for this is that the nineteen year old Calpurnia had certain advantages over her forty year old counterpart in Servilia: see Bauman (1992: 237). Her second husband, D. Iunius Silanus was at least dead by 57 B.C., but could be around 60 B.C. (NP \textit{iunius} [I30]).

commentary on the *pro Scauro* indicates that Servilia had an almost maternal authority over Cato (*ea porro apud Catonem maternam obtinebat auctoritatem*) (Asc. Sc. 19C). Another indication of possible influence over her brother is Cato’s refusal to prosecute Silanus on electoral bribery (Plu. *Cat. Mi.* 21). These two accounts, however, do not mean that she had a constant influence on him, and the hostile sources, when they do mention her, seem to make mention of her more as an embarrassment to Cato rather than an influence (Plu. *Cat. Mi.* 24). Her absence from almost all ancient sources following the death of Caesar (and in many cases before it) has met with apologetic justifications and speculative conjectures in an attempt to save any notion of her influence.\(^{116}\)

Bauman defends this absence in Plutarch on the grounds of Plutarch’s reliance on the memoirs of Bibulus (*Brut.* 13),\(^{117}\) despite having access to the letters of Brutus (*Brut.* 21.3; 23.1; 53.5). Yet the simplest reason for the absence of Servilia from most accounts after the death of Caesar is a lack of any real influence in politics at this time.

However, her influence over Brutus is not disputed, with this seemingly being one of the reasons that Cicero has conflicts with her and why she is such a

---

\(^{116}\) Means & Dickison (1974: 212) find her absence from Plutarch’s *Life of Cato* surprising given that ‘she was such a powerful force in the last years of the Republic’.

\(^{117}\) The assumption is that since Bibulus was Porcia’s son from her previous marriage, and given the disagreements between Porcia and Servilia, Bibulus’ memoirs would have reduced the importance of Servilia’s influence; see Bauman (1992: 238).
powerful comparison figure in his portraiture of Brutus\textsuperscript{118}. Influence over her own son, however, does not equate to extensive political influence. After the assassination, the conspirators held very little power in Rome, which is evident from the contemplation of the acceptance of such a disgraceful commission as grain acquisition. As such there is a tendency to over-estimate her influence. For instance, her use as an intermediary for Brutus can be accepted (\textit{Att. 15.17.2}),\textsuperscript{119} though this should not be extended to Cassius, and she should definitely not be seen as their official representative in Rome.\textsuperscript{120}

Another example where Servilia’s influence is extended well beyond the evidence is based on the description of her running family meetings like a consul presiding over the senate (\textit{ad Brut. 1.18.1}).\textsuperscript{121} The importance of women in family conclaves is not in doubt, nor is the fact that they would have been well informed on a range of important issues. As has also been stated, they may have exerted some influence over the men in these councils, but this does not necessarily make women like Servilia, no matter how they behaved, ‘one of the

\textsuperscript{118} Cicero’s criticism of Brutus making use of his mother’s advice and entreaties over sound reason has already been mentioned (\textit{Att. 15.10}).

\textsuperscript{119} There are also two letters which could extend this intermediary power to Caesar, though in both cases it is difficult to identify an exact influence, due to the generic nature of the comments and the fact that both Caesar and Brutus are mentioned in both accounts in close proximity to Servilia (\textit{Att. 13.11, 13.16}).

\textsuperscript{120} Brennan (2012: 361).

\textsuperscript{121} Münzer (1920: 333); (1923: 1820).
leaders of the senatorial party’. An example of this from Cicero’s letter to Brutus will suffice to demonstrate her approach to meetings (ad Brut. 1.18.1):

….rogatus sum a prudentissima et diligentissima femina, matre tua, cuius omnes curae ad te referuntur et in te consumuntur, ut venirem ad se a.d. viii. Kal. Sext. …

_I was asked by that most prudent and industrious woman, your mother, whose every care centres on and concerns you, that I meet with her on July 25._

Cicero clearly notes her mollycoddling intentions. His use of complimentary superlatives falls under the category of polite speech, especially in regard to addressing another’s wife, daughter or mother. As such, this should not be inflated to be indicative of Cicero’s absolute deference to her authority, but rather is polite convention.

When Cicero reports the meeting he creates a mock senate or law court for Servilia to preside over. Despite reporting that there were three Roman men

---

122 Abbott (1909: 69).

123 Other examples in Cicero include Fam. 5.8.2; 5.11.2; 6.22.3; 15.7.8; Att. 10.8a.1.

124 This is what Hall might call a ‘polite fiction’ useful in strategies to manufacture harmony and cooperation, ‘at least on a temporary basis’ (2009: 78), and is an example of affiliative politeness (Hall (2009)).
present,¹²⁵ it is Servilia who takes the lead and asks all the questions. Immediately after pointing out the presence of Casca, Labeo and Scaptius, Cicero emphatically sets up the oppositional phrase *at illa rettulit quaesivitque* ('yet that woman took up the conversation and asked the questions'). There is no doubt, as Münzer stated, that Cicero has chosen his verbs carefully: *refero* has obvious connections with the making of a motion or proposition in the senate, whilst *quaero* has links to judicial inquiry and investigation. Servilia is characterised as a participant in Republican political processes.¹²⁶ However, Cicero appears to see her as interfering, often without thought or discretion.¹²⁷ This does not indicate influence. Instead, it demonstrates a domineering approach when addressing people. This would seem to be how Cicero wanted her to be seen.¹²⁸ It could in fact be suggested that Cicero was setting up this situation as an example of derision rather than a statement of her influence.

¹²⁵ These men included the tribune P. Servilius Casca Longus, the conspirator Pacuvius Antistius Labeo and one of Brutus’ Asian agents M. Scaptius.


¹²⁷ There are two letters in the correspondence with Brutus which show Servilia interfering even after Brutus asks her not to. Brutus writes to Cicero saying that he has asked his family to stay quiet about Cassius’ achievements until Cicero sees fit to announce them (*ad Brut. 2.3.3*). Yet, by the time Cicero writes back, the news is already ‘common knowledge’ (*ad Brut. 2.4.5*). In her defence, however, Cicero notes it was not just Servilia, but many of Brutus’ acquaintances who leaked the material.

¹²⁸ Garlick & Dixon (1992: 54) identified that she was often ‘cast as the domineering dowager’.
If Servilia did have influence over anyone apart from her direct family, this had largely dissipated with the death of Caesar.\textsuperscript{129} One fairly clear indication of her loss of influence is the insinuation that Atticus looked after her following the triumviral proscriptions, despite Lepidus being her son-in-law and Antonius showing her the respect of returning Brutus’ ashes to her (Nep. \textit{Att.} 11; Plu. \textit{Brut.} 53.3). Any influence she once had was the type which was situational and fleeting:\textsuperscript{130} ad hoc solutions, the approach of the politician rather than of the statesman, were her forte. She was a master craftsman, but not an architect.

Now that we have looked at Servilia’s comment and the questionability of the resources at her disposal to bring this into fruition, Cicero’s reporting of the responses from these three characters can be reviewed. What is immediately apparent is that his arrangement of the series of reactions is identical in both letters: Cassius, Servilia, and then Brutus. One possible establishment of this link between Cassius and Brutus is evident by the connective \textit{et…et…} (\textit{sed et Cassius…et noster Brutus…}),\textsuperscript{131} placing Servilia’s response as an interjected

\textsuperscript{129} Wieand (1917: 427-8) even surmises that her influence over Brutus had dropped since the death of Cato.

\textsuperscript{130} Bauman (1992: 77).

\textsuperscript{131} It is possible that this first \textit{et} is connected to \textit{sed}, to mean ‘and further more’ (\textit{OLD} 1901 §9b).
sharp contrast within their responses, much like the general impression gained from Cicero’s earlier response to Servilia of *ego <me> repressi*. The difference in the second letter is the more clearly separated clauses, explained by Cicero’s intention to clarify.

Cassius’ defiance on the matter, despising the corn commission, is further complicated by indications of his unwillingness to accept it. While Servilia’s and Brutus’ responses seem quite similar, the response of Cassius is less easy to decipher from the Latin. There is little surprise that Atticus needed further clarification on these issues. Cassius’ reaction in the first letter is difficult to assess, as Cicero simply states *sed et Cassius mihi videbatur iturus* (‘and further more Cassius looked to me to be about to leave’), though he leaves out any indication of destination. The impression is one of a sudden departure, just like his interjection when he arrived. What then follows is the parenthetical statement introduced by *etenim* and featuring Servilia’s promise to remove the corn commission from the senatorial decree. What exactly Cicero meant by this usage of a parenthetical phrase is unknown. Was it meant to explain Cassius’ actions or was it merely an aside or a digression in rhetorical language?

132 OLD *sed* §1 contains the idea of ‘breaking in on a conversation’ and this would certainly have matched up well with Cicero’s depiction of Cassius in this letter.

133 For the use of *etenim* in parenthetical statements see OLD 683 §c; TLL 5.2.918.41. TLL also indicates that *etenim* can have an adversative feel, equating to *sed or autem* (5.2.921.18).
As stated previously, what this meant may have even confused Atticus. The only thing which is certain is that the conversation was drawing to an end, possibly indicated by the *sed et* introduction to this clause, and Cassius was looking like he wanted to go. In relation to where, the immediate assumption would be that Cassius was not off into Sicily, since if the corn commission was removed by Servilia, then there would be no need.\(^\text{134}\) Was he then off to Greece, his originally declared destination?\(^\text{135}\) A problem clearly existed here in the interpretation. Many modern commentators have tried to reconcile this through the creation of a grain acquisition legateship, with the grain acquisition part removed by Servilia. This would create something akin to the *legatio libera.*\(^\text{136}\) However, this stance becomes less tenable when the second letter, written some three days later, is taken into account. Cicero is unambiguous, he even uses *non dubitares*, when he states *(Att. 15.12.1)*:

\(^{134}\) SB (1967: 259). How (1926: 495) states that Cassius must have believed in her ability to remove the commission as he ‘lets himself be pacified by her promise’.

\(^{135}\) Shuckburgh (1900: 69) interprets this as Cassius going to Achaia on the way to take up the province of Syria; Bentivoglio (1830: 529).

\(^{136}\) Billerbeck (1836: 136); Cobet (1879: 21); Shackleton Bailey (1967: 259, 260). Lintott (2008: 340-341) mentions a letter from Decimus Brutus to Marcus and Cassius where he states that he had asked Hirtius to arrange for a *legatio libera* to allow the conspirator to leave the city *(Fam. 11.1)*. Decimus feared it would not be granted, and even if it was, whether it was just the first step to exile and declaration as public enemy *(Fam. 11.1.2)*. Whilst there are obvious comparisons with the grain commissions offered in June, the letter from Decimus dates from March 44, and despite the intended results being identical, there is no definitive proof here that the *legatio* given to Cassius and Brutus by the senate was necessarily the same as the *legatio libera* that Decimus had requested from Hirtius.
ut non dubitares quin essent otiosi futuri usurique beneficio Antoni contumelioso.

so that you would be in no doubt that they were intending to keep quiet and make use of the insulting favour of Antonius.

It was the commission itself which was the insult, with such a subordinate task being proposed for senior praetors during their office. Add the removal from Rome, and with it their political influence, there is no surprise at the original contempt for this position. The question remains though whether this legateship could even have existed without the commission.\footnote{I would like to thank personally Professors Boris Rankov and John Jory for their time and insights on this issue.} Essentially this would mean the retention of the \emph{legatio} with the removal of the \emph{curatio}. It will be conceded that the terms of a position could be changed, and there is ample evidence of political positioning throughout this period, but it is difficult to envisage what this legateship would then become. A \emph{legatio libera} was a different commission than a defined \emph{legatio}, such as the \emph{legatio provinciae}. Without further knowledge of what this commission actually contained, it is difficult to speculate further as to whether the removal of the primary function would render the legateship void.
Cicero does originally refer to the commission as a *legataria provincia* (Att. 15.9.1), indicating a provincial position consisting of a special *legatio*. Those provinces were Asia for Brutus and Sicily for Cassius. Whereas the strict adherence to a *curatio* should not have created problems, the commission of Cassius and Brutus to areas which already had governors would have the potential to destabilise the power structure within those provinces. It is, therefore, difficult to see a situation where retaining the legateship without a careful and specifically designated authority or duty would seem as a good idea to either Antonius, the senate or the conspirators.

One speculative scenario is that Servilia’s attempts to remove the commission may have been a clever strategy. Any such change would probably be met with resistance from Antonius, especially the providing of a ‘free’ provincial legateship to the conspirators. If this objection occurred, an opportunity would arise by which Cicero and the supporters of Cassius and Brutus could allege that Antonius was restricting the authority of the senate. However, the position of Servilia was such that her ability to remove this must at least be questioned. The need to persuade the senate to pass what would effectively be an anti-Antonian decree would create another level of difficulty for Servilia. Therefore, it

---

138 For the uniqueness of *legatarius* or *legatorius* and the subsequent MSS tradition problems, see T&P (1915: 329-30); SB (1967: 94, 256).
139 C. Trebonius was proconsul of Asia, and A. Pompeius Bithynicus was *propraetor* of Sicily in 44 (*MRR* 2 329-30).
is difficult to imagine that Servilia’s power extended to such extent that she could wield decrees counter to the wishes of a consul. Further still, if Appian is correct in assigning this action not to the scurrilous machinations of Antonius but to the concerns of a caring senate, then the possibility of Servilia being able to effect a change becomes remote. Presumably her family and certainly Cicero would have recognised this.

As indicated in the statement quoted above, even with Servilia’s promises, the decision of Cassius and Brutus was to stay quiet and make use of the insulting favour of Antonius (\textit{usurique beneficio Antoni contumelioso}). The question here is whether the legateship itself was the insult, or the grain commission? The overwhelming evidence seems to point to the degrading nature of the commission itself. In fact, Cicero had himself been looking for a legateship (\textit{Att.} 14.22.2; 15.8.1), and it was in this same letter that he told Atticus that he had received confirmation from Dolabella on June 3 that he had been appointed to his staff (\textit{Att.} 15.11.4). It is difficult to see that Cicero was willing to seek the benefits of a legateship for himself, while regarding these same benefits as insulting for Cassius and Brutus. This is especially true given the appearance of both sentiments in the same letter.

So, if the probability remains for the grain commission to stand, this would seem to mean that Cassius and Brutus had decided to take up the commission, i.e.
Cassius was about to leave to go to Sicily. This assumption is strengthened by the fact that, despite the confusion with Cassius, there is no such ambiguity with Brutus, who in both letters had decided to go into Asia, which is exactly where his corn commission was to be held. Cicero qualifies Cassius’ response with that statement that he despises the commission (frumentariam rem aspernabatur), but this was not new information for Atticus. It does, however, continue the image of Cassius which Cicero has developed throughout this whole letter. Just as Cassius seemingly stormed into the meeting breathing war, so here Cicero sets him as the most aggressive character, who despises the corn commission. The situation, therefore, seems to be that even though Cassius thought the commission an insult and detestable, he was still going to accept it for the moment. In presenting it thus, Cicero aligns Cassius’ opinion with his own attitude towards the commission: he also hated it, but could still see its current usefulness.

So, if Cassius had accepted the corn commission, the causal particle etenim of the first letter needs to be somehow reconciled with this. In the second letter, in which Cicero explained the outcomes more explicitly to Atticus, any causal connection between Cassius’ and Servilia’s responses is absent. Was this then the source of the confusion? If so, it can be conjectured that this

---

140 Süpfle (1866: 339).
141 Cassius frumentariam rem aspernabatur; eam Servilia sublaturam ex senatus consulto esse dicebat (Att. 15.12.1).
parenthetical phrase introduced by *et enim* was in fact an interjection into the responses of the conspirators, rather than a causal link between Cassius’ departure and Servilia’s promise.

Servilia’s claim to remove the corn acquisition has already been discussed in some detail, but, as mentioned above, its placement within the passage may be crucial in understanding Cicero’s intentions. Placed between Cassius’ and Brutus’ responses, it would appear to be interjected between a grammatical sense link between these two men possibly created through the *et…et…* connective structure.\(^{142}\) It would seem, then, that this position between the two men was meant to interrupt the sequence, just as she had interrupted Cicero’s earlier diatribe.\(^{143}\) The fact that Cicero keeps the sequence in the second letter, despite breaking the components up, demonstrates that Cicero did not want this interruption to go unnoticed. In doing so he continues the depiction of Servilia as overbearing and interfering. However, he also uses her to aid in his depiction of her son Brutus.

At the end of this sequence of responses comes Brutus. Interestingly, and perhaps significantly, he remains unnamed in the second letter, though easily recognisable by being cloaked in his usual possessive adjective (*noster*). The

\(^{142}\) This in itself may strengthen the conjecture that *et enim* was a parenthesis to indicate interjection in the first letter. It could also be adversative (p. 228, n. 133).

\(^{143}\) This interruption existed no matter whether Cicero checked himself or Servilia.
general tone is one of passivity, dislodged from his ‘empty talk’ to go to Rome, he now assents to take up the commission. The responses in both letters are very similar. In both he is described with the possessive noster, and in both he is shown to assent to Cicero’s proposal to take up the commission, agreeing that he would not be safe in Rome (adsensus tuto se Romae esse non posse). Cicero also makes it explicit that Brutus’ plan was now to go into Asia, the province of his proposed grain acquisition commission. In the first letter he writes that Brutus seemed to want to go straight from Antium to Asia (proficisci autem mihi in Asiam videbatur ab Antio velle), whilst in the second he seems to go off to Asia very solemnly (noster vero καὶ μάλα σεμνῶς in Asiam). Cicero, through these statements, removes any ambiguity that Brutus was intending to take up the commission. Cicero may be indicating that he himself was successful in his persuasion, that no longer would he go to Rome, instead they would take advantage of the commission. In doing so, Cicero constructs a depiction which consists of his advice being followed, while illustrating the rejection of Servilia’s promise to remove the commission.

The reactions of the major antagonists at the meeting can be summarised: Cassius despises, Servilia promises, and Brutus is accepting and compliant. He is then described as heading off into Asia very solemnly (vero καὶ μάλα σεμνῶς in Asiam). Unfortunately the Greek written by Cicero is too generic to assign to
CHAPTER TWO: COMPARATIVE PORTRAITURE

a definite author, if in fact it is even a quote. It may have been a classical tag which Cicero and Atticus used. If the καί is removed, however, four possible quotations appear. Of these, it is tempting to think of Cicero contemplating Demosthenes’ παραπτρεσβείας γραφή, in Latin de Falsa Legatione, whilst writing this phrase, though the general context of the speech, as well as the phrase within the text, are not strikingly similar, which makes this an unprovable connection. Whatever the precise reference, the meaning is clear. Brutus plans to go off into Asia in a most compliant manner. It should be noted that LSJ indicates that σεμνός can be used in a contemptible or ironic sense. This would certainly match the general feeling of docility in Cicero’s

144 According to the TLG, there are four known places this phrase appears: Sozomen’s Historia ecclesiastica, Joseph’s sermo prosphonematicus in despotem et fratem nostri imperatoris Demetrium Palaeologum, and two from Cyrillus’ Epistulae paschales sive homiliae paschales. Given that all of these writers are significantly later, they are of no consequence to Cicero’s writing. Cicero himself uses the word σεμνός two other times in the letters to Atticus, firstly in reference to Demosthenes (Att. 2.1.3), and secondly in a quote from Pindar (Att. 12.5.1). It is tempting to see a connection to Demosthenes’ de Falsa Legatione in the first example, though the connection is tentative. The MSS tradition is also a little sketchy on this phrase (Shackleton Bailey 1967 100 - καὶ μάλα σεμνῶς C: ΚΑΙΜΑΜCMΝΟC RMm: μεμνός pro σεμνῶς Zt), though little is written on it in the commentaries, thus indicating the acceptance of the current incarnation of the text. I see no reason why I should not continue with this.

145 A possible comparison may be found in Att. 13.42.1 where Cicero used καὶ μάλα κατηφής. From this SB deduced that, on the advice of Professor Hugh Lloyd-Jones, it was probably comedic, and likely to be from Menander (1966: 397).

146 LSJ (1076 s.v. μάλα §1.b) notes that the use of μάλα with an adverb is frequently found after καί, so this may actually be a classical tag where the adverb was changed to suit the meaning.

147 Two from Demosthenes (de Corona 18 35.8; de Falsa Legatione 19 23.2), and one each from Plato (Phdr. 258a) and from Xenophon (Smp. 3.10.2).

148 LSJ 1591 s.v. σεμνός III.2.
portrayal of Brutus. Unlike Cassius’ visibly defiant acquiescence, Brutus’ dissatisfaction is more internal and suppressed, almost brooding and sulking. Brutus seems completely resigned to his fate.

Cicero has again placed Cassius and Brutus diametrically opposed; one furious and defiant, the other demoralised and defeated, without even a name in the second letter. Cicero’s intention in splitting the two radically different depictions of Cassius and Brutus by a comment from Brutus’ mother has already been discussed. Yet there is one more consideration in this. Brutus is effectively going against his mother’s advice, however, she had already interfered on his behalf, and although her promises may be unrealistic or unachievable, she is still shown as an active participant, during which time Brutus is shown to be compliant and submissive. It was his connection to and the influence of his family, particularly Servilia, which Cicero seems to indicate was detrimental to Brutus’ achievements following the assassination. On this occasion, as well as the previous examples, Servilia almost acts as a surrogate for Brutus, exhibiting the traits that Brutus should, such as political boldness or decisive action, leaving Brutus relegated into passivity.

Cicero finishes his account with a general comment on what he saw was the state of affairs in Rome as they now stood after the meeting. All in all, Cicero walked away from this meeting without much hope for the future (Att. 15.11.3):
ne multa, nihil me in illo itinere praeter conscientiam meam delectavit. non enim fuit committendum ut ille ex Italia prius quam a me conventus esset discederet. hoc dempto munere amoris atque offici sequebatur ut mecum ipse 'ἡ δεῦρ' ὁδός σοι τι δύναται νῦν, θεοπρότες;' prorsus dissolutum offendi navigium vel potius dissipatum. nihil consilio, nihil ratione, nihil ordine. itaque etsi ne antea quidem dubitavi, tamen nunc eo minus, evolare hinc idque quam primum, ‘ubi nec Pelopidarum facta neque famam audiam’.

In short, nothing pleased me in that journey except my conscience, for I could not let him depart from Italy before he had met with me. After the discharging of this claim of affection and duty, it follows for me to say this to myself ‘O prophet, what does your journey mean now?’ I stumbled upon a ship utterly destroyed or rather scattered. With no plan, no reason, no order. Thus, although I indeed did not have doubts even before, however, now so much less, to fly away from here and at the first chance, ‘where I will hear neither the deeds nor the fame of the Pelopides.’

A few elements are immediately apparent in this summary of events. Firstly it becomes clear that this letter was written to Atticus primarily to inform him of Brutus’ position. Cassius is absent from the final description and the singular ille
makes it clear that he is not talking about both of them. Therefore, it can be suggested that the meeting at Antium was arranged to discuss Brutus’ future. Therefore, if Brutus is central to this letter, whilst the reporting of events accurately plays a role in the structuring of the account, the characterisation of Cassius and Servilia could also serve a role as a point of comparison for Brutus.

Secondly, and quite crucially to Cicero’s assessment of the situation, is the mentioning of a duty which needed to be discharged. Cicero, throughout the meeting, seems to have taken it as his duty to convince Brutus to take up the commission and to reject the idea of going to Rome. There is also the impression that he needed to negate some of Servilia’s influence on Brutus. Yet in countering Servilia, he could achieve more than persuasion. It appears that he places the matriarch in sharp contrast to her son, and in doing so, Brutus comes across as passive and compliant to others. He follows, he seeks advice and opinion, but he does not lead. Servilia, despite her domineering nature, is at least active, even if it is ineffectual and inappropriate under the circumstances. Similarly, the depiction of Cassius, as an impulsive and aggressive militant,

---

149 Cicero’s willingness to alter slightly historical facts, especially in matters of chronology is famously characterised in his letter to L. Luceius (Fam. 5.12); cf. Rudd (1992). He was not of course writing history here and so would not fall under any obligation towards unbiased retelling. For Cicero as a historian/antiquarian, with a summary of previous viewpoints, see Rawson (1972).

150 The idea of being ‘duty bound’ will be discussed in the next chapter.
challenging Antonius, yet finally seeming to bend to the utilitarian nature of the commission is also divergent from Brutus. This is not to say that Cassius’ response is appropriate. His hot-headedness, an appearance as if in battle, seems wildly inappropriate in a meeting to discuss political strategy from a position of vulnerability. Yet it has been shown that Cicero amplifies Cassius’ antagonistic nature. In contrasting Cassius and Brutus, Cicero draws out elements of their character, and aspect of his own political power, which he wants to emphasise.

One clear motivation for these characterisations is the connection Atticus had with Servilia and Brutus. The contemporary Cornelius Nepos was very clear to establish this connection in his Life of Atticus. The connection to Servilia has already been established, but for Brutus, Nepos is more forceful (Att. 8.1-2):

\[
\text{sic M. Bruto usus est, ut nullo ille adulescens aequali familiarius quam hoc sene neque solum eum principem consilii haberet, sed etiam in convictu.}
\]

*He (Atticus) enjoyed a friendship with M. Brutus in such a way, that that young man, who was friendlier with no one his own age than this old man, considered him not only foremost in council, but also in association.*
Nepos is not cryptic here. Throughout this time, Atticus actively sought associations with Brutus,\textsuperscript{151} which Brutus had reciprocated completely.

In regard to Servilia and Brutus, Cicero accentuates the domineering and contradictory nature of Servilia in order to persuade Atticus that Servilia’s current course of action was not congruent with societal benefits. She was interfering with and emasculating the one who was meant to be the saviour of Rome. Cassius’ depiction, on the other hand, produces a clear contrast to Brutus’ approach. Of course, Cicero did not want another Cassius, and it has been stated that Cassius’ actions were not exactly beneficial. However, he did want to demonstrate that Brutus needed to be more assertive: a middle road may have been more serviceable. If this interpretation is correct, Cicero’s motive would probably have related to Atticus bringing some of his influence to bear on Brutus to produce a more advantageous result. Maybe Brutus was unaware of his subservience to his mother and those around him. Alternatively, Atticus could use his associations with Servilia to influence her into diminishing her interference. Unfortunately for Cicero nothing changed; Brutus and Servilia were either unwilling or unable to change. Either way, Brutus’ compliance did not bode well for the salvation of the Republic.

\textsuperscript{151} It was also demonstrated at the start of this chapter how Cicero had tried to look after Brutus’ interests in Cilicia largely on the insistence of Atticus.
This fits well with Cicero’s final assessment of the situation, beginning with a quotation from an unknown Greek play (ἡ δεύρ’ ὁδός σοι τί δύναται νῦν, θεοπρόπτε;)\textsuperscript{152} which is repeated in a later letter (\textit{Att. 16.6.2}). In both these letters this quotation establishes an inquiry into the grand scheme, i.e. the purpose Cicero has for his actions. Here, the outlook is bleak, and causes Cicero to question everything. The shipwreck analogy is crucial to Cicero’s image of the republic. It was mentioned in the first chapter that \textit{gubernator civitatis} was one of the terms which Cicero used for an ideal statesman in \textit{de Re Publica} (2.51.1). It was also mentioned that this is one of the only times in which Cicero uses any word directly used to describe a Roman statesman in connection with the conspirators. Unfortunately it is not used positively, as the ship lies not only destroyed (\textit{dissolutum}) but scattered (\textit{dissipatum})\textsuperscript{153} The link to the ship of the State and the statesman’s role in guiding correct governmental policies has already been established.\textsuperscript{154} However, what follows is a criticism not of the governmental system itself, but of the duty that the conspirators had as statesmen. This tripartite negative expression (\textit{nihil consilio, nihil ratione},

\textsuperscript{152} Interestingly it appears in both comedic and tragic fragments collections, e.g. Nauck (1889: 860 §106); Kock (1888: 612 §1232); Meineke (1841: 610); Nauck & Snell (1964: 860); K-A adespota fr. 130. In general it is thought to be a line of comic iambic, though the inclusion of the νῦν is contested, see T&P (1915: 335); How (1926: 495).

\textsuperscript{153} T&P (1915: 335) and How (1926: 495-6) identify \textit{dissipatum} as a stronger word than \textit{dissolutum}. T&P identified this connection with Boeckel’s commentary on the meaning of the participles by \textit{Or. 235: facilius est apta dissolvere quam dissipata connectere}.

\textsuperscript{154} Schneider (2004: 167-8); see p. 163 fn. 325.
nihil ordine) stands in stark contrast to Cicero's own obligation to carry out his duty to see Brutus before he left. It is also reminiscent of his previous complaint to Atticus about the conspirators (Att. 14.21.3):

acta enim illa res est animo virili, consilio puerili.

For those affairs were done with the spirit of men, and the plan of children.

The hopelessness of the situation is aptly described. The disorganisation of Brutus and the conspirators was evident to Cicero at the meeting at Antium. They had no way forward or back, and had guided their ship to destruction. On these grounds Cicero decides to leave, and he turns to a favoured quote. Despite being from an unknown source,\textsuperscript{155} presumed to be either Accius' \textit{Atreus} or \textit{Pelopidae},\textsuperscript{156} it becomes a proverbial motif for his departure from the woes of politics and Rome.\textsuperscript{157} The quote appears once in the \textit{Philippics} but in a final twist, and one which removes any ambiguity over the source of the evil, Cicero replaces \textit{Pelopidarum} with \textit{Antoniorum} (\textit{Phil.} 13.21.49).\textsuperscript{158}

\textsuperscript{155} Novielli (2001 223) attributes the connection to ancient tragedy back to Muerto’s \textit{Ciceronis Philippicae Orationes} in 1562.

\textsuperscript{156} Ribbeck (1852: 215); \textit{TrRF} (2012: 252).

\textsuperscript{157} This same quote, though abridged, also appear at \textit{Att.} 14.12.2 and \textit{Fam.} 7.28.2, and elsewhere in full – \textit{ubi nec Pelopidarum nomen nec facta audiam} (Fam. 7.30.1).

2.3: ESTABLISHING A RIVALRY

Another way in which Cicero employs a form of comparative portraiture in the direct correspondence to Cassius and Brutus can be seen in his depictions of the other’s successes. Although a reporting of events could be considered, there are problems with this interpretation. Not only were Cassius and Brutus spatially closer to each other than to Cicero in Rome, but they also seem to have been aware of each other’s movements. Consider this letter to Cassius from February 43 (Fam. 12.5.1):\textsuperscript{159}

\begin{quote}
loquebantur omnes tamen (credo, quod volebant) in Syria te esse, habere copias. id autem eo faciliti credebatur quia simile veri videbatur. Brutus quidem noster egregiam laudem est consecutus. res enim tantas gessit tamque inopinatas ut eae cum per se gratae essent tum ornatiores propter celeritatem. quod si tu ea tenes quae putamus, magnis subsidiis fulta res publica est. a prima enim ora Graeciae usque ad Aegyptum optimorum civium imperiis muniti erimus et copiis.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{159} The dating of this letter is either immediately prior to or after the Tenth Philippic, the date of which itself is uncertain. A safe approximation for both the letter and speech is probably mid to late February: see T&P (1899: 64). How’s date of February 5 seems the earliest possible, though this may be too early for the correct timing of the Tenth Philippic (1926: 522-3). SB (1977: 504) is vague, assigning it to after February 3, and citing Nardo (1966) that the speech was not necessarily first. Willcock (1995: 95) assigns it to about February 14; cf. Schmidt (1877: 26-8, 54); Beaujeu (1991: 155-7).
Everyone, however, says (I believe, because they want it) that you are in Syria, and that you have troops. This is far more easily believed, however, because it seems likely to be true. Indeed our Brutus has acquired extraordinary praise. For his achievements are so great and so unexpected that they are not only welcome but more illustrious due to their rapidity. If you possess the things which we think you do, the State is propped up by great reinforcements. For from the closet coast of Greece right up to Egypt we will be protected by the authorities of the best citizens and by their armies.

Cicero’s vagueness regarding what this achievement of Brutus actually was presumably is indicative of Cassius' familiarity with the accomplishment. The reticence could also be due to the nature of the accomplishment. A dispatch from Brutus at this time on the state of affairs in Macedonia had caused mixed reactions. Q. Fufius Calenus, the father-in-law of the consul Pansa, had been

160 The continued confusion over the legal holdings of the provinces was nowhere more prevalent than with the province of Macedonia. Caesar had left the province to M. Iunius Brutus, which was necessarily ratified with the rest of Caesar’s acta on March 18. This appointment, however, had been overruled when in early April 44, the province had been given to M. Antonius as his proconsular province. This again changed in June when the law on the exchange of provinces effectively swapped Macedonia with the two Gauls. Therefore Macedonia was arguably free, so it was allocated to C. Antonius on 28 November 44 (D.C. 45.9.3; Cic. Phil. 3.10.24-26). All of these manoeuvres were undone on 20 December, when the senate annulled this appointment by confirming all existing governors (Phil. 3.15.37-39), yet by all accounts C. Antonius had already set out for Macedonia (cf. Phil. 10.5.10-11; 13.15.30); see Sternkopf (1913: 22). The existing governor, Q. Hortensius, had duly acknowledged Brutus as
notably negative (Cic. Phil. 10.1.1-3.7). In response Cicero proposed in the Tenth Philippic that Brutus should be commended; that he be permitted to retain his command and be protector of Macedonia, Illyricum and Greece; that he have the authority to levy funds and make requisitions; and that Hortensius should remain as governor until a successor was named by the senate (Phil. 10.11.25-26).

Nevertheless, despite the lack of explicit references, Cicero’s acclamation in the above letter is full of hyperboles. Brutus has acquired not just praise but an eminent form of it ( egregious laudem ). Cicero begins his description of his achievements with the standard tantas but moves quickly onto the adjective inopinatas.161 Cicero’s surprise at the possibility of a sudden resolution of a legal obscurity, and his joy at the hope of a united East in the hands of the State, or at least in the hands of those who supported the republican cause, are the obvious origins of this somewhat unusual adjective of praise.162 Cicero then rounds off his approval by referring to Brutus’ achievements as pleasing and illustrious. The use of the comparative form ornatiores pushes the praise past his successor (Phil. 10.5.11). Meanwhile C. Antonius was holding on to Apollonia with seven legions (Phil. 10.6.13).

161 The unexpected nature of this action is repeated in the Philippics when it is called ‘an unexpected and hasty protection for the State’ – insperatum et repentinum rei publicae praeidium (Phil. 10.11.24).

162 The word inopinatus carries the idea of ‘unexpected’ or ‘unforeseen’, but can also have the slightly more sardonic sense of ‘contrary to expectation’ (OLD 1008-9 s.v. inopinatus; TLL 7.1.1749.2, 1750.51).
the hedonistic and instantaneous gratification of *gratae essent* to the ornate and grand; it is something to be admired. This recalls the *egregiam laudem* which began the exaltation. Overstatements are dense and demonstrative of the rhetorical devices expected in laudatory speeches, such as can be seen in Cicero’s version of this same deed in the *Philippics* (*Phil. 10.5.11*):

> quae tempestas, di immortales, quae flamma, quae vastitas, quae pestis Graeciae fuisset, nisi incredibilis ac divina virtus furentis hominis conatum atque audaciam compressisset! quae celeritas illa Bruti, quae cura, quae virtus!

What a storm, immortal gods, what a blaze, what devastation, what a plague would have come to Greece, if an incredible and divine courage had not crushed the endeavour and audacity of a madman!

How swift was Brutus in this, how concerned, how courageous!

The hyperbole is again obvious. Both the letter and *Philippic* refer to how great the accomplishment was and the speed of its completion. The *Philippic* comments on the swiftness (*quae celeritas illa Bruti*), yet the letter notes the rapidity as the reason for its distinction (*tum ornatores propter celeritatem*). The prefacing of this comment with the seemingly indifferent *cum per se gratae essent* is further evidence of the prime focus being on the swiftness of the action. The difference is subtle. The *Philippic* looks to highlight the actions of
Brutus, and how his rapid control of the situation prevented the possibility of disaster. The letter, on the other hand, focuses on the praise and greatness because of the rapidity. It is the actual reason why the actions themselves are omatiores. This difference can be explained by the different purpose of the speech and the letter, and is suggestive of the rhetorical elements which are present in Cicero’s correspondence. In the Tenth Philippic Cicero is trying to convince the senate that Brutus should be commended and supported in the East. It is therefore crucial that he depict him as proactive, courageous and having the interests of the State at heart. In the letter there is no need for Cicero to convince Cassius. So what is Cicero’s reason for this praise?

One thing which is noticeable is the juxtaposition of the implied facts regarding Brutus with the rumours about Cassius. The opening two sentences contain rumour (loquebantur), wishful thinking (credo quod volebant and credebatur) and unsubstantiated opinion (videbatur). Following this is the positive, unequivocal statements of Brutus’ accomplishments, before Cicero returns back to doubt with the conditional clause si tu ea tenes. Ostensibly this can be viewed as Cicero attempting to verify the news about Cassius. Yet, by placing the outstanding and tangible performance of Brutus between two sections of questionable information about Cassius, Cicero appears to be sending a message to Cassius. Just as with the placing of Servilia between the responses
of Cassius and Brutus at the meeting in Antium, Cicero again uses the positioning of information as a technique of characterisation and persuasion. The conditional itself can be placed amongst the use of hypotheticals to soften advice giving and provide an illusion of choice. The inclusion, however, of the relative clause *quaee putamus* adds a further dimension to this advice, moving it into the grounds of what was expected of Cassius.

Brutus also had written to Cicero on April 1 to inform him that Cassius was in possession of Syria (*ad Brut. 2.3.3.*). Cicero reciprocated on April 11, writing about the reception of this news (*ad Brut. 2.2.3.*). The letter to Brutus on the following day, however, is further evidence that Cicero’s depiction of Cassius to Brutus is not merely an exercise in information exchange (*ad Brut. 2.4.2.*):

> de Cassio laetor et rei publicae gratulor, mihi etiam qui repugnante et irascente Pansa sententiam dixerim ut Dolabellam bello Cassius persequeretur. et quidem audacter dicebam sine nostro senatus consulto iam illud eum bellum gerere. de te etiam dixi tum quae dicenda putavi. haec ad te oratio perferetur, quoniam te video delectari Philippicis nostris.

---

163 See pp. 234-5.

164 This provides further evidence of the communication which existed between Cassius and Brutus and that Brutus was more likely to receive information about Cassius before it got to Rome.

165 This was prompted by the arrival of a letter from Lentulus on 9 April.
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I am delighted about Cassius and I congratulate the State, and me also, since I spoke my opinion, with Pansa opposing and raging, that Cassius should pursue Dolabella in war. And indeed defiantly I was saying that he already, without our senatorial decree, was waging that war. At that time also I stated what needed to be said about you. This speech will be conveyed to you since I see you delight in our Philippics.

This letter would appear to be contemporaneous with the Eleventh Philippic in which Cicero attempted to legitimise Cassius’ command in Syria.\(^{166}\) He also endeavoured to authorise Cassius to conduct war against Dolabella, including the authority to make requisitions in Syria, Bithynia, Asia and Pontus and to grant maius imperium regarding this war (Phil. 11.12.29-31).

Even though the praise of Brutus’ actions in the previous letter to Cassius was grandiose in its adjectival phrasings, this passage is more linguistically subtle, but symbolically strong. Cassius’ achievement again brings about an instantaneous gratification for Cicero (\textit{laetor}), before he links it directly to the State and back to himself (\textit{rei publicae gratulor, mihi etiam}).\(^{167}\) He is actually so pleased that he openly admits to the constitutionally subversive nature of

\(^{166}\) Including the full title and authority of governor of the province.

\(^{167}\) See Hall (2013) for Cicero’s attempts to connect himself and his actions to the survival of the State.
Cassius’ actions (*sine nostro senatus consulto*). Not only does he disclose this seditious act of waging war without senatorial decree, he sees it as something worthy of congratulations.\(^{168}\) This justification of an unconstitutional act which is beneficial to the State is indicative of Cicero’s sentiments regarding crisis politics. Cicero seems to have believed that during crises the ends justified the means, since the optimum duty of a statesman was his duty to the State.\(^{169}\)

The focus on the justification in the letter of Cassius’ actions and achievements is not surprising. Cicero is keen to promote himself as looking after the interest of the conspirators. However, his comment on looking after Brutus’ interests is curious in its non-descript, minimalist approach. The simple line *de te etiam dixi tum quae dicenda putavi* is a more subdued approach to the grandstanding praise in the earlier letter. This vague statement is compared to the praise of Cassius in serving the Republic above his own interests and position. Both these letters show Cicero lavishly praising the other party while the correspondent himself is treated with doubt or bordering on indifference. Praise is certainly not uncommon in personal correspondence, but the overemphatic praise of someone other than the recipient outside of a letter of

\(^{168}\) This is not unusual in itself since the *Philippics* are full of references to what could be seen as unconstitutional acts attempting to be justified by Cicero. It has just been shown how in the *Tenth Philippic* Brutus had been commended for his legally questionable actions in Macedonia.

\(^{169}\) For Cicero’s notions on politics and how they specifically relate to the period after the Ides of March see van der Blom (2003); Harries (2006: 204-229). For Cicero’s own comments see *Rep.* 2.46; 3.33; *Leg.* 1 passim.
recommendation or encomiastic letter seems unusual. It remains to examine
the circumstances surrounding these achievements.

Brutus’ efforts in Macedonia included the gathering of troops and resources, the
securing of the provincial regions, and the suppressing of the threat that these
provinces could become a refuge for the enemies of the republic.\textsuperscript{170} This letter
makes it clear that nothing was definite about Cassius’ movements, or whether
he had secured Syria, or what resources he had at his disposal. Cicero ends
this letter by expressing his hopes of procuring a strong State-controlled East
from Greece all the way to Egypt. In connection with the questionability of
Cassius’ position and the hope that he has secured Syria, Cicero would appear
to be calling on Cassius to act swiftly and decisively, if he has not already done
so, and in a manner which is expected.\textsuperscript{171}

Yet, in fairly stark difference, the letter to Brutus has Cassius depicted as nobly
standing in defiance of a consul and waging war without senatorial approval.
His duty to the State places him beyond the need for approval from the titular
government. In contrast, Brutus, meanwhile, had been asking Cicero for advice
on what to do with C. Antonius (\textit{ad Brut.} 2.4.3), had been sending conflicting

\textsuperscript{170} A regular theme in the correspondence is Cassius and Brutus as a refuge for the Republican
supporters (\textit{Fam.} 12.6.2, 12.8.1; \textit{ad Brut.} 1.3.2, 1.5.2).

\textsuperscript{171} An almost identical expression appears in the \textit{Philippics} – \textit{exterae nationes a prima ora
Graeciae usque ad Aegyptum optimorum et fortissimorum civium imperii et praesidiis tenentur
(Phil. 10.5.10).}
reports on Dolabella’s movements and atrocities throughout Asia and Rhodes (ad Brut. 2.4.3), and had been requesting help in regard to troops and money (ad Brut. 2.4.4).

By highlighting Cassius’ decisiveness in a letter to Brutus, Cicero is implicitly recommending to Brutus such a course of action. Cassius’ ability to act spontaneously, with no thought to legality, and in what Cicero views is in the best interest of the State, is presumably how Cicero wants Brutus also to act. Cicero would seem to want Brutus to think more about what is best for the State, and less about his own position and standing in Rome. It would seem that this depiction failed to rouse Brutus since Cicero decided to instruct Brutus directly in regard to this on 5 May (ad Brut. 1.5.1):

\[
\text{cui cum essem adsensus, decrevi hoc amplius, ut tu, si arbitrarere utile exque re publica esse, persevererere bello Dolabellam; si minus id commodo rei publicae facere posses sive non existimares ex re publica esse, ut in isdem locis exercitum contineres. nihil honorificentius potuit facere senatus quam ut tuum esset iudicium quid maxime conducere rei publicae tibi videretur.}
\]

\[\text{172 At this time Cicero also informed Cassius directly that he should go ahead and defend the State without waiting for senatorial decrees or instructions (Fam. 12.7.2). The impetuousness, as well as its illegality, fits well with Cicero’s portrayal of Cassius as fiery individual who takes actions into his own hands.}\]
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When I had given my support to him (Cassius), I decreed this further, that you, if you should decide that it was for the benefit of the State, should pursue Dolabella in war; but if you could not do so to the advantage of the State or if you did not think it to be beneficial for the State, that you should keep the army in the same places. The senate was unable to bestow a greater honour than to allow it to be your decision what seemed to you the greatest profit for the State.

The passage mentions res publica four times, each time referring either to the proposed action’s usefulness (utilis), suitability (commodus), contemplated benefit (existimare) or advantage (maxime conducere) to the State. The comparison makes the advice implicit but all the more powerful for that. Brutus should act in the best interest of the State and not in regard to his own position.

These letters have further demonstrated how Cicero uses his depictions of Cassius or Brutus, in this case by the reporting of the success of the other, as rhetorical devices to persuade his correspondent to act in a way that Cicero sees as beneficial to the State and appropriate to the situation. The establishment of a sort of rivalry in reporting the success of the other in order to spur on the actions of the correspondent is yet another weapon in Cicero’s rhetorical arsenal of comparative portraiture.
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2.4: CONCLUSION

This chapter has explored in detail one particular rhetorical technique which appears in Cicero’s correspondence: comparative portraiture. It is accepted that no modern commentator or historian can possibly know the ‘real’ personality of these characters, however the presence of clear and affective rhetorical, literary and dramatic devices used in the reporting of events and the depictions of these people should cause the reader to pause. As has been stated, Servilia was probably domineering and protective, Cassius could have been volatile and impetuous, and Brutus may very well have been contemplative and cautious. However, what can be shown is that Cicero reports sequences of events and uses contrasts and comparisons within wider persuasive schemes. Whether it was to convince Atticus to use his influence over Brutus and Servilia to a particular course of action, to steal some military glory for himself from Cassius in Cilicia, or persuade Brutus to be more proactive, the reporting in Cicero’s letters demonstrates a considered approach to how and what he would write to different people in different situations in order to be most persuasive. The result is a presentation or depiction of personality and character which is heavily rhetorically influenced. One key element in this persuasive rhetoric is the paired contrast between Cassius and Brutus. A question must therefore be asked about the extent to which Cicero’s accentuation of the characteristics of these
two men may have coloured the depictions of Cassius and Brutus in later historians, biographers and playwrights.
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Following the departure of Cassius and Brutus from the Italian peninsula, Cicero’s position as a defender of the republican cause within Rome became progressively more difficult. Absence from Rome was a minor inconvenience if one stayed fairly close to the seat of power, but by departing for the East, the conspirators moved out of the range of immediate political impact. Cicero was left with a growing rivalry between Antonius and the young Caesar,¹ two consul designates in Hirtius and Pansa with doubtful loyalties to the republican cause due to their strong Caesarian links,² and a divided senate. Unfortunately for the study of the correspondence, this period also roughly coincides with the sudden cessation of the letters to Atticus on November 12, 44 B.C.³ As explained in the introduction, this loss is greatly felt, and possibly could have provided many answers to the controversies surrounding this final period of the correspondence and the republic. At the same time, however, there is an increase in the personal letters to both Cassius and Brutus, not to mention other

¹ It has been conjectured that the corn commission had been an attempt by Antonius to remove the conspirators so that he could focus on the emerging rival in Octavian; see Bringmann (2003).
² The letters from Cassius and Brutus asking to make Hirtius into a better person constitute a question over his loyalty to the senatorial cause and the optimates (Att. 14.20.4; 14.21.4; 15.6.1; 15.5.1). The difficulty which Cicero faced in the senate from Pansa’s opposition to motions he put forward to legitimise Cassius’ and Brutus’ positions in the East is another example (Fam. 12.7.1; ad Brut. 2.4.2).
³ The standard explanation for this is the fact that both Cicero and Atticus were in Rome so they could talk privately if necessary. See pp. 38-39 for a discussion on this.
critical figures of the period, including D. Iunius Brutus Albinus, C. Asinius Pollio and L. Munatius Plancus. This changes the focus of the portraiture in Cicero’s letters, as the depictions are directed upon the personalities themselves rather than through an intermediary like Atticus.

One of the more persistent notions depicted in the letters from this final phase of the correspondence is the idea of overwhelming popularity in Rome for the absent Cassius and Brutus. Much of the philosophy behind Cicero’s rhetoric in these depictions seems to be based largely on Stoic models of universal consent. It was these ideas which were crucial to Cicero’s plan to entice these men back to Rome, preferably at the head of an army. However, one immediate issue which must be dealt with is how Stoic models could have any influence on or appeal to the Epicurean Cassius and the Antiochean Platonist Brutus.

The method by which the assassination of Caesar has been reconciled with Epicurean philosophy will be used to help understand how universal consent could be convincing to Cassius. Although the argument of a personal grudge against Caesar can be used to explain the assassination sitting outside of the usual Epicurean ideal, the taking up of arms and defence of the East following his departure from Rome cannot so easily be explained.\textsuperscript{4} An argument based

\footnote{4 It becomes progressively harder to reconcile the notion of personal grudges when Dolabella, then Antonius, Lepidus and Octavian are added to list of people against whom Cassius actively fought.}
on his own inner peace and tranquillity not being able to abide tyranny is also unsatisfactory. Similarly, Cassius’ apparent ignoring of Epicurean non-involvement has caused some to label his following of its tenets as more cultural than political,\(^5\) and to refer to him as being of an Epicurean persuasion rather than a fanatic.\(^6\) Both of these arguments are unfair when firstly there is evidence that the ‘no politics’ rule could in fact be suspended when necessity compelled the Epicurean (Cic. Rep. 1.10; Sen. de Otio 3.2),\(^7\) and secondly that Cassius’ reply to Cicero’s letters challenging his beliefs seem to indicate that he had a firm understanding of and ability to defend Epicurean principles.\(^8\)

Epicureans did approve of the type of government which brought about peaceful conditions and made society more suitable for their Epicurean lifestyle (Lucr. 5.1143-51; Plu. Adv. Col. 1124D).\(^9\) It would also seem that a sense of obligation did not mean one needed to reject hedonism. In fact there is evidence that the Stoic value of οἰκείωσις,\(^{10}\) inasmuch as it engenders social obligations and duties, may have been accepted by the Epicurean

\(^{5}\) Castner (1988: 31).
\(^{6}\) Syme (1939: 57).
\(^{7}\) See also Fowler (1989); Griffin (1989: 30-3).
\(^{8}\) The series of exchanges between Cicero and Cassius between December 46 and January 45 consist of three letters from Cicero (Fam. 15.16; 15.17; 15.18), and one reply from Cassius which defends adequately Cicero’s attacks on Epicureanism (15.19). For studies of this series see Sedley (1997: 46-47); Griffin (1995: 344-6).
\(^{9}\) See Sedley (1997: 46); Belliotti (2009: 112-3).
\(^{10}\) See the opening remarks of George (1988) for an explanation of the Stoic ides of οἰκείωσις; cf. Cic. Fin. 3.19-22.
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Hermachus.\textsuperscript{11} Another aspect linked to social obligations, and which Cassius himself indicates that he was persuaded by in his response to Cicero (\textit{Fam. 15.19}), was the idea of friendship and goodwill being a pleasure in its own right.\textsuperscript{12} Thus, if Cicero could convince Cassius that this sense of friendship and goodwill extended to the people of Rome, then the notions of universal support and consent may have had more influence on him than would immediately be apparent, given his Epicurean affiliations.

Brutus’ agreement with the tenets of Stoic philosophy is easier to reconcile. It is generally agreed that Brutus was an adherent of the Old Academy, i.e. he was an Antiochean Platonist (Cic. \textit{Brut. 120}, 140, 332; \textit{Fin. 5.8}; \textit{Tusc. 5.21}; \textit{Att. 13.25.3}; Plu. \textit{Brut. 2.2-3}).\textsuperscript{13} As Sedley points out, despite Antiochus seeing Stoicism as ‘a degenerate descendant of true Platonism’, he still used much of its terminology and conceptual framework.\textsuperscript{14} As such many of the philosophical outlooks which Cicero was basing his rhetoric on would have been recognisable and acceptable to Brutus. For instance, it will be demonstrated that Cicero’s notions of good governing resting on the good of all the people outweighing that of the individual was based on Platonic prescriptions.\textsuperscript{15} As such, the idea of

\textsuperscript{11} Sedley (1997: 45-7); Belliotti (2009: 112).
\textsuperscript{13} Sedley (1997: 42); Barnes (1989).
\textsuperscript{14} Sedley (1997: 42).
\textsuperscript{15} See p. 283.
universal support and consent could have an appeal to Brutus’ philosophical beliefs. Plato had himself in fact used the *consensus gentium* argument in his writings (e.g. *Lg.* 886a, 887e), so it is reasonable to believe that this type of argument would have seemed reasonable to Brutus.

In the correspondence to Brutus, one of the most extensive displays of overt popularity comes from around 23 April 43 (*ad Brut.* 1.3.2):

> triduo vero aut quadriduo ante hanc rem pulcherrimam timore quodam perculsa civitas tota ad te se cum coniugibus et liberis effundebat. eadem recreata a.d. xii Kal. Mai. te huc venire quam se ad te ire malebat. quo quidem die magnorum meorum laborum multarumque vigiliarum fructum cepi maximum, si modo est aliquis fructus ex solida veraque gloria. nam tantae multitudinis quantam capit urbs nostra concursus est ad me factus. a qua usque in Capitolium deductus, maximo clamore atque plausu in rostris collocatus sum. nihil est in me inane, neque enim debet; sed tamen omnium ordinum consensus, gratiarum actio gratulatioque me commovet propterea quod popularem esse in populi salute praecarum est. sed haec te malo ab aliis.

*Indeed three or four days before this most illustrious event, the entire community, having been struck down by some fear, streamed out to*
you with their wives and children in tow. By April 20, they had recovered, at which time they preferred for you to come here rather than them to go to you. On that very day I reaped the richest harvest for my great toils and frequent vigils, if any crop can be harvested from true and genuine glory. For it caused a crowd, as large as our city could contain, to flock to me. I was led all the way to the Capitol by it, and I placed on the Rostra, amidst great acclamation and applause. I am not being vain, for neither is there any need to be; yet the unanimity of all the orders, the action of their good will and their rejoicing does stir me because it is honourable to be popular in seeking the salvation of the people. But I would prefer you heard this from others.

The victory at Forum Gallorum is prefaced here in true dramatic style by an unexplained panic which swept through Rome. Cicero uses this as an opportunity to express overwhelming support for Brutus, since the thoughts of the entire community (civitas tota) turn only to Brutus when gripped by this unimaginable fear. The similarity with the historical and contemporary theme of the military panic before a major battle cannot be ignored here. In one way it mimics the feelings of the soldiery before the battle of Forum Gallorum, but also places the citizens of Rome within their own battle for survival and liberty. For general background on ‘panic’ see Borgeaud (1988: 88-104), Wheeler (1988), Fantuzzi (2011: 41-54).
through the image of a mass exodus and abandonment of the city by all, including the vulnerable non-combatant families (*cum coniugibus et liberis*). The unspecified cause of this fear (*timore quodam*) adds to the dramatic effect of the passage. Notwithstanding that the fear may have been justified,\(^\text{17}\) by casting it in indefinite terms, Cicero seems to turn this panic into a demonstration of universal support for Brutus. In doing so Cicero casts Brutus in the role of protector and source of refuge: a role which will resurface a number of times in the final correspondence to the conspirators. This role is also one which is applied to the ideal statesman in the republic.\(^\text{18}\)

Of course the people regained their senses, but not their desire to join Brutus. Rather the preference turns to Brutus’ return instead of an exodus and abandonment of the city. The return of Brutus to Rome was Cicero’s primary purpose, and an appeal to this effect is one of the most common features of the direct correspondence in the last phase of Cicero’s letters to the conspirators. In this case, Cicero juxtaposes two possible scenarios, one of which seems patently absurd: the abandonment of the city. In doing so, Cicero conveys to Brutus the more logical choice: his return to Rome. This is the reasoned

---

\(^{17}\) It is known that Pansa’s departure from Rome around March 19 with his newly recruited legions had created a period of great disorder in Rome (*ad Brut. 2.5.2*). The approach of the anticipated battles with Antonius would also have destabilised public feeling.

\(^{18}\) The custodial responsibility of a statesman to the populace was a standard Republican theme, see Laser (1997: 31-43); Morstein-Marx (2004: 223).
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argument, gained only after the people had recovered from their panic. Now it is
doubtful whether Brutus was actually meant to believe in the hyperbole of a
mass exodus of Rome, nor was this the point. The symbolism of the universal
consent to seek the safety of the conspirators is the scenario which Cicero is
establishing. This picture of universal support is more significant for what it
symbolically represents, Cassius and Brutus as the ‘figureheads’ and protectors
of the people and the free republic. These depictions are heavily laced with late
republic rhetoric, and this would not have been lost on Brutus.¹⁹

What makes this letter unique, however, is the sudden deviation that the
depiction of events takes at this point. The mass support for Brutus is suddenly
converted to universal support for Cicero. In making this change, Cicero seems
to become a surrogate for Brutus. His hyperbolic statements of capacity crowds
and triumphal procession conjure up the image of the ideal orator-statesman
which was central to his notion of the ideal republic. Why, however, should
Cicero do this? Ostensibly, the answer is, because it actually happened.
However, as always, the scene is depicted rhetorically to achieve desired ends.
Clearly, it sits within practices of maintenance and negotiation of power. It also
functions to entice Brutus to return by showing to him what support and glory

¹⁹ A connection to the early civil war and Pompey’s exodus from Rome would have been
undeniable in the mind of Brutus. Hopefully he would have focussed on Pompey as the
champion of the Republic opposing the dictator Caesar, rather than the disastrous outcome of
that civil war for both Pompey himself and the republic in general.
could also be bestowed on him. Cicero may have been stirring up envy in Brutus to ensure his return to Rome.

Of particular interest in this passage, and which is indicative of the overall expression throughout the later correspondence, is the disclaimer Cicero places on the popularity he has received. Taking vanity out of the picture, he places this popularity within the confines of his service to the community. In doing so he seems to imply that popularity, and - as a natural extension of this – populist politics, is justifiable and acceptable if it is done for the common good of the community. This is another key feature of Cicero’s ideal republic and, in the context of Late Republican politics, sets him rhetorically apart from the other leading figures. This could be considered an unusual position for Cicero, whose attitude towards populist politics could not always be considered conciliatory. What it manages here is to increase the apologetic tone in providing a justification for his being affected by the entreaties and celebrations of the people. In light of this sense of justification, praeclarus seems here to mean


21 T&P (1899: 115) point out Cicero’s less than sympathetic attitude to democratic and popularist politics on grounds of their ‘clamouring for what was not for their real good’.
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‘honourable’, and provides a point at which being popular, and rejoicing in this popularity, is principled and acceptable.

Indeed there may be further evidence of the personal nature of this defence, i.e. Cicero’s necessity to preserve his integrity in light of what he depicts as overwhelming and zealous popular support. The text of Shackleton Bailey omits *me* from the second last line despite some compelling evidence for its inclusion from the MSS tradition. By this omission Shackleton Bailey suggests a generalised tone which allows this passage and ideal to be extended out as a principle, one to which Brutus could, and should, aspire. However, if *me* is in fact supposed to be part of this phrasing (*popularem me esse*), Cicero would be actually declaring that it is glorious that *he* is seen as popular in seeking the salvation of the people. This would lessen the generalising nature of the statement, but it would accentuate this apologetic tone contained throughout. The result would suggest a more personalised message for Brutus, and one possibly designed to appeal to Brutus’ vanity and create a sense of jealousy. Either way, the attempt to persuade Brutus to return to Rome seems clear in this letter.

---

22 *TLL* states that the possibility of a link with the Greek ἔντιμος (10.2.485.51-2), as well as an established link with its use with gifts and honours (10.2.487.72).

23 The tradition shows: *popularem esse* EN; *popularem me esse* GRΔ; *me popularem esse* V. SB (1980: 232) dismisses this as ‘not only needless but out of tune with Cicero’s exalted frame of mind’, whilst T&P (1899: 115) accept it without question.
What Cicero has depicted here is the ‘true’ *popularis*, mounting the Rostra to deliver a *contio* to the people. He wants Brutus to see his intentions are pure and his actions and thoughts are for the benefit of the people. He is portraying himself as the ideal statesman and not a ‘false’ *popularis*, acting popularly for his own agenda in the way of the demagogue. There is little doubt that Cicero believed that his actions were for the benefit of the people and the State. Yet, his methodology in pursuing popular consent to justify and legitimise his opinions and plans for the conspirators does not appear as altruistic as his intentions. His reporting of events and public feelings in Rome during this last phase of the republic reveal writing full of rhetorical and dramatic devices indicative of persuasive speech. The rhetoric seems directed towards casting the conspirators as popular heroes, duty bound through universal consent to complete what they had started in restoring *libertas* to the republic.

As can be seen, letters, such as the one above, contain an insight into the general feeling in Rome and Cicero’s opinions and perceptions of the events which unfolded in these last months before the triumvirate of Antonius, Lepidus and Octavian. As such, it is important to place it within the historical perspective. The treacherous murder of Trebonius and the ravaging of the Eastern provinces by Dolabella saw the temporary loss of control over the
province of Asia until such time as it could be reclaimed. Meanwhile the jubilation at the defeat of Antonius at Mutina was soured by the death of both consuls and Antonius’ escape. Then there was the defection of Lepidus to Antonius’ standard. To further complicate matters, all this was amidst the growing influence and sense of entitlement in the young Caesar, Octavian.

With this in mind it is possible to start to decipher Cicero’s methods of character depiction. Whether he was trying to describe the ideal statesman-orator or the man of overwhelming support and popularity, Cicero would appear to use these depictions in an attempt to persuade those in his correspondence to act in a way which would deliver the greatest benefit to the State. In the case of Cassius and Brutus, this most frequently seems to mean their return to Rome, preferably with their armies, in order to help in the establishment and protection of a stable and free republic. Other times Cicero uses his rhetorical devices to remind them of their obligations, which had not ended, but indeed had only started, with the death of Caesar.

3.1: CASSIUS AND BRUTUS: ‘POPULAR HEROES’

The meaning of the word popularis, especially as it relates to the comparison with optimas, is well-travelled ground. From a lexicographical perspective the

24 ad Brut. 2.3.1.
OLD lists three noun meanings and nine adjective meanings. There seems to be an inherent ambiguity in the terminology, essentially a contrast between ‘in the interest of the people’ and ‘pleasing the people’. Robb’s recent analysis of this word in Cicero reveals 244 mentions in his extant works, with only 25 in the letters. Of these, she lists 52% of these as being in relation to ‘genuine popularity’, citing as evidence a letter to Cassius from 51, during his time as proquaestor in Syria (Fam. 14.14.4):

ego ceterarum rerum causa tibi Romam properandum magno opere censeo. nam et ea quae reliqui tranquilla de te erant et hac tua recenti victoria tanta clarum tuum adventum fore intellego. sed si quae sunt onera tuorum, si tanta sunt ut ea sustinere possis, propera; nihil tibi erit lautius, nihil gloriiosius. sin maiora, considera ne in alienissimum tempus cadat adventus tuus. huius rei totum consilium tuum est; tu enim scis quid sustinere possis. si potes,

---

25 OLD 1544-45 s.v. popularis. Of particular interest to this study is the use as a noun in Republican politics to indicate the member of the ‘popular’ party or promotor of ‘popular’ politics (OLD 1545 §3; TLL 10.1.2700.20-21). Other seminal works in understanding popularis in the context of politics at Rome are Hellegouarc’h (1963: 518-44) and Meier (RE Suppl.: 10.549-615).

26 Cicero himself directly speaks of this ambiguity and confusion about what popularis means, asking his audience for their help and wisdom in defining it (Ag. 2.7).

27 Meier (RE Suppl.: 10.568).

28 Robb (2010: 70-71)
For the sake of other matters, I am greatly of the opinion that you ought to hasten to Rome. For things, as I left them, were untroubled in relation to you and, on account of your recent great victory, I imagine that your arrival will be exceptionally glorious. But if the burdens of your relatives are such that you are able to bear them, hasten (to Rome): nothing will be more distinguished, nothing more glorious for you. But if they are more serious, be mindful that your return not fall at a most inappropriate time. Your judgement of this matter is paramount; for you know what you are able to bear. If you are able, it is both praiseworthy and civil-minded; if you are clearly not able, you will more easily bear the remarks of the people in your absence.

This letter is some six years before the period under study, and around two years before Caesar would even cross the Rubicon. Yet, the basic concept remains the same, an appeal for Cassius to return to Rome. Just as with the letter to Brutus, this return to Rome is made more enticing by the prospect of popular support. Robb's identification of this as a positive use of the word seems correct, though regarding this as genuine popularity without further
consideration of what may in part be a rhetorical device is problematic. In this particular case, Cicero suggests to Cassius to return to Rome to face in person possible charges of extortion arising from his governance of Syria. The timing of this letter is just before the arrival of Bibulus in October of 51 (Att. 5.20.4), which would also free Cassius up to leave Syria for Rome. All these are excellent reasons for returning to Rome. However, why is Cicero using the rhetoric of popularity in the face of adversity to entice him? Ostensibly Cicero may be urging Cassius to return either to face up to his own charges or to help support a case against one of his family members (onera tuorum). In this instance it is a call to his familial pietas. If this is the case then Cicero is reassuring Cassius not to worry and that his return will see support in these legal proceedings be completely on his side. However, a speculative, if not cynical, answer could look at Cicero’s military and political position in Cilicia and surrounding areas. As was summarised earlier, Cicero at times reported news on the Parthian conflict in a way which seemed to diminish Cassius’ responsibility for the success, at the same time bolstering his own reputation and assigning himself more credit. If Cicero was to have any opportunity to garner some military credibility out of his appointment in Cilicia, especially now that the Parthians had

29 Shackleton Bailey saw this as possibly relating to some legal issues for Cassius’ cousin Quintus Cassius Longinus (1968: 230-1). Rawson likewise points to this possibility, but also alludes to the legal issue relating to Cassius’ time in Syria (1986: 119).

30 See pp. 180-183.
been routed, the experienced and capable general in Cassius needed to depart. What Cicero’s intention was cannot be proven, but what can be reasonably assumed from the passage is that a declaration of popular support in Rome, whether genuine or potential, was one of Cicero’s rhetorical devices in his depictions of personalities for the purpose of this persuasion. Thus, whilst Robb may be correct in identifying this as a depiction of genuine popularity, the interpretation should be considered that this depiction was an attempt by Cicero to present Cassius as the popular returning hero in order to convince him to return to Rome.

However, when the focus is turned onto the direct correspondence to Cassius and Brutus following their departures from Italy, what becomes immediately apparent is the absence of the term *popularis*, even when Cicero is presenting what can only be described as popular support and fervour. In fact, the letter to Brutus which opens this chapter contains the only use in the correspondence to Cassius and Brutus.\(^\text{31}\) Despite the almost complete absence of *popularis*, the presence of the characteristics and expressions which are normally associated with the notion of the popular hero is certainly visible, and even at times seems to represent the dichotomy, false or real, between *popularis* and *optimas*. Ostensibly it is clear that Cicero would want to distance himself and the conspirators from any association with the use of *populares* as representative of

\(^{31}\text{ad Brut. 1.3.2.}\)
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Antonius and his supporters, yet it will be suggested presently that this may not completely justify its omission.

The closest texts temporally to Cicero’s letters during the absence of Cassius and Brutus from Rome that can be examined are the *Philippics*, and fortunately there are two passages which provide a significant insight into Cicero’s opinion on populist politics. The *Seventh Philippic* contains what appears to be a confusing movement between meanings, with *popularis* mentioned no less than five times (*Phil. 7.2.4*):

> atque haec ei loquuntur qui quondam propter levitatem populares habebantur. ex quo intellegi potest animo illos abhorruisse semper ab optimo civitatis statu, non voluntate fuisse popularis. qui enim evenit ut, qui in rebus improbis populares fuerint, idem in re una maxime populari, quod eadem salutaris rei publicae sit, improbos se quam popularis esse malint? me quidem semper, uti scitis, adversarium multitudinis tementitati haec fecit praeclarissima causa popularem.

And those who speak in this way are those who formerly were called populares on account of their levity. From this can be understood that these men hated in their heart the best form of the constitution, that they were not populares by preference. For how does it happen that,
those men who were populares in wicked matters prefer, in that one
greatest popularis matter, because it is for the betterment of the
State, to be wicked rather that popular? Indeed although I have
always, as you know, been opposed to the rashness of the crowd,
this most excellent cause has made me a popularis.

The translation has intentionally left popularis/es in the original Latin to evoke
the intended contrast and ambiguity. This passage does not contain a
comparison between optimas and popularis, but rather with improbus. Largely
this is a distinction between the right and the wrong type of populist, and
making this distinction Cicero heightens the denunciation of Antonius, all the
while creating an impact regarding their corruption of the word popularis. As
Dyck suggests, popularis is actually a neutral term in Cicero, but a word which
gains meaning through its context. The context here seems to be the
differentiation in Cicero between those who are ‘true’ populares, i.e. those
whose actions and policies lead to genuine beneficial reform for the people and

32 This contrast to ‘normal’ concepts of opposition was also noted by Meier (RE Supp.: 10.549-615).
33 Robb (2010: 92).
Roman society, and those who only feign populist politics in order to legitimise and benefit their own position. Those latter types provide no actual benefit or usefulness to society, and, in accordance with Cicero’s ideal republic, because of this they hold no constructive function within the State apparatus.

It should also be noted that the way in which Cicero places praeclarus in relation to popularis in this passage is the same as he did in the letter to Brutus - propterea quod popularem esse in populi salute praeclarum est. What this suggests is that Cicero’s use of the term popularis in these last years of the republic was complicated by a distinction between what he interpreted as the true populists, whose excellence was in the benefit they could provide to the community, and those who called themselves populists, but in fact were self-serving and manipulating the people to do their bidding: i.e. the difference between doing something in the interest of the people compared to doing something which was crowd-pleasing.

37 An example of this in Cicero is quamquam ubi tu te popularem, nisi cum pro populo fecisti, potes dicere? (Dom. 77) – ‘although when can you say that you are popularis, except when you have acted on behalf for the benefit of the people?’

38 This opinion is set out clearly in the Lucullus when Cicero first writes quod seditiosi cives solent, cum aliquos ex antiquis claros viros proferunt, quos dicant fuisse popularis, ut eorum ipsi similes esse videantur (Luc. 13) – ‘what seditious citizens are accustomed to do, when they list appropriate examples from those distinguished men of old, whom they claim to be populares, so that they themselves will appear to be similar.’
The *Eighth Philippic* also contains a similar play on a positive and negative interpretation of the term *popularis* when referring to Q. Fufius Calenus (*Phil*. 8.6.19):

\[
\text{antea deterrere te ne popularis esses non poteramus; exorare nunc}
\]
\[
\text{ut sis popularis non possumus.}
\]

*Before we could not deter you from being a popularis; now we cannot prevail upon you to be a popularis.*

Cicero here is finishing up his criticism of the consular Calenus who has been calling himself a supporter of peace and reproaching Cicero for stirring up war. Cicero points out that this is just posturing, that he sought peace in nothing but name, and that his idea of ‘peace’ was the path to slavery. There again seems to be a distinction between the two uses of *popularis*, though less obvious than in the previous example. Manuwald sees the first mention to be relating to alignment to a political party,\(^{39}\) whereas the second relates to individuals whose actions, in Cicero’s eyes, are beneficial to Rome, and which would contribute to the welfare of the people.\(^{40}\) Robb takes this passage further, linking this second statement to those historical figures that saved the State through the killing of its

\(^{39}\) This is despite the fairly well established notion that no such political organisation existed, and that there was no continuity of policy through generations. See Meier (*RE* Supp.: 10.549-615); Seager (1972); Perelli (1982); Ferrary (1982); Mackie (1992); Lintott (1999b: 174).

\(^{40}\) Manuwald (2007: 980).
enemies.\textsuperscript{41} Although this is an intriguing suggestion, a play on the ‘true’ versus the ‘false’ \textit{popularis}, such as Cicero has demonstrated in the previous examples, could also explain this use of \textit{popularis}. Furthermore this is supported by the fact that Cicero would most likely have seen Calenus as one of those ‘crowd-pleading’ and self-serving \textit{populares}.\textsuperscript{42}

Another point to make before exploring further Cicero’s depictions of the conspirators as popular heroes, is that Cicero’s use of \textit{popularis} both in the \textit{Philippics} and the letter to Brutus is not used to describe the conspirators, but rather it is used solely to describe himself. Cicero seems unafraid to refer to himself by this terminology, as there was little chance that anyone would potentially associate him with Antonius and his supporters. Rather it appears as if Cicero uses himself as a point of comparison for the term, seemingly asking his audience to decide on which type of \textit{popularis} they would prefer. However, when it came to Cassius and Brutus, it is likely that he felt that this comparison would seem inappropriate. Any attempt to link Caesar’s assassins to the term \textit{populares} on the grounds of the benefit the assassination had on the

\textsuperscript{41} Robb (2010: 77).

\textsuperscript{42} The hostility of Cicero’s invective towards Calenus is explainable by their previous associations. Calenus had been a contributing factor in the acquittal of P. Clodius in 61 from the \textit{Bona Dea} scandal (Cic. \textit{Att.} 1.16), and had been responsible in 59 for individual voting of the orders so as to know the vote of each class structure (C.D. 38.8.1). He had supported and fought alongside Caesar, and was eventually awarded the consulship in 47 B.C. He would later command eleven legions in northern Italy under the banner of Antonius (App. \textit{BC}. 5.3, 5.24), though this last element, of course, has no relevance at this time.
community had the potential of setting up an irreconcilable clash with those *populares* who claimed this title through Caesarian links.\(^\text{43}\) Thus, Cicero would need to refer to their popularity in regard to this benefit without directly associating them with the term *popularis*. In this way he could create the popular hero persona without reference to the contemptuous term.

This does not stop him from drawing comparisons with what could be seen as the traditional notions of ideological polarity: *optimates* and *populares*.\(^\text{44}\) In fact, there are a number of occasions on which Cicero uses some of his alternative words for the *optimates* when talking about support for Cassius and Brutus, including *boni* (*Fam. 12.6.1*):\(^\text{45}\)

> omne perfugium bonorum in te et Bruto esse positum

*Every refuge of good men is placed in you and Brutus.*

---

\(^\text{43}\) Cicero did on occasion write lists of those *exempla* who were worthy of the title of *populares*. These lists change in accordance with the purpose of the passage, e.g. *Luc. 13; Har. 42; Sest. 101-103; Ver. 5.180-1; Lintott* (1999b: 174). One grouping is those who saved the State by killing its enemy. Amongst this list would be Nascia, Opimius, Marius and even Cicero. Cassius and Brutus would certainly be considered by Cicero, especially for propaganda reasons, to be worthy additions to this list.

\(^\text{44}\) *optimas*, both a noun and an adjective, usually denotes powerful, wealthy and noble people, often leaders of the community, whether Roman or foreign, with connections to notions of aristocracy (*OLD* 1385 s.v. *optimas*, *TLL* 9.2.819.7-821.21). Scholarship is, however, moving away from these notions of a binary model for these terms (e.g. *Arena* (2012); *Russell* (2013)), but this does not mean that Cicero did not use the appearance of this duality for his rhetorical purpose, especially if trying to simplify the descriptions of divided loyalties.

\(^\text{45}\) Amongst the most common are the ‘*boni*’ and the ‘*summi*’. 
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This simple statement to Cassius from mid-April 43 is very clear in its intent and support base. In many ways the traditional senatorial classes, the usual meaning when Cicero mentions the *boni*, were the expected support base for Cassius and Brutus. The notion of being a refuge (*perfugium*) is repeated to Cassius later that year, around June 9 (*Fam.* 12.8.1). A connection with a similar sentiment made in the *de Officiis*, with *summi* replacing *boni*, is certainly inviting (2.63.5):

> ...quod summi cuiusque bonitas commune perfugium est omnium.

> ...because the goodness of each man of high rank is a common refuge for all.

Here Cassius is represented as the ideal citizen and statesman, a man of high rank, presumably including the property qualification that goes with this, who is at once both morally good and a benefit to the people. A more elaborate expression of popularity with the *optimates* is given within the letter of recommendation for C. Nasennius which Cicero sent to Brutus in June. In this letter Cicero actually uses *optimus* to describe those people who support Brutus (*ad Brut.* 1.8.1):

> optimus enim quisque vir et civis maxime sequitur tuum iudicium
tibique omnes fortes viri navare operam et studium volunt, nec
quisquam est quin ita existimet, meam apud te et auctoritatem et
gratiam valere plurimum.

For any best man and citizen is greatly inclined to follow your
judgement and all brave men want enthusiastically to be of service to
you, nor is there anyone who does not think that my influence and
favour have great weight with you.

The genre of the letter of recommendation cannot be ignored and will certainly
explain some of the hyperbolic nature of this passage. This is particularly true if
Fronto’s association between the laudatio and the commendatio, that the letter
of recommendation seemed to bear a testimony of the character of the person
recommended, is correct (ad Amic. 1.1.1).46 For a man like Cicero, with all his
forensic experience, the conversion of the testimony of character from the
courtroom to the written recommendation is certainly believable. The probability
of this increases exponentially with the mentioning of the inclination the
populace had towards Brutus’ judgement (tuum iudicium) in the first line.
However, when the passage is actually examined, it becomes clear that the
testimonium is not for Nasennius, but actually relates to Brutus himself. Overt
flattery in letters of recommendation is no doubt an extension of the unwritten

46 item istae commendantium litterae laudationis munere fungi visae sunt – ‘so these letters of
recommendation seemed to perform the function of a testimony of character.’
tradition of politeness between members of the Roman aristocracy.\(^{47}\) It also fits in well with the notion that the letter of recommendation can often have less to do with the person being recommended than with the establishment and continuation of the personal relationship and the negotiation of status between the sender and the receiver.\(^{48}\) This seems likely during the absence of Brutus, when Cicero was wanting to convince Brutus that a return to Rome was necessary.\(^{49}\) The re-establishing of their relationship and a deeper trust in Cicero’s opinion would have been advantageous in this case.

The expression *optimus quisque vir et civis* is both generic and specific. Although not universal in the true sense, it gives the impression that the more important members of Roman society are supportive of Brutus. Yet what does this term *optimus quisque* actually mean? It is certainly not unique to Cicero, and he himself used it in many different contexts.\(^{50}\) If Festus has preserved the law correctly, the figure of speech dates back to the Ovinian Law,\(^{51}\) when the

---

\(^{47}\) In relation to Pliny’s letters of recommendation, both Hoffer (1999: 177-193) and Rees (2007: 161, 164) ascribe to them a conspicuous role in the continuation of aristocratic value systems and patronage networks. There is little doubt that this can also be applied to Cicero; see Hall (2003: 30-2, 52-3).

\(^{48}\) Rees (2007: 154-6).

\(^{49}\) The exact timing of this letter is not known, see T&P (1899: 205); SB (1980: 239), however, its position in the series would indicate that it can at least be placed during Brutus’ absence from Rome, whilst he was in the East.

\(^{50}\) e.g. Cic. *Fam.* 8.9.5.2; 10.31.3.4; *Arch.* 26.8; *Flac.* 11.14; *Sest.* 97.1; *Fin.* 1.24.12; *Off.* 154.1; *de Orat.* 2.314.1; *N.D.* 3.50.3.

\(^{51}\) Around 312 BC.
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selection of senators was transferred from the consul to the censors (Festus 290L).52 A literal translation of this phrase has often sufficed,53 though some have questioned whether this relates to moral or social worth.54 Hellegouarc'h extensively looked at the term and felt that it designated the social elite, though he saw that it had both a moral and social element,55 thereby seeing the *optimus quisque* as a person of the finest qualities within good society.56 If Hellegouarc'h is correct in connecting the etymology of *optimus* with *opes*,57 there is no doubting that there was also a monetary/property qualification, which the censorship during the Augustan period would support.58 The evidence seems to indicate that these men were indeed wealthy men from the elite ranks of society, but that they should also be men of good moral standing.59

52 *ut censores ex omni ordine optimum quemque curiat<in> in senatu<in> legerent.*
53 Hofmann (1847: 10) translated this as *die würdigsten Männer*, Willems (1878: 166-7) used *les meilleurs*; whilst Kunkel (1995: 438-43) used words like *die besten* and *die jeweils besten*.
54 Rich (1976: 132 n.24). Ferenczy (1976: 160) also sees a moral element to this and links the *optimus quisque* to the πρόκριτοι. LSJ (1487) links the meaning in Rome to the term *princeps*.
55 Hellegouarc'h (1963: 496-98).
56 'L’optimus est un personnage de la bonne société, étant sous-entendu qu’il possède de ce fait les plus grandes qualités' (Hellegouarc'h (1963: 496-7)). He uses Plautus as a source to demonstrate this, e.g. *As*. 681; *Aul*. 136, 137, 139; *Capt*. 391, 946; *Mil*. 99; *Mos*. 21,84; *Per*. 566-7.
57 Hellegouarc'h (1963: 499).
58 Talbert (1984: 10). Lintott (1999b: 71) points out that there is no evidence for a specific property qualification for membership into the senate before Augustus.
One of Cicero’s uses for this term can be seen in the *de Officiis*. In this passage, Cicero talks about Platonic prescriptions on good governing: the good of the people takes precedence over personal interests; and no single section should profit at the expense of another. He continues *(Off. 1.85)*:

> ut enim tutela, sic procuratio rei publicae ad eorum utilitatem, qui commissi sunt, non ad eorum, quibus commissa est, gerenda est. qui autem parti civium consulunt, partem neglegunt, rem perniciosissimam in civitatem inducunt, seditionem atque discordiam; ex quo evenit, ut alii populares, alii studiosi optimi cuiusque videantur, pauci universorum.

*For just like a trusteeship, so the administration of State affairs must be conducted for the benefit of those who are entrusted into one’s care, not for the benefit of those to whom it is entrusted. However, those who consult the interests of part of the citizen body, but neglect the other, introduce into the State a very dangerous matter – civil discord and dissension. Out of which arises some who are populists, others of the aristocratic party, and few for everyone.*

The same phrase (*optimus quisque*) appears here in the genitive, and has the fairly clear meaning of a type of aristocratic leader or member. Cicero is talking

---

60 e.g. *Pl. Lg.* 4.715b; *R.* 420c, 421b-c.
not only about the upper echelon of society, but also those who perpetuated the control of power within this level.

The use of *optimus quisque* can be confirmed as providing a point of comparison within society in two letters written to Cicero. The first letter comes from September 51, when Caelius wrote to Cicero informing him of the elections for the praetorship. In describing the failure of Favonius to secure the position (*Fam. 8.9.5*):\(^{61}\)

>nolo te putare Favonium a columnariis praeteritum esse; optimus quisque eum non fecit.

*I do not want you to think that Favonius was rejected by the slackers (alone); any of the best did not vote for him.*

The term *columnarius* is taken to relate to the lower orders, i.e. those who hang around in the colonnades around Rome.\(^{62}\) If this is so, the term is again used as a comparison of the class structure in Rome, but does not necessarily indicate a political division. Instead there is a distinction between those who under-utilise their time, loitering in public spaces, compared to those others who presumably

---

\(^{61}\) This is the same Favonius who appears in the meeting at Antium.

\(^{62}\) SB (1977: 395). T&P (1890: 69) mention its reported origin as those who were convicted at the *Columna Maenia*, but admit that it is likely to relate to those who loiter in the colonnades of Rome (*OLD 392 s.v. columnarius §1; TLL 3.0.1742.42-3*). It can also mean those workmen who build columns (*OLD 392 §2; TLL 3.0.1742.45-6*).
play important roles in society. There is, however, an implied political division here. As has been mentioned, Favonius was an imitator of Cato, and as such he would not be expected to win support of the populist elements in Rome, i.e. the *columnarii*. However, to the amusement of Caelius (and presumably Cicero), not even the conservatives, his expected support base, voted for him.

This division is again noted in a letter from Pollio to Cicero from March 43. This letter is not only contemporaneous with Cicero’s letter to Brutus, but it seems to echo the idea of a separation of political persuasion with the term *optimus quisque*. Musing on why he would not accept the despotism of another man, Pollio recalls what he was required to do under the dictatorship of Caesar (*Fam.* 10.31.3):

> quae mea sententia gerere mihi licuit ita feci ut optimus quisque maxime probarit; quod iussus sum eo tempore atque ita feci ut appareret invito imperatum esse.

> *What I was permitted to do on my own initiative, I did in such a way that any of the best would approve thoroughly. What I did under order, I did at that time and in such a way that it was apparent that the order had been given to an unwilling agent.*

Pollio seems to be establishing a difference between the orders of the populist Caesar, even those which he himself had executed, and his own self-directed
actions which achieved praise amongst the best. The letters of Pollio to Cicero have been well studied, and often a tone of deceit is identified, especially in light of the eventual outcome. However, whatever the political persuasion of Pollio was, at this time he was writing to Cicero in order to convince him of his intentions. It is therefore crucial to note that whether he is being disingenuous or not, there is no doubting his attempts to portray that his natural loyalties, demonstrated by those deeds which he did himself, lie with the optimates rather than the populist deeds forced upon him by the orders of Caesar. As such it can be demonstrated that both Caelius and Pollio wrote to Cicero using optimus quisque very specifically as a point of comparison and difference. The similarity in their usage, despite the passage of time and personal differences, would certainly indicate that an understanding of the meaning of this terminology was not only immediately apparent to Cicero, but would also be to his circle of acquaintances, friends and intimates. It can, therefore, be assumed that Brutus was also immediately aware of its meaning in the letter to him. Cicero was saying that the upper members of society (optimus quisque vir et civis), whether or not it is expedient to call them the ‘aristocrats’, were in full support of him and

---

63 Pierce (1922); Andrè (1946); Bosworth (1972); Gelzer (1972); Massa (1993).

64 The animosity Pollio had for Cicero would have increased, rather than diminished the political fiction he depicted towards Cicero, particularly in polite exchanges like this. For this dislike of Cicero: Sen. Suas. 6.15; 6.24. See also Andrè (1949: 24-5); Gabba (1956: 238-9, 265); (1957: 317); Noè (1984: 46-8); Hall (2009: 82-3).
the part which he is playing in politics. As mentioned earlier, this was exactly the support base which Brutus would have expected to attract.

The next element of society which Cicero referred to in the letter of recommendation for C. Nasennius was the *fortes viri* (*ad Brut.* 1.8.1):

> optimus enim quisque vir et civis maxime sequitur tuum iudicium tibique omnes fortis viri navare operam et studium volunt, nec quisquam est quin ita existimet, meam apud te et auctoritatem et gratiam valere plurimum.

> *For any best man and citizen is greatly inclined to follow your judgement and all brave men want enthusiastically to be of service to you, nor is there anyone who does not think that my influence and favour have great weight with you.*

There is a possibility that these represent a point of contrast with *optimus quisque*, with the inclusion of the suffix –*que* in *tibique* indicating a close linking. These men offer something to Brutus different from those who are disposed towards his political thought. They offer a direct service to him, and an enthusiastic one at that. The idiomatic phrase *navare operam et studium* can

---

65 T&P (1899: 205) described the approval of the part played in politics as the crucial element in Cicero’s use of *tuum iudicium* here.
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mean to come to one’s assistance, or to serve or assist enthusiastically. This is strengthened if operam et studium is considered to be a hendiadys. Who were these men and why were they given the descriptor fortes? One option is that these were those ‘brave men’ who had the courage and strength of conviction to act on Brutus’ behalf. However, in this lies a problem for Cicero. If they are brave because they openly work for Brutus’ benefit or have the courage to support him, then Cicero’s description of universal consent in Rome for the conspirators is flawed and merely a literary construction. However, before this can be claimed as proof of a rhetorical depiction, it must first be considered that fortis does not necessarily mean ‘brave’, but could alternatively mean ‘steadfast’ or ‘vigorous’. In this case, these active members stand in contrast to the elite who support Brutus’ judgement and political position, but yet are not demonstrative in their support. These fortes viri are not populists, but it would seem to indicate those men willing to support openly the cause. Whilst

66 OLD s.v. navo 1278 §1b.
67 OLD 797 §7. (of a person, his disposition, etc.) courageous, brave, bold, resolute; TLL 6.1.1148.5 §2. magis de sustinendo, tolerando (patiens, constans, pervicax sim.). For instance, in a letter to Cassius dated to 2 or 3 February 43 the word fortis again appears in a similar context. In that case, SB (1977: 502) favoured ‘firm’ and T&P (1899: 58) chose ‘vigorous’ (Fam. 12.4.1). This letter will be examined in the following pages.
68 Another proposed option is that Cicero used this term in his political language to be almost synonymous with ‘boni’, see Roggenbuck (1949); Marek (1966: 385). In both the Brutus letter here and the later Cassius letter, this seems unlikely as it would not fit into the context properly. Cicero had already talked about the optimus quisque and this inclusion as the boni would be essential a repetition of the same segment of the political community.
Cicero’s obvious intention is to strengthen Brutus’ own resolve by the courage of his supporters, the question remains: why did Cicero give them the qualifier *fortes*? The use of *fortis* could possibly relate to their bravery in regard to their fearlessness to engage in what could be conceived as dangerous or foolhardy.

The final grouping is listed through the litotes *nec quisquam* and directly links to the value to which Cicero’s influence and favour (*auctoritatem et gratiam*) is held with Brutus. Obviously this adds to the hyperbolic nature of this exchange, with such flattery expected in a letter of recommendation. Cicero would seem to employ a mirroring technique to exhibit favourable traits with the use of such terms as *iudicium*, *auctoritas*, and *gratias*. The fact that Cicero is talking about his own influence and favour holding sway with Brutus may also fit into the category of establishing envy to inspire the recipient into rectifying this imbalance. In the case of Brutus, this would mean a return to Rome to solidify his own position, influence and power.

Since Cicero has appeared to be going through groups or segments of the Roman community, it is likely that this is continuing here. If so, one could assume that this *quisquam* should represent the general populace, covered by the ambiguity of the generic. It would appear with this series of groupings that Cicero is attempting to establish a notion of universal consent, which will be discussed in the following pages. Suffice to say, he is building up the notion of
complete approval in Rome. Moving from the generic singular of the socio-economic elite (*optimus quisque vir et civis*), he then introduces the collective agreement of the politically active (*omnes fortes viri*), and finally to universal approval of all through the emphatic litotes and a return to the generic (*nec quisquam*). Put another way, he moves from the elite, to the politically active, to the average citizen on the street. By doing so, Cicero would make it seem to Brutus that all members of society, singularly and collectively, from the top to the bottom, from the passive to the vigorous participants in political activism, support him. Whether or not this support actually existed is impossible to tell, but the rhetorical technique is undeniably present in this letter.

While this passage has been shown to demonstrate the support of the social elite for Brutus, it seems that, at times, it was the most elite of Rome, the ex-consuls, who posed the most resistance to Cicero’s advice in the senate concerning the conspirators. This is particularly noteworthy in the letters to Cassius. A reason for this may be that Cassius, unlike Brutus, for some reason could not count as much on the support of the highest class. This, however, is not to say that Brutus never received a letter indicating lack of support in the senate, such as this one written around April 11, 43 (*ad Brut. 2.2.3*):

> quas statim cum recitavissem, cecidit Servilius, complures praeterea;

> sunt enim insignes aliquot qui improbissime sentiunt.
At that moment when I had recited this, Servilius collapsed, and with him several others; for there are several distinguished men who think most unscrupulously.

However, the reaction that this passage is describing was still in relation to Cassius, since Cicero had just read to the senate the report containing news of Cassius’ successes in the East, complete with legions and control of Syria. The use of the word *improbus* also appears in letters to Cassius when commenting on senatorial divisions, and this will be discussed below. The adverbial use here, even in the superlative, indicates that it is not the men themselves who are *improbus*, but rather their ways of thinking. This certainly softens the meaning, as opinions can be changed easier than the man. The indeclinable *aliquot* intentionally makes this division non-specific and indefinite, making it impossible to understand accurately the extent of the dissent. It was, however, sufficient to affect the debate.

Even though this letter demonstrated to Brutus some disagreement in the senate when discussing issues to do with Cassius, the makeup of loyalties in the senate in the direct correspondence directly with Cassius is made clearer.
For instance, in the first few days of February 43, Cicero wrote to Cassius and made the composition of support in the senate known to him (Fam. 12.4.1):69

quamquam egregios consules habemus, sed turpissimos consularis; senatum fortem, sed infimo quemque honore fortissimum. populo vero nihil fortius, nihil melius, Italiaque universa, nihil autem foedius Philippo et Pisone legatis, nihil flagitiosius.

*Although we have excellent consuls, nevertheless we have the most shameful consulars; we have a brave senate, but the bravest are those of the lowest rank. Indeed nothing is braver, nothing better, than the people and the whole of Italy, however, nothing is fouler than the emissaries Philippus and Piso, nothing more scandalous.*

This is a passage of juxtapositions, an exposé of the actions and sentiments of the senate and the people. The marked use of antithetical phrasings may provide further insights into Cicero’s meaning of *fortis* in relation to the senate structures and dealings. The first comparison is that of the excellent consuls (*egregii*) and the most shameful consulars (*turpissimi*).70 This was not the first time that Cicero had mentioned this to Cassius, for in late September to early

---

69 A previous letter in September had put forward this idea (Fam. 12.2.1-3). Mommsen (1893 615-618) attempted a reconstruction of these consulars.

70 Whilst not in itself superlative, *egregius* seems to equate to a superlative expression. In fact, *OLD* 654 *s.v. egregius* and *TLL* 5.2.287.37, 288.5-6, 290.69 note that the superlative form is rare and perhaps only appears in Pacuvius (*trag.* 230) and A. Gellius (14.5.3).
October he had written that with the exception of L. Cotta, L. Caesar, and Ser. Sulpicius, the rest of the consulars, barring the consul designates, were not worthy of this title (Fam. 12.2.3). Cicero had posed to Cassius at that time the question that if true consulars were scanty when things were going well, what could be expected at times of despair (perditis)?

The quick-fire repetition of the polyptoton of fortis, cycling through the varying degrees of the adjective immediately stands out. The senate itself holds the lesser form (fortis), though within its lowest ranks are those who are depicted by the superlative fortissimus. Did Cicero really view these men as the bravest, or are they described in this way here in order to provide another hyperbolic, dramatic comparison to accentuate the disapproval Cicero feels for the consulars? Of course, it cannot be denied that they are described in such flattering terms merely because these are the ones who support Cicero, yet in the same way, the comparison seems convincing. The comparative term is preserved for the people. Cicero, however, uses a clever trick here. By placing the comparative after the superlative, he can make fortior stronger than fortissimus, since comparatives are relative to the two points in association. The lower ranks may be the ‘bravest’ in the senate, yet over all it is the people who

---

71 reliquis exceptis designatis – ignosce mihi, sed non numero consularis – ‘The rest, with the exception of the consuls designates, forgive me, but I do not count them as consulars.’

72 qui numerus etiam bonis rebus exiguus esset, quid censes perditis? – ‘The number of which are scanty even in good matters, what do you think it will be in desperate matters?’
are even ‘braver’ than them. He then steps up the rhetoric to reveal the universality of the support for the conspirators throughout Italy (*Italia universa*). The implications of this are about to be considered.

Before this can be examined, however, the rest of this letter needs consideration. Having moved through the adjectival degrees of *fortis*, the final outcome is the comparison with the *foedius* and the *flagitiosius* in describing the emissary of Philippus and Piso.\(^{73}\) Their return from Antonius, with his counter demands and his envoy L. Varius Cotyla in tow, was too much for Cicero, who was astonished that they could even have listened to these demands without complete indignation.\(^{74}\) The embassy had been sent to Antonius for a reason, and their return was seen as a compromise which Cicero was not willing to concede. If *fortis* is therefore acting as a comparison to the embassy’s disgrace in compromising, with the comparative adjectives indicating the need to considered this in relation to the actions of others, a translation such as Shackleton Bailey’s ‘firm’ or ‘steadfast’ would seem appropriate. It is clear that this letter abounds in literary and rhetorical techniques designed to impart a message and persuade Cassius in regard to a particular perspective, one in which the senate was problematic, but where the people of Rome almost unanimously supported him.

---

\(^{73}\) L. Marcius Philippus and L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus were the surviving members of the embassy sent to Antonius. The third member, Servius Sulpicius Rufus, had died on the journey.

\(^{74}\) *Phil.* 8.10.28; Manuwald (2007: 1017-8).
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This is confirmed in the next letter in the correspondence to Cassius. Written at the end of February, the letter contains an almost identical picture of the position in Rome. The difference is that all the references to fortis have now been replaced in favour of the clearer meaning firmus (Fam. 12.5.2-3):

> erat firmissimus senatus exceptis consularibus, ex quibus unus L. Caesar firmus est et rectus. Ser. Sulpici morte magnum praesidium amisimus. reliqui partim inertes, partim improbi; non nulli invident eorum laudi quos in re publica probari vident. populi vero Romani totiusque Italiae mira consensio est.

The senate was most steadfast except the consulars, from whom only L. Caesar is steadfast and upright. We have lost a great support with the death of Servius Sulpicius. The rest are part inactive, part disloyal. Some are envious of the praise of those whom they see have gained approval in the State. The unanimity of the people of Rome and the whole of Italy is truly amazing.

The similarities between the two passages are undeniable, and seem to confirm that fortis, at least in this context, is synonymous with firmus. However, when describing those that are not resolute, Cicero provides reasons why this is the case, and the first is inactivity (inertes). In this way the idea of vigour in their
support contained within the initial investigation of the word *fortis* can still remain.

Cicero again laments that the consulars do not share in the senate’s resolve (*erat firmissimus senatus exceptis consularibus*). He points to the death of Servius Sulpicius as a great loss, another supporting consular that could no longer help the cause. He then points to three reasons for the irresoluteness of the consulars: inactivity (*partim inertes*), disloyalty (*partim improbi*), and envy (*non nulli invident eorum laud*). This envy is for those who have met State approval. This was seen by Shackleton Bailey as approval of one’s statesmanship, which would place the reference firmly on Cicero.\(^75\) It is in this context that the idea of disloyalty must be examined.

*Improbus* has many meanings within the context. Firstly it can be comparative to the actions of the embassy from the previous letter, which will be clearly shown to have caused Cicero considerable angst. It is obvious by Cicero’s intense reaction to the return of the embassy that he saw the action of compromise with Antonius as a form of disloyalty and not to be tolerated. Secondly, and most clearly, it relates to those who do not share Cicero’s loyalties, and, by association, must support Antonius. The clearest indication of this is the comparison of this passage of *improbi* and *probari*. If it is correct to

\(^75\) SB (1977: 505). This opinion was anticipated by T&P (1899: 65) and How (1926: 524).
translate *in re publica probari* as the approval of statesmanship, those *improbi* must relate to those whose statesmanship is to be disapproved of, that is they are disloyal to the State and Cicero’s notion of the ideal statesman. This does not necessarily mean that they are staunch Caesarians, but that their attitude and oppositional stance at this point in time makes their actions non-beneficial to the State and hostile to Cicero’s vision. That is, by blocking Cicero’s proposals, which he views as always done to the advantage of the Roman people and the republic, they are not living up to the ideal of the Roman statesmen and leaders in politics, who should be united by the agreement of law and a common benefit (*Rep.* 1.39).

In this letter, as in the previous one, the actions of the members of the senate are brought into question, though few details are given of the ways in which the consulars are less than resolute. The impression seems to be that although these are issues in the senate, the popular opinion throughout the city and country is in full support of the conspirators. To add dramatic effect, this support is so great that even Cicero voices his amazement (*mira consensio*). This again may indicate an attempt to persuade through the use of literary techniques including the suggestion of universal consent within the populace.
The disgust at the conduct of the consulars can also be detected in the *Philippics*, particularly the Eighth which corresponds in timing to the last letter examined. In relation to the shameful embassy, Cicero makes the simple declaration that Rome has been deserted by its leaders (*Phil. 8.7.22*). He then continues to describe the obligations of the consulars (*Phil. 8.10.29-11.32a*), ending with a reflection on how the consulares have conducted themselves in the civil war, using the return of the embassy from Antonius as the lens by which to examine this (*Phil. 8.11.32*):

> non enim ita gerimus nos hoc bello consulares ut aequo animo populus Romanus visurus sit nostri honoris insignia, cum partim e nobis ita timidi sint ut omnem populi Romani beneficiorum memoriam abiecerint, partim ita a re publica aversi ut se hosti favere prae se ferant, legatos nostros ab Antonio despectos et inrisos facile patiantur, legatum Antoni sublevatum velint.

> For we consulars have not borne ourselves in such a way in this war that the Roman people will look upon the insignia of our rank with equanimity, when some of us are so timid as to cast away all

---


77 *deserti, deserti, inquam, sumus, patres conscripti, a principibus* – ‘Deserted, we are deserted, I say, conscript fathers, by our leaders.’

78 On those consulars see Mommsen (1893: 615-8); Syme (1939: 163-5); SB (1977: 481-2); Manuwald (2007: 910).
recollection of the benefits of the Roman people, others are so estranged from the State that they bear their favour for the enemy openly, suffering easily the disrespect and ridicule from Antonius placed upon our embassy, and wanting the legate of Antonius to be supported.

This is a speech to the senate themselves, and calls upon those present to reflect upon their behaviour at this stage of the war. From the fearful to the openly hostile, the basic premise is that by abandoning the needs and benefits of the people and the State, the ex-consuls had become unworthy of the honour bestowed upon them. These are the equivalent of the improbi of Cassius’ letter, though now there is more detail provided about how they are disloyal to the State. This rhetoric, including much of the same phrasing and concepts, continued in a later speech to the senate (Phil. 14.7.17):

hoc vero tempore in tanta inopia constantium et fortium consularium quo me dolore adfici creditis, cum alios male sentire, alios nihil omnino curare videam, alios parum constanter in suscepta causa permanere sententiamque suam non semper utilitate rei publicae, sed tum spe, tum timore moderari?

Truly at this time, in such shortage of resolute and brave consulars, with what pain do you believe I am afflicted, when I see some are
traitorous, others are utterly careless, and others continuing with little resolve in the cause undertaken and moderating their opinion not always in the interest of the State, but now by hope, now by fear?

Cicero reverses the order of severity by the *Fourteenth*, starting with the most severe and ending with the waverers. An atmosphere of fear and uncertainty permeates the passages as Cicero moves from those of bad intentions to the apathetic to the fence-sitters who pass from side to side as the general feeling in Rome shifts. The focus in the *Philippics* is on the disappointment and fracturing within the order, and how far this has taken the senate from its ideal state. In the letters to Cassius, even though containing references to this, the general mood and consensus is that there is support in Rome, particularly amongst the people, for the conspirators. The purposes and audience, of course, are very different and account for much of this discrepancy. It will, therefore, be profitable to look at another letter from this period to see if any further differences can be identified.

The letter to C. Trebonius, contemporaneous with the letters to Cassius, offers such a viewpoint (*Fam. 10.28.3*):

habemus fortem senatum, consularis partim timidos, partim male sentientis. magnum damnum factum est in Servio. L. Caesar optime sentit, sed, quod avunculus est, non acerrimas dicit sententias.
consules egregii, praeclarus D. Brutus, egregius puer Caesar, de quo spero equidem reliqua…

We have a steadfast senate, yet some consulars are fearful, others traitorous. The death of Servius was a great loss. L. Caesar has the best opinions, yet, being the uncle (of Antonius), he does not say his most pointed opinions. The consuls are outstanding; D. Brutus is splendid, the young Caesar is admirable, about whom I hope his future remains on this path…

Similarities between this letter and the earlier examined letter to Cassius can immediately be seen, and this may be expected in respect to senatorial support. Not only was Trebonius from equestrian origins and amongst Caesar’s novi homines, which many count for some reduced support amongst the more staunch republican senators, but he was also one of those ex-consuls Cicero had been addressing in the Philippics. As such, this letter seems to stand in between the expression of events in the Philippics and the correspondence to Cassius. The separation of consulars into the fearful (timidos) and the

---

79 For Trebonius’ equestrian background (NP s.v. Trebonius). The letter from Antonius to the consul reported in the Thirteenth Philippic seems to depict Trebonius’ father as an idler or buffoon (scurra), though the propagandist tone for justifying Dolabella’s killing of one of Caesar’s assassins is manifest (Cic. Phil. 13.10.23). Cicero reverses this in his answer, referring to him instead as splendidus eques Romanus. Cicero also refers to him in this letter as civis acerrimus (Fam. 10.28.1). In possible support of Antonius’ depiction is Horace (Sat. 1.4.114).

80 Trebonius had been a suffect consul in 45 BC.
treacherous (*male sentientis*) mimics closely the *Philippic* in its use of the cognates *timidus* and *timor*, and the phrase *alius male sentire* of the *Philippic* closely resembles the *male sentientis* of this letter. In both the *Philippics* and the letter to Trebonius, the expressions of treachery are considerably more defamatory and inflammatory than those in the letters to Cassius, in which consulars were inactive, disloyal and envious. The position of L. Caesar has also changed for Trebonius in comparison to Cassius. Although still being a man of the best sentiments, he is forced to tone down his opinions due to his relations with Antonius. This remark is notably absent from the version of events sent to Cassius, possibly because it would diminish the expression of support in the senate if this limitation was included. In this letter, as in the letter to Cassius, *fortis* makes a reappearance to convey the idea of a ‘steadfast’ senate (*habemus fortem senatum*). This is different from the use of *fortis* in the above passages from the *Philippics* where it appears in respect to what the senate is lacking, not what it has. In this regard a signal of hope in a senate which will prevail appears to be passed on in the personal letters to both Trebonius and Cassius. This would suggest that Cicero in the correspondence is trying to

---

81 As mentioned earlier, *improbus* can be a difficult word to translate in context. In the letter to Cassius in question it was decided that ‘disloyal’ was the best translation as the position was that these were the men who were opposing Cicero in the senate. In any case, this is less aggressive than the treachery indicated by *male sentire*.
portray the situation in the senate as problematic but generally manageable despite some elements of disagreement and dissent.

Again, the audience and purpose of these pieces differ significantly, and this accounts for much of the difference. The disappointment in the *Philippics* is much more forthright and biting, designed to shake the consulars into action and a return to what Cicero sees as their purpose – as an ideal model of the statesman through which the rest of the senate can draw strength. The letter to Trebonius takes the middle ground, whilst fear and treachery are mentioned, the opening statement puts forth Cicero’s intention and overall feeling – ‘we have a steadfast senate’. Problems may exist, the consulars need to stand up and do the right thing, but overall the situation is manageable. The message to Cassius is much the same, though the severity of the problems which Cicero faces in the senate are reduced or omitted in order to lessen the feeling of dissent and to increase a sense of universal support and hope in Rome. It can therefore be suggested that Cicero has altered his account of the support and loyalties in the senate for different recipients.

This is further demonstrated by the absence of any expression regarding universal support for the conspirators in the letter to Trebonius. Cicero’s plans for Trebonius are different from his intentions for Cassius and Brutus. He does not want Trebonius to act as a figurehead for the restoration of the republic, nor
to return to Rome as a triumphant hero. Instead, he wants him to stay strong in the province and resist any incursion from the enemy, within or without. As such, rather than talk about support in Rome, Cicero refers to the resoluteness of those men actively challenging Antonius’ military push: Pansa and Hirtius, D. Brutus and Octavian. From the letter to Trebonius, the impression of external matters being handled outweighs the internal issues in the senate. It will be noted that Cicero uses *egregius* for both Hirtius and Pansa as well as Octavian in this passage, separated by the *praeclarus* for D. Brutus. In doing so he creates a chiastic structure which not only adds balance to the line, but links Octavian to the consuls and the defence of the State against Antonius. It may be suggested that this was an attempt by Cicero to ease some of the tension that the conspirators must have been feeling over the sudden rise of Caesar’s adopted son. Further still, Cicero neutralises this possible apprehension by first referencing him by the name Octavian, rather than the title he preferred, Caesar,\(^{82}\) and through the somewhat condescending use of *puer* to describe him. Whatever Cicero’s intention was, there is no denying the passage is thick with rhetoric and literary devices.

\(^{82}\) Cicero is remarkably inconsistent in how he refers to Octavian. Octavian’s preference for Caesar is expressed in the letter to Atticus from April 44 where Cicero noted that his followers called him Caesar, but Cicero had decided not to (*Att. 14.12.2*). This can also be noted in the letter Matius wrote to Cicero in August/October where he called Octavian *Caesar adolescens* (*Fam. 11.28.6*). Then, progressively he refers to him as Octavianus to Cornificius in October (*Fam. 12.23.2*), Octavius to Tiro in November (*16.24.2*), and *meus Caesar* to D. Brutus in January (*Fam. 11.8.2*).
One final letter, written early in March to Cassius, will suffice to build the picture of resistance in the senate and popular support amongst the people which Cicero continued to present to varying degrees in the correspondence. In this letter, Cicero points out the source of resistance as the consul Pansa (Fam. 12.7.1):

quae mea sententia in senatu facile valuisset, nisi Pansa vehementer obstitisset. ea sententia dicta productus sum in contionem a tribuno pl. M. Servilio. dixi de te quae potui, tanta contentione quantum forum est, tanto clamore consensuque populi ut nihil umquam simile viderim.

*That proposal of mine would have prevailed easily in the senate, if Pansa had not vehemently resisted. Once I had presented my argument, I was led forward into the assembly by the tribune of the plebs, M. Servilius. I spoke about you what I could, with a passion as huge as the forum, so much were the shouts and the applause of the people that I have never seen anything similar before.*

The context of this disagreement in the senate is over who should take up command against Dolabella. Cicero had pushed for Cassius, whilst the consul Pansa had argued that it should be held for the consuls, i.e. himself and Hirtius, until after they had dealt with Antonius at Mutina. The letter to Brutus on April 12
demonstrates that this decree was eventually passed in favour of Cassius (*ad Brut. 2.4.2*), though the *Philippics* indicate more of the compromise which was needed to get through the decree, including the clause by which either consul can restructure provinces and commands if he so chooses after the restoration of the State (*Phil. 11.12.29-31*).

Pansa’s aggressive resistance (*vehementer obstitisset*) of Cicero’s proposal is weakened, however, when Cicero is led to the assembly by M. Servilius, the tribune of the plebs. This is the same tribune who had brought Cicero to the assembly to deliver the *Fourth Philippic* on December 20, 44.*Unfortunately the *contio* to the assembly following Pansa’s resistance is not extant, but as indicated here by Cicero, it was well received. In fact, the hyperbole in describing his own passion as being as huge as the forum (*tanta contentione quantum forum est*) has been noted for its odd expression, though it is admittedly Ciceronian.* The need for such vigorous oration was to overcome the thunderous shouts and applause of the people. Again Cicero uses hyperbole to demonstrate the emphatic support of the people, those present at the *contio*, for the proposal for Cassius to take on the command (*nihil umquam simile viderim*). The inclusion of personal experience through the first person

---

83 This letter was discussed in the previous chapter (pp. 249-253).

84 *Phil. 4.6.16*.

expression adds a touch of authenticity to the depiction and increases the rhetorical effect.

What these letters and speeches demonstrate is that there were definite signs of disapproval regarding Cicero’s proposals, and less than collective support for the conspirators amongst some of the senators. Despite this, there are multiple declarations in the letters to Cassius and Brutus that point towards not only overwhelming popularity of the conspirators, but also universal consent. This last letter, with the reference to the *contio*, may hold the key to what Cicero’s intention was by depicting the universality of support in a Rome, despite there still being divided loyalties.

### 3.2: THE RHETORIC OF UNIVERSAL CONSENT

As has been shown, the appeal to universal popularity and support is a feature of the letters to Cassius and Brutus. Even when the situation in the senate indicates a level of disagreement, the support by the Roman people is often depicted as unanimously in favour of the conspirators, commonly with the use of a simple phrase (*ad Brut. 2.1.3*):

> maioris autem partis animi te Cassiumque respiciunt
However, the thoughts of the majority look to you and Cassius.

Of course, it is difficult to know the level of support they actually had amongst the people. Appian’s hostile source depicts Cassius and Brutus bribing the crowds to yell out support for them after the death of Caesar and at the Games of Apollo in which Brutus was notably absent (BC 2.120-1; 3.24.1). However, the nature of historical writing generally places the major machinations of this period away from Rome and there are often only glimpses of political life in the capital, except for Cicero.

Even after the victory at Mutina, and the consequent public enemy status for Antonius, Dolabella, and Lepidus, when Republican hopes rose significantly, resistance was still present. The property levy for the Republican war effort was unpopular (ad Brut. 1.18.5), and resistance in the senate continued (Fam. 11.14.1):

"mihi crede, homini non glorioso; plane iam, Brute, frigeo; ὄργανον
enim erat meum senatus; id iam est dissolutum."

"Believe me, as a man not prone to boasting; clearly now, Brutus, I am impotent; for the senate was my instrument; but now it is dissolute."
The senate was no longer Cicero’s ὀργανόν in this letter to Decimus Brutus written at the end of May. On another front, Cicero’s attempt to postpone the priestly elections had required a great deal of debate and persuasion (mea summa contentione) (ad Brut. 1.14.1), and in mid-June, he wrote (ad Brut. 1.10.1):

...ingravescit enim in dies intestine malum nec externis hostibus magis quam domesticis laboramus, qui erant omnino ab initio belli sed facilius frangebantur...

...for the internal unrest grows daily and we are distressed no more by our external enemies than by those inside the gates, enemies who have existed since the beginning of the war, but were then more easily subdued...

This statement alone indicates that popular support in Rome fell well short of ‘the consent of all.’ Furthermore, the inability to install suffect consuls following the death of Hirtius and Pansa indicates the State in crisis and disagreement. The support of Octavian, including rumours of a consulship, suggests the

---

86 Just as Cicero had voiced his frustration at the lack of progress or a contingency plan following the assassination of Caesar, so too now did he reveal further irritation at the lack of momentum after Mutina, and with it came the fading of hope.
fracturing of coalitions between various pivotal figures. Unrest and polarisation in Rome would likely have grown as the Western generals progressively defected to Antonius, creating a force which was gradually building the appearance of an army united under the Caesarian standard. This growing unease is expressed in the cautionary statements given to Brutus dated to April 20, and probably dispatched before knowledge of the victory at Forum Gallorum arrived in Rome (ad Brut. 1.2a.3):

\[
\text{opprimemini, mihi crede, Brute, nisi providetis. neque enim populum semper eundem habeitis neque senatum neque senatus ducem. haec ex oraculo Apollinis Pythi edita tibi puta. nihil potest esse verius.}
\]

\textit{Take my word for it, Brutus, you will be crushed, if you do not make provisions; for you will not always have the same people, senate, nor the same leader of the senate. Consider these as utterances spoken...}

---

87 By June there were rumours of Octavian coveting the consulship (ad Brut. 1.4a.4; 1.10.3; cf. App. BC 3.82, 337ff; D.C. 46.42.2; Plu. Cic. 45f). The rumours were over by August when Octavian marched on Rome (cf. App. BC 3.88, 361; 3.92, 382).

88 Of significance were the defections of Ventidius, Lepidus, Pollio, and Plancus. Cicero’s correspondence only covers the defection of the first two, and cuts out before the joining of Pollio and Plancus to Antonius’ banner.

89 SB (1980: 231). Notwithstanding that T&P (1899: 112-3) agree that if the date xii Kal. at the end of the letter is correct it must have been dispatched early in the morning, they preferred an emendation to the xv Kal. or April 17. The MSS show xii in Σbd, and xiii in EMms. Schmidt suggested xv, which is the source of Tyrrell and Purser’s preference.
to you from the oracle of the Pythian Apollo. Nothing can be more accurate.

This letter conveys a growing concern that any support for the conspirators which Cicero had accrued and maintained was not to be counted on for any fixed period of time. There is the sense of urgency and frustration with an impression of inactivity from the conspirators. It is crucial to notice the positioning of the support, beginning with the people, moving into the senate and finally to the leader of the senate. There is no mention made here of any divisions within the senate.90 Again, this seems to reflect the previous indications of a more inclusive support in the senate for Brutus, though it is also clear that any mention of fracturing in the senate would be counterproductive to Cicero’s line of argument here. The point of this passage is to impart to Brutus that whilst support was available at this moment, he should not count on it lasting forever.91

90 It may be advantageous to point out here that the letters to Cassius and Cornificius, where the senate divisions were mentioned, were both from February, whereas the lament of the loss of the senate as a tool dates from the end of May. It is difficult to imagine a sudden acquiescence in the senate during March and April, especially given the divided opinions indicated earlier and the growing tension and uncertainty as the threat of war with Antonius crept closer towards open conflict.

91 The final comment on the veracity of the statement in reference to the Delphic Oracle seems to be an idiomatic Latin phrase, appearing in multiple authors of the republican periods (Ter. An. 698; Pl. Ps. 480; Lucr. 1.738), as well as being used by Cicero with a similar sentiment in the Tusculan Disputations (Tusc. 1.17).
The situation in Rome seems more complex than Cicero presented to Cassius and Brutus. Resistance to the conspirators, and to the proposals of Cicero, continued. However, despite this, Cicero continued to portray a simpler version of overwhelming support. The repeated requests to return, in association with these impressions of support, indicate that the primary purpose of Cicero’s depictions was to entice Cassius and Brutus back to Rome, preferably with their armies, for the defence of Rome and the republic. There is a disparity between the perceived level of consent and Cicero’s presentation of this support.

Another example from the start of June 43 illustrates Cicero’s over-zealous attempt to depict Cassius as a popular man in Rome (Fam. 12.8.2):

\[\text{te quidem magnum hominem et praesenti iudicio et reliqui temporis exspectatione scito esse. hoc tibi proposito fac ut ad summa contendas. nihil est tantum quod non populus Romanus a te perfici atque obtineri posse iudicet.}\]

\[\text{Know indeed that you are a great man both in present judgment and in the expectation for the rest of time. With this placed before you,}\]

\[\text{92} \text{ Cicero potentially was risking further problems in requesting their return. Even putting aside his reputation and the position and reputation of Cassius and Brutus, there was a real threat to the Eastern provincial stability, either from Antonian supporters or provincial uprisings, if Cassius and Brutus should have moved with their armies towards Rome.}\]
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make it so that you strain for the highest. Nothing is so great that the
Roman people do not judge it to be possible for you to complete and
possess.

The polite exaggeration is obvious, as it was presumably to Cassius. Emphasising his greatness serves not only to bolster Cassius’ ego and confidence, but also provides him with the benchmark for future actions. Having established this, Cicero introduces the depiction of Cassius as universally supported and trusted.

In the letters to Cassius mentioned in the previous section, references to the bravery and unanimity of not only the Roman people, but also the whole of Italy (*Italiaque universa / totiusque Italiae*) display this consent within the Italian peninsula (*Fam. 12.4.1; 12.5.2-3*). In the correspondence to Brutus, this support is at times simple in its expression and exaggeration (*ad Brut. 1.10.4*):

\[
\text{omnis omnium concursus ad te futurus est.}
\]

*Every gathering of all men will be towards you.*

At other times the hyperbole is dramatic, such as the letter to Brutus following the news that he had taken control of the province of Macedonia and that C. Antonius was shut up in Apollonia (*ad Brut. 2.5.2*):\(^{93}\)

---

\(^{93}\) This despatch is the subject of the *Tenth Philippic.*
di immortales! qui ille nuntius, quae illae litterae, quae laetitia senatus, quae alacritas civitatis erat! nihil umquam vidi tam omnium consensione laudatum.

Immortal gods! What a message that was, what a despatch, how jubilant was the senate, how rapturous were the citizens! I have never seen anything praised with such complete unanimity.

The embellishment again serves to depict Brutus as having the support and respect of all Rome. Cicero, in emphasising the universality of this praise, mentions directly both the senate and the citizen body before he refers to the consent of all (omnium consensione). The jubilation of the senate (laetitia) is a far cry from the difficulties Cicero was having with motions concerning Cassius a month earlier. The departure of Pansa from Rome may certainly have helped since he seemed to be a major force of opposition to the assigning of an official position to Cassius in Syria.94 However, it has already been shown in the previous chapter that the news of Brutus’ capture of Macedonia brought mixed feelings in Rome,95 all of which is omitted here. There is no denying a change in approach when reporting senatorial support to Brutus. The zeal or enthusiasm (alacritas) of the citizenry adds to the sense of joy throughout Rome, sealed

94 Particularly since the consul’s tendency to call on his father-in-law Calenus in Senatorial debate. Examples of this obvious resistance from Calenus and Pansa can be seen in the Tenth and Eleventh Philippics.
95 See p. 245-246.
with another hyperbole and the authenticity of personal observation (*nihil umquam vidi*), the reporting of a state of complete accord is emphatic. This entire passage, replete with emotion, movement, hyperbole, personal experience and resolution, would seem just as at home in the theatre as in this personal letter.

Cicero even appears to use universal attention as a tool to encourage Brutus to discontinue his grief and resume his mission following the death of his wife Porcia (*ad Brut. 1.9.2*):

> ac mihi tum, Brute, officio solum erat et naturae, tibi nunc populo et scaenae, ut dicitur, serviendum est. nam cum in te non solum exercitus tui sed omnium civium ac paene gentium coniecti oculi sint, minime decet propter quem fortiores ceteri sumus eum ipsum animo debilitatum videri.

*But at that time, Brutus, I had to pay regard only to duty and nature, but you must pay regard to the people and the stage - as the saying goes. For when the eyes of not only your army, but of all citizens and of almost all nations are turned towards you, it is not at all seemly for the one on account of whom we are braver, to seem, in his own case, enfeebled in spirit.*
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This letter again refers to the duty which a Roman statesman should abide by. In comparing Brutus’ emotional state to his own grief at the death of his daughter Tullia, Cicero declares that he held no high office, so his obligations were only personal. Brutus’ responsibilities, however, are more pressing because they are in public view. The role of the ideal statesman, notably the obligation to benefit and take care of the people, comes out strongly in the passive periphrastic conjunction. Cicero then turns to a colloquial phrase (ut dicitur) relating to the part one plays on the stage (scaena), i.e. in public life, which Horace seems to relate to the political sphere (S. 2.1.71). In light of this important position which Brutus holds, Cicero considers that it would be detrimental to appear in any way debilitated, especially in spirit, on the stage on which he is viewed. The varied parts which Brutus was playing at this point included commander, statesman, and liberator, and as such the tricolon crescendo of genitives express this (exercitus tui ... civium ac paene gentium). Although reference to Brutus’ civil role is not unusual, his role as a commander is often underplayed, and it is this military position that stands out as an important element of Cicero’s depiction of him here. A commander thought of as

---

feeble by his army was a recipe for disaster, but there are other reasons for this new-found focus on Brutus’ military reputation.  

The letter above dates to sometime around June 18. Much had happened since the victories at Forum Gallorum and the rescue of Decimus at Mutina on April 21. By now Lepidus’ defection to Antonius on May 29 was well known, and news in Rome of the conflict with Dolabella seemed mostly rumours. Octavian’s refusal to support Decimus in his pursuit of Antonius was troublesome, and all that seemed left on the republican side was Decimus and Plancus, with a possibility of Pollio coming up from Spain. This was against a growing Caesarian force in Antonius’ camp: Ventidius had sneaked through to Antonius with three veteran legions, with or without Octavian’s aid or hindrance, and now Lepidus was with him. Plancus was holding strong against the attempted parleys and incentives coming from the Caesarians, during the time that he waited for Decimus at Cularo (Fam. 10.23).

With this precarious military situation, it is not surprising that Cicero began to look for military forces that could come to the State’s aid. There was one nearby, that of the young Caesar, but his loyalties were progressively more questionable, and on more than one occasion Cicero was finding the need to

97 White (2010: 57) noticed a sharp focus on military affairs in this final stage of the correspondence.

justify or to assure others of Octavian’s allegiance. By mid-July the situation appears to have again changed. Cicero was now using the threat of Octavian and his army as an incentive for Brutus to return (*ad Brut. 1.14.2*):

> exercitus autem Caesaris, qui erat optimus, non modo nihil prodest sed etiam cogit exercitum tuum flagitari; qui si Italiam attigerit, erit civis nemo, quem quidem civem appellari fas sit, qui se non in tua castra conferat.

*However, the forces of Caesar, which were excellent, are not only of no benefit but even compel your army to be sought urgently. If it should land in Italy, there will be no citizen, who is worthy to be called a citizen, who would not convey himself into your camp.*

The military language in this passage is thicker, with the army of Octavian juxtaposed to the army of Brutus. The movement from the imperfect tense of Octavian’s army being excellent to the present tense of the urgent need to seek Brutus’ army underlies the earnestness of the situation. The meaning of *optimus* in this context must relate to the loyalty which these troops exhibited for the State,99 which of course, was exemplary against Antonius at Mutina. Cicero’s use of the imperfect suggests that these troops had since become less reliable

99 *OLD* (261 § 7a) demonstrates the use of *bonus* in association with troops relates to their ‘reliability’ and ‘trustworthiness’. *TLL* (2.0.2080.8-9) links the use with troops to *fortis* and *strenuous*. *SB* (1980: 245) also saw this connection to loyalty.
and, as he insinuates here, were becoming a possible liability. This could be interpreted as an attempt to spark the hostility and rivalry which Brutus felt towards Octavian, and to use this to accentuate the urgency of the need for Brutus’ return to Rome. Cicero augments this by noting that should Brutus return, then the support of the State was definitely with him. All the true citizens would rush to his camp, and by this action, would support Brutus over Octavian. One may assume that Cicero wanted this to be true and for Brutus to be persuaded by it, and this is what lies at the heart of these depictions. It was in Brutus’ hands, and it was his responsibility to divert this potential disaster.

Cicero potentially continues the use of military language in the verb attingo, which could be depicting Brutus’ return as a military operation in regaining Italy for the republic, accompanied by the use of castra as the rallying point for the citizens of Rome. Even the restrictive use of quidem to indicate those who support Brutus are those citizens worthy of the title adds to the air of resistance and warfare. The use of fas is particularly powerful, with its connections to

---

100 A comparison could be made with the opening passage to Brutus where Cicero used his own success and congratulations from the people to stir up a sense of rivalry or envy between Brutus and himself (ad Brut. 1.3.2).

101 On a basic level attingere means to arrive to/at (TLL 2.0.1145.20), but it can also carry the meaning of gain possession or control of, to assail and to lay a finger on in an assault (OLD 221 §2a, 2c, 10b; cf. TLL 2.0.1144.50 §2).

divine and natural law as compared to the laws of men.\textsuperscript{103} By doing so, Cicero calls Brutus’ supporters the true citizens, ordained by natural law. It was only from these true citizens that universal consensus can derive.\textsuperscript{104} Cicero constructs a sense of overwhelming support for Brutus through the use of the negative qualifier (\textit{civis nemo}). This depiction creates the image of two military encampments vying for control of Rome: the Roman republican citizen army of Brutus, chosen by natural law, versus the often self-serving,\textsuperscript{105} possibly rebellious, and by default, non-citizen army of Octavian.

Amidst these growing military tensions, Brutus was pondering another difficult decision he needed to make: how to treat the brother of Antonius. This became even more complicated and perilous after C. Antonius, along with the other supporters of Antonius, was declared a public enemy. Brutus’ consistent approach was towards clemency, but Cicero made it clear that no such quarter should be given. In trying to convince Brutus in mid-July, he again called upon the notion of universal consent (\textit{ad Brut. 1.15.11}):

\begin{quote}
quamquam haec quidem sententia non magis mea fuit quam omnium.
\end{quote}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[\textsuperscript{103}] OLD 743 s.v. \textit{fas}.
\item[\textsuperscript{104}] The connection between natural law and universal consent will be discussed below.
\item[\textsuperscript{105}] If not Caesarian at this point in time.
\end{footnotes}
Although this particular opinion was not more mine than that of everyone.

He did not stop there, however, and moved this on to the next stage, by stating that not only was the consent universal for the Roman citizenry, but all States throughout history had the same opinion:

sed id et antiquum est et omnium civitatum…

But this is an ancient usage and common to all States…

This is a clear example of universal consent being used to justify and legitimise a point of view. The fact that Cicero expands this approval beyond a Roman context to relate the harsh treatment of public enemies on a basis of a universal truth, unaffected by time or place, further demonstrates the expected weight that such an argument should have carried with Brutus, shifting it towards a consensus gentium argument.

In this same letter to Brutus, Cicero reveals his consummate skill in creating complex depictions, combining the idea of popularity with other motives (ad Brut. 1.15.12):

sed haec quidem non ita necessaria, illud valde necessarium, Brute, te in Italiam cum exercitu venire quam primum. summa est exspectatio tui; quod si Italiam attigeris, ad te concursus fiet omnium.
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But indeed this is not so urgent, but what is highly urgent, Brutus, is that you come to Italy with your army as soon as possible. There is the greatest expectation of you; since if you land in Italy, a gathering of all men will rush to you.

The language, with its depictions of armies and military operational landings on the Italian peninsula, is almost identical to the previously examined letter. The notable exception is that Cicero has removed the qualitative version of a Roman citizen, and replaced it with a universal gathering of men to the flag of Brutus (ad te concursus fiet omnium).\(^{106}\) The promise of popularity in Rome, however, is mingled with a sense of responsibility and expectation. The urgency in this letter is a standout feature. Vocabulary alone provides a sense of movement and the need for immediate action: necessarius (used twice in antithesis), venire quam primum, summa est exspectatio, even concursus gives the idea of rapid movement. Later in this same passage the urgency is undeniable with the phrase sed propera, per deos! (‘But hurry, for the gods’ sake!’).

So why does Cicero depict Cassius and Brutus as being the recipients of universal consent and popularity? Even though it is obvious that he manipulates the depictions in order to attempt to persuade Cassius and Brutus to do his bidding, it would seem that a declaration on the consent of all had far greater

\(^{106}\) This concursus omnium had also appeared in ad Brut. 1.10.4.
implications in Roman republican politics. For instance, there seems to be a direct link for Cicero between liberty and the power of the people to make decisions (Rep. 1.47):

> itaque nulla alia in civitate, nisi in qua populi potestas summa est, ullum domicilium libertas habet; qua quidem certe nihil potest esse dulcius, et quae si aequa non est ne libertas quidem est.

> And so in no other constitution, except one in which the power of the people is sovereign, can liberty have any abode; than which indeed without a doubt nothing can be sweeter, and which, unless it is equal, is not even liberty.

These words from the *de Re Publica*, written between 54 and 51 BC, were placed in the mouth of Scipio, and seem to indicate that the democratic principle alone produced true liberty.¹⁰⁷ When writing to Cassius and Brutus concerning the support from all of Rome, the people feature prominently. Cicero, by declaring universal support for the conspirators, infuses his requests with the power of the people. This in effect marks them as the bearers of liberty. If this is

¹⁰⁷ Wirszubski (1950: 9-10) states that this passage implies that ‘libertas ought to amount to complete egalitarianism and true government of the people’. In this way it is likened to the Greek concept of ἐλευθερία καὶ ἴσονομία. His reflections on Cicero’s writings on democratic equality revealed the obvious Greek origin of Cicero’s philosophy, but more interestingly for this study, Wirszubski referred to it all as probably purely literary in its purpose.
so, in denying the appeal of the people they could be considered to be denying their role as ‘liberators’.

A similar sentiment is seen in Cicero’s defence of the belief in the existence of the divine in the *Tusculan Disputations* written following the death of Tullia in 45 B.C. (1.13.30):

>nec vero id conlocutio hominum aut consessus efficit, non institutis opinio est confirmata, non legibus; omni autem in re consensio omnium gentium lex naturae putanda est.<br>

*Neither indeed do the discussions nor the assemblies of men accomplish it, nor is the belief established by institutions, nor by the laws; however, in all matters, the consensus of all nations is to be considered the law of nature.*

Later in the same passage, Cicero uses the following succinct phrase as an established truth on which to base a conditional phrase (*Tusc.* 1.15.35):

>quodsi omnium consensus naturae vox est…

*if then the consensus of all is the voice of nature…*

Albeit a belief in the divine and the construction of popular belief in the duty towards the liberty of the State are very different matters, what is important in these examples is the establishment of a term of reference for the notion of
universal consent in Cicero. In essence what Cicero seems to accept is the recognition of what is right and proper through the establishment of universal consent. This means that if universal consent can be established in the depiction of support or the actions of a person, then whatever it is that the populace agree on must be right and must be necessarily the correct path to be taken. This is a following of the Stoic philosophical concepts of universal consent and ‘common preconceptions’. Examples can also be seen in Seneca, such as the moral letters to Lucilius (Ep. 117.6):

multum dare solemus praesumptioni omnium hominum et apud nos veritatis argumentum est aliquid omnibus videri; tamquam deos esse inter alia hoc colligimus, quod omnibus insita de dis opinio est nec ulla gens usquam est adeo extra leges moresque proiecta ut non aliquos deos credat. cum de animarum aeternitate disserimus, non leve momentum apud nos habet consensus hominum aut timentium inferos aut colentium.

We are accustomed to attribute much to the presuppositions of all men and in our eyes the fact that something seems so to all is evidence of its truth. For instance, on account of this (amongst other

---

108 Horowitz (1974); Schofield (1980); Obbink (1992); Carey (2005: 56). It has been shown at the start of the chapter that, despite the Stoic nature of Cicero’s intentions, these arguments may still have been appealing to both the Old Academic Brutus and the Epicurean Cassius.
reasons) we infer that the gods exist, because an idea about the gods is innate in all, nor is there any race flung so far beyond laws and customs that it does not believe in some sorts of divinity. When we discuss the immortality of souls, the influence of the consensus of men, who either fear or worship infernal beings, is regarded not lightly amongst us.

Again, the connection with divinity is the primary focus, but the basic tenet of this Stoic philosophy which Cicero has used is that universal consent adds legitimacy to a claim.

In the pro Sestio, published in 56 B.C., Cicero reveals three places in which the will and judgement of the Roman people could be revealed to any great extent: the contio, the elections, and the audience at the games or gladiatorial exhibitions (Sest. 106). The contio was an opportunity for a politician to speak to the people without seeking a vote or directly proposing any measure (Gel. 13.16.3), and it provided the Roman people an opportunity to participate

---

109 etenim tribus locis significari maxime de (re publica) populi Romani iudicium ac voluntas potest, contione, comitiis, ludorum gladitorumque consessu – ‘and indeed in three places it is possible in the greatest degree to demonstrate the judgement and will of the Roman people about public matters: in the contio, in the elections, and in the audience of games and gladiatorial exhibitions.’

directly in politics.\textsuperscript{111} Though \textit{contiones} could be given from many places, the place of preference was the Rostra.\textsuperscript{112}

The delivery of a \textit{contio} was a conscious decision on behalf of the deliverer,\textsuperscript{113} and one which could be used either to convey information to the people or to seek popular support.\textsuperscript{114} It was shown at the start of this chapter that Cicero had accepted the pursuit of populist politics if there was an overarching benefit to the Roman people. Cicero was not averse from using this platform when claiming popular support or promoting a widely supported agenda,\textsuperscript{115} though at other times his attitude towards the \textit{contio}, particularly when they were used against him, could be considered hypocritical.\textsuperscript{116} One area which has been identified as a use for the \textit{contio} was the engagement of popular will to strengthen support for a motion in the senate.\textsuperscript{117} Given the problems that Cicero


\textsuperscript{112} The Rostra itself was often associated and a symbol of the \textit{popularis}: see Tan (2008: 171).


\textsuperscript{114} Tan (2008: 165, 169) stresses the need for senatorial opposition as the distinguishing element between conveying a \textit{contio} as a vehicle of information to the people and the employment of a \textit{popularis} methodology.


\textsuperscript{116} Amongst the various unkind sentiments about the \textit{contio} and its audience are \textit{Flac.} 19; \textit{Sest.} 125; \textit{Mil.} 5. A Ciceronian example of harsh criticism is the letter to Atticus (\textit{Att.} 1.16.11) in which he first calls them \textit{sordem urbis} – ‘the dregs of the city’, and then follows it up with the most descriptive \textit{illa contionalis hirudo aerari, misera ac ieiuna plebecula} – ‘that assembly-going bloodsucker of the treasury, the wretched and starveling rabble’.

\textsuperscript{117} Pasoli (1957: 26-7); Morstein-Marx (2004: 140).
was having with the consulars, this could be a legitimate reason for his continued use of the *contio* to gain popular consent during the period under study.

Much research has been done on the legitimacy of the *contio* as a representation of the Roman people. The exact makeup of the audience itself would depend upon the circumstances,\(^\text{118}\) but in general the speech itself would likely represent a cause which the audience would view as their own.\(^\text{119}\) It is generally accepted that although those attending any given speech would be a mere fraction of the total Roman populace, this would still be seen to represent the actual will of the Roman people in general.\(^\text{120}\) This rhetorical fiction added a sense of legitimacy or plausibility to a cause, and would often be seen as a demonstration of support, consensus and public will.\(^\text{121}\) If accepted and well received, a sense of popular sovereignty could be established.\(^\text{122}\) There is also the element that it was important that issues of State were seen to have been referred to the people and their will and judgement taken into consideration.\(^\text{123}\)

---

\(^{118}\) See Tan’s recent summary of the makeup of Roman *contiones* (2008: 172-180).

\(^{119}\) Tan (2008: 172).

\(^{120}\) Morstein-Marx (2004: 12, 15, 42); Tan (2008: 173).

\(^{121}\) Morstein-Marx (2004: 8, 121-2, 187).


\(^{123}\) Millar (1984); (1986: 8).
Several problems arise from the nature of the *contio*, especially one which seeks legitimisation of universal consent. Firstly, it is generally established that popular opinion is a fabrication of the interaction and prompting of the definer or measurer of that public opinion.\textsuperscript{124} Even silence, when interpreted in a particular way, could be used by the speaker to represent the approval of the crowd.\textsuperscript{125} There is no doubt those *contiones* called by magistrates tended to be favourable to that speaker, and to address the crowd in a way which can be considered *popularis* in design.\textsuperscript{126} The second issue was access to information and different sources and opinions on this information. Since the people in general did not have access to diverse sources or official debates, they relied on the particular viewpoint which was presented to them at the *contio*.\textsuperscript{127} Whereas the well-connected were able to access information through the senate, wide correspondence and personal acquaintances, the average Roman citizen was more dependent on the orator and these elite, if somewhat biased, sources.\textsuperscript{128}

\textsuperscript{124} Morstein-Marx (2004: 19); Zaller (1992: 265); Key (1966: 1-8).
\textsuperscript{125} Examples of silence indicating popular approval in Cicero include *Sest.* 106-8; *Mil.* 91; *Rab.* *Perd.* 18, but also are evident elsewhere, such as Plutarch *Brut.* 18.
\textsuperscript{128} Laser (1997: 38-39); Tan (2008: 179). As Morstein-Marx (2004 257) states, with an analogy to modern estimations of popular opinion, the deliverer of the *contio* was part leader, television station and pollster in one.
It is sometimes thought that part of Cicero’s failure in this period came down to the fact that he had misinterpreted the popular support for the conspirators,\textsuperscript{129} but this misses the mark completely. In addressing this misconception, we return to the question posed earlier of the gap between Cicero’s perception of support and his presentation of that support to Cassius and Brutus. In other words, does Cicero use these depictions of support and popularity more as a rhetorical device to add legitimacy to his claims than as a literal expression of popularity? Even though Cassius and Brutus may not have taken heed of this declaration of popular sovereignty, and the fact that they did not return to Rome, or even engage with the possibility, indicates that they did not, the use of the \textit{contio} and the establishment of this universal consent was very much a part of standard republican practice. The sovereignty of the populace was both a crucial benefit for the Roman people and a powerful weapon in the late Republic.\textsuperscript{130} It was one which Cicero needed, particularly given the problems and disagreements in the senate, not to mention the fact that he held no official magistracy to force through his opinion. As such, one should not view his inability to secure the return of Cassius and Brutus as a failure or a serious

\textsuperscript{129} Morstein-Marx (2004: 147, 155-56).
misreading of the situation.\textsuperscript{131} Instead, what is presented is a legitimate claim to universality as a standard tool of rhetoric in the late Republic. What makes this unique in many ways, however, is its use in the personal correspondence, rather than its typical appearance in oratory\textsuperscript{132}.

\section*{3.3: DUTY BOUND: TO LIBERTY AND ROME}

Cicero’s purpose in applying these rhetorical devices can now be considered. It would seem that he was calling for Cassius and Brutus to take up the cause of liberty which they had begun when they assassinated Caesar. Whereas before much of the rhetoric had focused on creating political or ideological action, now, as the situation became direr, the demand of liberty required a more physical obligation, and with it came the call for their return with an army. The need for military protection is succinctly expressed in this letter to Cassius from

\textsuperscript{131} It is also possible that the conspirators did not return because they had received correspondence from other sources which gave a different perspective of the state of affairs in Rome and their level of popularity.

\textsuperscript{132} Of course, the uniqueness of Cicero’s use of universal consent in the letters is based largely on his own correspondence. If more letters from this period were extant it is possible that it may be discovered that it was a standard argumentation in letters of the Late Republic.
the start of February, just after the return of the ill-fated embassy to Antonius (Fam. 12.4.2):\textsuperscript{133}

summa laus et tua et Bruti est quod exercitum praeter spem existimamini comparasse.

\textit{There is the highest praise for both you and Brutus because you are regarded as having gathered an army contrary to hope.}

Cicero’s urgency for Cassius’ return to Rome is usually less direct than it was for Brutus. Cicero seems happy, at times, to have Cassius in the East with a strong army to control, presumably to limit the effectiveness of any Caesarian incursion into these Eastern provinces. At this point, the movement of Dolabella towards Syria had the power of the law behind it,\textsuperscript{134} but there is little doubt that anxiety was beginning to build in regard to how Dolabella would act when he arrived there. Secondly, when referring to matters of obligation and duty to the

\textsuperscript{133} This is the same letter in which Cicero described the makeup of the senate following the return of the embassy from Antonius (pp. 292-294).

\textsuperscript{134} Dolabella had been assigned the province of Syria as early as April 44 (Cic. Att. 14.9.3; 14.4; App. BC 3.7-8, 12, 24, 27; 4.57; C.D. 45.15.2; 47.29.1; MRR 2.317). In the same letter, Cicero referred to Dolabella as having no rights to be admitted into the province on the grounds that Cassius had only been there for a month (Fam. 12.4.2). This seems to be a reference to the \textit{lex Cornelia} which stated that a governor could remain in the province for thirty days after the arrival of his successor (Fam. 3.6.3). The problem, of course, was that Cassius had only been there for a month, though in reality he had no legal claim to the province at this time. The evidence of the \textit{Philippics} in this matter should take precedence over Appian’s account (Phil. 11.12.28; cf. App. BC 3.2).
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State, which Cicero depicts as having been thrust upon them by their assassination of Caesar, it is common to see second person plural verbs, personal pronouns and possessive adjectives. The above description is far more explicit in address, but the use of this plural, to mean both Cassius and Brutus, is common in correspondence to Cassius, as seen in this passage. Therefore, when the singular form is used with Cassius, it can be fairly certain that this message was for him alone.

The escape of Antonius after Mutina, the uncertainty of Octavian’s loyalties, and the defection of Lepidus were crises that needed immediate attention, and dire enough for D. Brutus to suggest the recall not only of Brutus but also of the African legions and troops from Sardinia (Fam. 11.14.2; 11.25.2; 11.26). However, the appeal to the conspirators in respect to their duty had begun much earlier.\(^{135}\) Cicero’s portraits of the ‘liberators’ as duty bound had begun even before the duo left Italian shores. Whilst probably still in southern Italy, at the end of September, Cicero wrote to Cassius (Fam. 12.2.3):\(^{136}\)

\[
\text{qua re spes est omnis in vobis. qui si idcirco abestis ut sitis in tuto,}
\]
\[
\text{ne in vobis quidem; sin aliquid dignum vestra gloria cogitatis, velim}
\]
\[
\text{salvis nobis, sin id minus, res tamen publica per vos brevi tempore}
\]
\[
\text{ius suum reciperabit.}
\]

\(^{136}\) It is this letter to Cassius which is used to indicate that he was still in Italy at this time.
On account of this all hope is in you. But if you are staying away in order to be safe, then there is no hope even in you; if, however, you are thinking up some act worthy of your renown, then I would like this while we are still unharmed, if this is less likely, the State, nevertheless, through you in a short time will restore her authority.

The use of the plural pronouns indicates that this message was also for Brutus.\textsuperscript{137} This letter is straight to the point and seems to avoid, at least initially, much of the emphatic face-saving politeness that is expected when giving potentially dangerous advice.\textsuperscript{138} At one moment all hope lies with the conspirators, and at the next they are no longer a point of salvation. The use of hypotheticals softens the advice somewhat, giving the impression of free will.\textsuperscript{139} His meaning is clear: Cassius and Brutus must restore the republic by returning despite the dangers.\textsuperscript{140} They are duty bound to restore the \textit{ius} to the State.

\textsuperscript{137} This direct connection to Brutus is anticipated by an earlier comment in the letter in which Cicero referred to the audacity of L. Marcius Philippus putting forward his son for the consulship in the year designated for Cassius and Brutus (\textit{vestro anno}) (\textit{Fam.} 12.2.2). For the identification of L. Marcius Philippus see SB (1977: 482).


\textsuperscript{139} White (2010: 120-121) identified this as a standard device used to soften the appearance of advice.

\textsuperscript{140} Cassius seems well aware of Cicero’s intentions. On 7 March 43 he responded in kind telling Cicero to look after matters while they were away. He then diverted the role of saviour of the Republic back onto Cicero – \textit{scire te volo firma praeidia vobis senatuique non deesse ut optima spe et maximo animo rem publicam defendas} (‘I want you to know that staunch protection is not
Another letter to Cassius on June 9 continues with this motif of being duty bound, as well as illustrating the use of universal consent, flattery, and obligation. Beginning with a lament over the defection of Lepidus to Antonius, Cicero continues by describing the military status of the republic (*Fam.* 12.8.1):

\[\text{…spemque omnem in D. Bruto et Planco habemus, <vel>, si verum quaeris, in te et in meo Bruto, non solum ad praesens perfugium, si, quod nolim, adversi quid acciderit, sed etiam ad confirmationem perpetuae libertatis.}\\]

*We have all hope in D. Brutus and Plancus, or rather, if the truth be known, in you and in my friend Brutus: not only as an immediate refuge, if some reverse should happen (God forbid!), but also as an assurance for permanent liberty.*

Cicero begins his statement at the military front against Antonius and Lepidus, i.e. the combined forces of Decimus and Plancus, but quickly shifts it to the East and the armies of Cassius and Brutus. The use of *meo Bruto* has caused some consternation, since if it is meant to separate Decimus from Marcus, it insinuates that Decimus is not Cicero’s friend, nor Cassius’ for that matter.\(^\text{141}\) As lacking to you and the senate, so that with the best hope and greatest spirit you may defend the Republic’ (*Fam.* 12.11.2).

\(^\text{141}\) SB (1977: 560) points out *nostro* would have fitted better in this regard.
such it may be best to allow the emendation to *M. Bruto*. The duty of the statesman to be a refuge for the people has already been discussed, but this in no way required a return to Rome. Similarly, the responsibility to keep liberty in perpetuity would not necessarily require Cassius’ return, particularly if Brutus’ was already expected. It will be granted that the statement in this letter is ambiguous as to the extent to which Cassius would be required to carry out this duty. However, if the letter to Brutus written within two weeks of this letter is considered, it is clear that Cicero is not asking for Cassius to return. In the letter from June, despite the death of his wife, Brutus was urged to moderate his grief and return to Rome with his army because freedom depended on it (*ad Brut. 1.9.2-3*):

*ac mihi tum, Brute, officio solum erat et naturae, tibi nunc populo et scaenae, ut dicitur, serviendum est. nam cum in te non solum exercitus tui sed omnium civium ac paene gentium coniecti oculi sint, minime decet propter quem fortiores ceteri sumus eum ipsum animo debilitatum videri. quam ob rem accepisti tu quidem dolorem (id enim

---

142 The MSS are fairly sound for *meo* (MDH, vulg.), with manuscript V having *me*. The emendation to M. is attributed to Gronovius, see T&P (1899: 228); SB (1977: 285, 560).

143 A date around the June 18 is now generally accepted (SB (1980: 242)), though T&P (1899: 236) and Shuckburgh (1900: 307) both date this to around June 8. If this earlier date is correct, then the comparison between the letter to Cassius and the letter to Brutus is much stronger.

144 I have included the whole passage to put the letter in context, yet it is the final sentence which will be discussed presently.
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amisisti cui simile in terris nihil fuit), et est dolendum in tam gravi vulnere, ne id ipsum, carere omni sensu doloris, sit miserius quam dolere; sed ut modice, ceteris utile est, tibi necesse est.

scriberem plura nisi ad te haec ipsa nimis multa essent. nos te tuumque exercitum exspectamus, sine quo, ut reliqua ex sententia succedant, vix satis liberi videmur fore.

But at that time, Brutus, I had to pay regard only to duty and nature, but you must pay regard to the people and the stage - as the saying goes. For when the eyes of not only your army, but of all citizens and of almost all nations are turned towards you, it is not at all seemly for the one on account of whom we are braver, to seem, in his own case, enfeebled in spirit. On account of which indeed you let in your pain (for nothing on earth is like that which you lost), and one must grieve under such a heavy wound, lest that very thing, to be void of all sense of pain, is more wretched than to grieve; however, moderation (in grief) is advantageous for other men but for you it is a necessity.

I would write more except this which I have written is too much to you. We are expecting you and your army, without which, even if
other matters advance as planned, we seem to be about to be scarcely sufficiently free.

There is no ambiguity in this statement. Brutus, despite his grief, and it should be noted that Cicero is explicit in empathising with his emotive state, is expected at the head of his army. The obligation to defend *libertas* is also present, and often appears in this last phase of Cicero’s correspondence to the conspirators. The final phrase’s limitation on the degree of freedom without Brutus simulates the struggles that the State is under by pointing to the hope of only a mediocre future for Rome. The crux of the matter is that this barely sufficient level of liberty will be Brutus’ fault for not returning.

In the letter to Cassius from June 9, Cicero turns the attention away from the other participants in the conflicts with Antonius and Lepidus, notably D. Brutus and Plancus, and back specifically onto Cassius. After complaining about the lack of solid and reliable news on the Dolabella situation, Cicero gives an assessment of how Cassius is viewed in Rome and provides some advice on how to maintain this stellar reputation (*Fam.* 12.8.2):  

---

145 See p. 335-336.

146 This letter also appeared earlier in this chapter in relation to its use of polite exaggeration and it being a benchmark for the description of Cassius as a popular man in Rome in relation to universal consent (p. 332).
te quidem magnum hominem et praesenti iudicio et reliqui temporis exspectatione scito esse. hoc tibi proposito fac ut ad summa contendas. nihil est tantum quod non populus Romanus a te perfici atque obtineri posse iudicet.

Know indeed that you are a great man both in present judgement and in the expectation for the rest of time. With this placed before you make it so that you strain for the highest. Nothing is so great that the Roman people do not judge it to be possible for you to complete and to possess.

The use of the singular verbs and pronouns here make this message purely about Cassius. Cicero is no doubt assuring him that his reputation in Rome is sound and being preserved under Cicero’s protection. Again, Cicero does not ask Cassius to return, but, in reporting what is expected of him, he implicitly tells him to strive for the highest things (ad summa contendas), and to complete (perfici) and take possession of (obtineri) the situation. All this is to be done under the auspices of the Roman people. Whilst the declaration of universal consent is not as strong here, its presence is certainly felt. The depiction here is of things in hand judiciously. In other words, Cassius would have the sense that he should continue his activities in the East, and not to worry about any matters that should arise because of them. There is certainly no indication of an overt
request to return to Rome. His mission lies in the East. Of course this is mere speculation, but it is certainly possible that Cicero saw that a strong republican force under the experienced commander Cassius maintaining a solid presence in the Eastern provinces would free Brutus up to return to Italy. It would also help more directly should the advance military front of Decimus and Plancus fail or Octavian turn rogue. Thus, the ambiguity of the beginning of the letter becomes a little clearer. Both Cassius and Brutus were, at this time, to play different roles in the coming conflict, one as the provider of refuge in the East, and the other as the direct ‘liberator’ of the Roman people.

It is not that Cicero does not ask Cassius to return, only that the frequency or directness in which this is requested of Brutus is far greater.\textsuperscript{147} Take for instance this letter written around the middle of June. Cicero has just referred to Octavian as influenced by his associates in order to increase the urgency of the need for Brutus to intervene (\textit{ad Brut.} 1.10.4-5):\textsuperscript{148}

\textsuperscript{147} It should be noted that this could be explained by the frequency of extant letters in the correspondence. There are 26 letters to Brutus in the collection, 2 of which are spurious, and there are 12 letters to Cassius from this same time period. If this is restricted to letters from Cicero, there are 17 letters to Brutus and 10 to Cassius.

\textsuperscript{148} The dating of this letter is anything from certain. Rice Holmes (1928: 212), Botermann (1968: 144) and the first edition of T&P (1899: 224) believed the date to be before the arrival of news of Lepidus’ defection, i.e. around June 9. SB (1980: 241) points out that by the 2\textsuperscript{nd} edition, T&P take the opposite assumption that the definitiveness of Cicero’s statements concerning Lepidus would not have been written in such a way if there was still hope of his loyalty.
quam ob rem advola, obsecro, atque eam rem publicam, quam virtute atque animi magnitudine magis quam eventis rerum liberavisti, exitu libera. omnis omnium concursus ad te futurus est. hortare idem per litteras Cassium. spes libertatis nusquam nisi in vestrorum castorum principiis est.

Therefore come flying, I implore you, and ultimately set free this State, which previously you have freed by courage and nobility rather than by the outcome of events. Every gathering of all men will be towards you. Urge Cassius to the same goal in a letter. The hope of liberty is nowhere except in the headquarters of your camps.

The sense of necessity and urgency is palpable in the employment of the imperatives, particularly *advola*, mixed with the pleading of *obsecro*. What then follows is a reminder and what seems to be a compliment wrapped up in a criticism. The word *exitus* in this context seems to indicate the fulfilment of the deed mentioned, in this case Brutus’ swift arrival in Rome. However, it also follows on well from the *magis quam eventis rerum.* The continued references to freedom, first in the perfect indicative and present imperative forms, followed by the abstract noun *libertas* in the final sentence, places the emphasis on Brutus’ obligation, both before and now, to free the Roman people.

---

and the State. He sees this as only beginning with the bold and well-intentioned slaying of Caesar. This liberation from a tyrant did not produce political freedom, and so the implication is that the responsibility remained with the conspirators. It is, therefore, Brutus’ responsibility to bring this promise of *libertas* by the fulfilment of his duty which could start with his return to Rome. A reassurance of support on arrival is added to the depiction, and with it further legitimacy to this action through the statement of universal support emphasised through the repetition of *omnis* (*omnis omnium concursus*).\(^{150}\) It is at this point that Cicero requests Brutus to intervene with Cassius to request his return as well.\(^{151}\)

Cicero finishes off the passage with a declaration of obligation to liberty, reinforcing his earlier insistence on where the responsibility lay. Given the circumstances that Cicero is trying to convey, i.e. the mistrust of Octavian and his forces, not to mention the growing threat from Antonius and Lepidus, the expressed need for military strength is not surprising. It should be noted that the first use of the plural form is in the final sentence, indicating that the earlier messages had been for Brutus alone. This in itself may suggest that Cicero felt Brutus had better communication with or more influence with Cassius at this time.

---

\(^{150}\) This line had previously been defined as an example of universal support (p. 313).

\(^{151}\) This is a firm indicator that Cicero believed that Cassius and Brutus had clear lines of communication established between them.
This passage is a perfect example of Cicero’s depiction of the conspirators. As the passage progresses Cassius and Brutus as portrayed as ‘liberators’, ‘duty bound’, ‘tyrannicides’, ‘universally popular’, and ‘commanders’. The terminology explored in Chapter One is firmly situated within the politics of popular government in Rome. Mixed up within all of this is that they are intrinsically linked to the safety and survival of the republic, i.e. they are ‘figure-heads’ of the restoration of the republic, heroes like Harmodius and Aristogeiton. For Brutus particularly, growing mistrust and rivalry between himself and Octavian would have been a motivating factor. This is not to say that there was not a threat from Octavian and the Antonian armies - quite to the contrary, as hindsight would prove. What can be said, however, is that Cicero is definitely structuring a rhetorical argument for their return by establishing and maintaining this heightened fear, sense of duty and a scenario in which Brutus would receive overwhelming support and preference in relation to the young Caesar.

The fact is that at the time at which this letter was written, Brutus was not living up to the ideal which Cicero had set him. Earlier in this same letter, Cicero, with a note of frustration, calls out Brutus for not only ignoring him, but also his obligation and duty to the State (ad Brut. 1.10.1):

nullas adhuc a te litteras habebamus, ne famam quidem quae declararet te cognita senatus auctoritate in Italiam adducere
exercitum; quod ut faceres idque maturares magno opere desiderabat res publica.

Up until now I have had no letter from you, not even a rumour which declares that you know about the senatorial authority and are leading an army into Italy; the State is most greatly anxious that you should do this, and do it quickly.

The inclusion of the senatorial authority to return to Italian shores removed another objection that Brutus may have had for not returning. Again, a sense of urgency and with it an obligation to the republic permeates this letter. This particular revelation of senatorial influence added strength to the portrayal of obligation, especially as Brutus could now be seen as potentially in breach of his official duty. The commonality of these depictions is clear when the same image is reassigned to Cassius a month later (Fam. 12.10.3):

tua virtute magnitudine animi nihil est nobilius. itaque optamus ut quam primum te in Italia videamus. rem publicam nos habere arbitrabimur si vos habebimus

Nothing is more excellent than your bravery and greatness of mind.
Thus we desire that we may see you in Italy as soon as possible. We shall believe that we have a republic if we have both of you.
The continued depictions of the conspirators as popular heroes and duty bound to the republic is a common theme throughout these letters. They are being depicted as the ‘liberators’ of Rome; anything less is dereliction of their duty and unworthy of their status and dignity.\textsuperscript{152} Cicero is portraying his political vision, where all should play the role assigned to them. It is this insistence on his grand design which arguably led Cicero into trouble, primarily because of the resistance against his depicted ideal. Cicero combines all his elements of depiction in one as he continues this letter to Cassius (\textit{Fam.} 12.10.4):

\begin{quote}
Be convinced that everything depends on you and your Brutus, that you both are expected, indeed Brutus at any moment, even if, as I hope, you have come after our enemies are conquered, still the Republic will rise up by your authority and will be established on some bearable basis. For there are very many ills which need to be
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{152} Two clear examples of the return being linked to the reputation and position of Brutus are \textit{ad Brut.} 1.12.2 and \textit{ad Brut.} 1.14.2.
healed, even if it appears that the Republic has been freed enough from the villainies of its enemies.

By the time this letter was written early in July 43, the depictions of the conspirators had been well established. At this point it may be prudent to ask to what extent did Cicero really believe that Cassius and Brutus would return to Rome or indeed that Brutus was already on his way; that all the enemies of the republic would be eliminated by the time he arrives; and that the only hope for a restoration of stable government was Cassius and Brutus?

There is some indication that he harboured some notion that Brutus would return. He issued a confident statement in a letter to Brutus in the first half of July that he would soon see his son, who was serving with Brutus, when they came to Italy (ad Brut. 1.12.3). The reality of the situation, however, soon hit home when he discovered that Brutus was sending young Marcus to Rome by himself. The response was immediately to write back requesting the recall of the boy and that Brutus should accompany him back to Rome as had been planned, and indeed decreed by the senate (ad Brut. 1.14).

The return of Cassius may have been less expected. He was further abroad than Brutus, with a sizeable army in an area in which he was familiar and had a military reputation. The letter asking Brutus to urge Cassius also to return to
Rome may indicate, as mentioned, this suspicion that Cassius was not at all likely to return on Cicero’s bidding alone.

There is also evidence that both Cassius and Brutus recognised this depiction of widespread approval for what it was within Cicero’s dramatics and rhetoric. The fact that neither Cassius nor Brutus returned to Rome on Cicero’s request is one obvious indicator that this line of argument was either not believed or not successful. However, more concrete evidence is available in the letters which Cicero received from the conspirators. The first came from Cassius on May 7, and it indicates that despite Cicero’s depictions of Rome as conciliatory to the conspirators, he was well aware of the difficulties and dangers that were present in Rome at this time (\textit{Fam.} 12.12.1):

\begin{verbatim}
videbaris enim non solum favere nobis, id quod et nostra et rei publicae causa semper fecisti, sed etiam gravem curam suscepisse vehementerque esse de nobis sollicitus. itaque quod te primum existimare putabam nos oppressa re publica quiescere non posse, deinde, cum suspicarere nos moliri, quod te sollicitum esse et de salute nostra et de rerum eventu putabam, simul ac legiones accepi quas A. Allienus eduxerat ex Aegypto, scripsi ad te tabellariosque compluris Romam misi.
\end{verbatim}
For you seemed not only to support us, that which you have always done both for us and the republic, but also to have taken up a heavy anxiety and to be greatly concerned about us. Therefore because at first I was thinking that you were of the opinion that, with the crushing of the republic, we were not able to keep quiet, then, I was thinking that since you suspected that we were struggling, because you were anxious both about our safety and the outcome of the affairs, as soon as I received the legions which A. Allienus had led out of Egypt, I wrote to you and sent a fair number of couriers to Rome.

The passage is replete with demonstrations of concern. Of particular note is the beginning of the passage with the passive form of *video*. Whilst not necessarily adding a sense of ambiguity or underhandedness about Cicero's assistance, it does seem to indicate an element of political stagecraft to this support. Is Cassius here indicating to Cicero that he can see that the demonstrations of support are part of Cicero's rhetoric? Cassius is clear that he knows that the task in Rome has not been easy, using such phrasing as *gravem curam* and *vehementerque esse…sollicitus*. This may be a further indication that he was aware that this support was not unanimous. He goes further by reference to the fact that Cicero was suspecting that they were struggling (*cum suspicarere nos moliri*), and completes this theme with an iteration of the worry he mentioned earlier, expanding on it further (*quod te sollicitum esse et de salute nostra et de*
rerum eventu). It seems Cassius is more than aware of the difficulties and dangers the conspirators were facing. Indeed, he seems more aware of happenings in Rome than Cicero is aware of Cassius’ actions in the East. The use of puto gives to Cicero a face-saving escape. By encasing his statements within the self-experience of puto, he places them more in the area of personal belief than evidentiary fact. Cicero’s concerns with their safety and the progress of events, becomes Cassius’ self-perception of events, which do not necessarily diminish or destroy Cicero’s construction of reality in the expression of the support the conspirators had in Rome. It is Cassius who reverses the situation by attempting to provide solace for Cicero by stating that he is now established in the East, has an army, and so Cicero no longer needs to worry about him or ask for his return.

Contemporaneous with Cassius’ letter is one written by Brutus on May 15 to Cicero. Its message is very similar, though its stylistic approach is more stinging. Adopting the hyperbolic nature of Cicero’s expressions of support, Brutus turns the table on the aging senator, not only placing the image of popularity and obligation on him, but also making it clear that if things were so unanimous in Rome, the only person to blame if things suddenly went wrong, was Cicero himself (ad Brut. 1.4a.2):
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nihil iam neque opinantibus aut patientibus nobis adversi evenire potest in quo non cum omnium culpa tum praecipue tua futura sit, cuius tantam auctoritatem senatus ac populus Romanus non solum esse patitur sed etiam cupit quanta maxima in libera civitate unius esse potest. quam tu non solum bene sentiendo sed etiam prudenter tueri debes, prudentia porro, quae tibi superest, nulla abs te desideratur nisi modus in tribuendis honoribus.

Now no misfortune can find us, unsuspecting or inactive, in which the blame shall not only be with all, but especially you, whose influence the senate and the Roman people not only allow to be so great, but even desire it to be the greatest allowable to one man in a free State. This authority you ought to protect not only by good intentions, but also judiciously. Furthermore, this prudence, which is plenteous to you, is not found lacking by you except moderation in the bestowing of honours.

This is a highly complex letter, with connections between phrases throughout the passage. The general theme is Cicero’s control of issues of State at this point in time. Through Cicero’s auctoritas any oppositional force should be identified and neutralised, but in exchange for this is the need to act judiciously. The final statement is no doubt about the honours being placed upon Octavian.
The agreement between *nobis* and *opinantibus* and *patientibus* is indicative of the previous circumstances. The insinuation is that now (*iam*) the conspirators cannot be caught unsuspecting\(^{153}\), nor merely allow things to happen, as they did previously. The word *patientibus* seems to couple with *patitur* to give the impression that it is now Cicero who is allowed to be in control, and so everything from here on in is more his responsibility than the conspirators’.

Brutus carefully constructs this deference of blame in the *cum…tum…* clause, further accentuating Cicero’s responsibility with *praecipue*. As stated, the source of Cicero’s responsibility is his *auctoritas* which Brutus again ties up firstly with a *tantus…quantus…* construction, as well as a *non solum…sed etiam…* series. The relative *quam*, with *auctoritas* as the antecedent, moves the passage onto the trade-off for this authority: the duty to act with good intentions and judiciously (*non solum bene sentiendo sed etiam prudenter tueri debes*).

Another *non solum…sed etiam…* strengthens this dual obligation, as does the verb *debeo*. The polyptoton of the adverb (*prudenter*) and the noun *prudentia* reveals Brutus’ main point. The word *porro* enlarges and progresses the previous point:\(^{154}\) Cicero has not discerned well the honours bestowed upon Octavian. A clever link between the *prudentia* which Cicero possesses (*quae

\(^{153}\) *OLD* (1380 s.v. *opinor* §2b) demonstrates the use of *opinor* with *nec* or *neque* (also *necopinans* and *necopinatus*) and the present participle indicates ‘unsuspecting’, and with the perfect participle it means ‘unforeseen’. The same definitions in the positive forms, without *nec*, are illustrated in *TLL* (9.2.723.28, 728.27-8, 728.38).

\(^{154}\) *OLD* 1547 s.v. *porro* § 4, 6b; *TLL* 10.1.2769.45-6, 2773.68-9.
tibi superest) and the amount which he is using (abs te) provides a less subtle reminder that he needs to think things through more carefully. The progression of the passage is the passing of responsibility, step-by-step, very carefully, from Brutus and the conspirators, to Cicero. The loss of the republic now is in his hands. The overall tone of the passage is very oppositional, with no fewer than seven negatives\textsuperscript{155}. Brutus seems to be stating that all the power and popularity now lies with Cicero and not with the conspirators, and as such the decisions that are made from here on in are Cicero’s responsibility.

These two letters may be indicative of why Cicero’s attempts to recall Cassius and Brutus to Rome ultimately failed. They saw through the rhetoric of universal consent and support. Instead they seemed cautious, and at times opposed to the attempts of Cicero to remind them of their obligation by casting them in different roles. However, this study does not seek to critique Cicero on the level of success which he achieved in exacting real change in the political system. Rather it looks to identify and analyse the various ways in which he sought to depict the conspirators, and to suggest, when possible, the reasons for this. Whether it was through the portraiture of the popular hero (\textit{heros}) with unwavering, universal support, or the depiction of the conspirators as \textit{liberatores} and duty bound to the higher notion of \textit{libertas}, Cicero sought to cast

\textsuperscript{155} nihil, non (x3), nulla, neque…aut…, nisi. Even if the two non solum… references are removed, there are still five negatives in this short passage.
Cassius and Brutus in these roles often as an attempt at persuasion or to express his opinion on their obligations, duties, mistakes, and actions, past, present and/or future. The key concepts analysed above are actualised within the context of popularity, politics, and Stoic values of common assent. The in-depth analysis of the letters has demonstrated that this personal correspondence abounds in rhetorical, dramatic and literary devices. The rhetoric of the letters approximates Cicero’s public oratory. As a final example, take the *contio* from May 43 which would form the *Sixth Philippic*. Many of the depictions given to Cassius and Brutus in the letters are immediately identifiable in this speech. The passage itself comes from the very end of the speech and succinctly sums up Cicero’s activities during this period, and aptly demonstrates the continuity of the portraiture throughout this period (*Phil. 6.7.18-19*)\(^\text{156}\):

\begin{quote}
   idem volunt omnes ordines; eodem incumbunt municipia, coloniae, cuncta Italia. itaque senatum bene sua sponte firmum firmiorem vastra auctoritate fecistis. venit tempus, Quirites, serius omnino quam dignum populo Romano fuit, sed tamen ita maturum ut differri
\end{quote}

\(^\text{156}\) The *Sixth Philippic* is a *contio*, convened by the tribune P. Apuleius, delivered to the people on January 4 after four days of debate; see Manuwald (2007: 736). The end result was the delivery of this speech to inform the people of the decision to send an embassy to Antonius. The *Sixth Philippic* in general is an example of how to turn a defeat in the senate, since Cicero had argued against the motion passed, into a positive in line with his own agenda. Through it he can justify and legitimise his continued policy to the people, and in doing so hope to bring firmer resolve to the senate. For a recent summary of the text see Manuwald (2007: 736-743).
All the classes want the same thing; the municipalities, the colonies and the whole of Italy devote themselves to the same thing. And thus, you have made the senate, steadfast enough by its own volition, more steadfast by your influence. The time has come, citizens, entirely later than was befitting the Roman people, but, however, so late that the hour now is not able to be delayed. A fated calamity, as I may say, befell us, which we bore, in whatever way it had to be borne; now if another should come, it will be of our own choice. It is contrary to divine law that the Roman people be enslaved, whom the immortal gods have willed to rule over all nations. The matter has been led to the utmost crisis; it is an issue concerning liberty. You must either be victorious, citizens, which will surely come to pass by your dutifulness and such unanimity, or do
anything at all rather than be slaves. Other nations are able to endure servitude, but the birth right of the Roman people is liberty.
CONCLUSION

It has been argued throughout this thesis that there is an undeniable presence of rhetorical devices in the depictions of Cassius and Brutus in the correspondence of Cicero following Caesar’s death. Although the purpose of this rhetoric can be conjectured, this thesis was directed towards the more knowable elements, that is the recognition and analysis of these devices. The overwhelming presence of rhetoric in the correspondence of Cicero, particularly dense in some places, is undeniable. In the letters examined the literary techniques and rhetorical devices set up in these letters resemble language consistent to the pursuits of oratory. Just as it has been recognised that a potential tension can exist between the form and function in oratory,¹ the same can be said for Cicero’s correspondence during the period under study. Cicero’s declared purpose of the letter was to communicate important information or to demonstrate the mood of the sender (Fam. 2.4.1). The simplicity of this declaration would appear to stand in opposition to the purpose of persuasive techniques present in rhetorical pursuits. The evidence of rhetorical and literary devices in the personal correspondence, used to construct depictions of character, belies any residual claims that Cicero’s letters are an unaffected form of communication.

¹ Berry & Erskine (2010a: 5).
CONCLUSION

Some work has been done on epistolary persuasion, but the concept of epistolary persona in Cicero’s letters is still elusive to many. Steel once referred to Cicero as a ‘competent manipulator of the epistolary medium’,\(^2\) with Morello attributing this competence to his ability to build a persona for his recipient which intertwined with the topic and themes in the letter.\(^3\) This thesis has expanded on these works, looking at the period following Caesar’s death and how Cicero chose to depict Cassius and Brutus. The implications of this study are significant to our understanding of the extent of Roman rhetoric in the lives of the Roman elite,\(^4\) and in the contemplation of Cicero’s correspondence as a source of character portrayal.

The first challenge of this thesis was to examine the collective nouns used to describe the conspirators, and perhaps one of the more intriguing findings from this study was the absence of many of these words from extant Latin literature prior to Cicero. Much of this could have to do with the sparse amount of earlier extant literature, however, the political crisis of the times would certainly have allowed for an innovation of terminology. This would represent an attempt to encapsulate general popular feelings and also to counter oppositional attacks in

---

\(^2\) Steel (2000: 78).

\(^3\) Morello (2013: 214).

\(^4\) I mention the elite here because it is these upper levels of Roman society that are most frequently represented in the letters of Cicero.
a seemingly clear and succinct manner. In this way, these collective nouns can very well be called ‘catchwords’.

However, this thesis has also shown that these terms require further consideration, as no doubt Cicero had done when he chose to use them. Rather than being the panegyric-style praises that many historians and commentators have presented them as, Cicero’s constructions surrounding these words seem to be characterised by limitation, perspective and paradox. The complexity of the crisis in the State certainly contributed, such as the antithetical motif of freedom from the tyrant but not from the tyranny, but Cicero’s sense of frustration at the lack of any progression towards a restoration of the republic should also be noted. As such, it can be suggested that heros juxtaposed the glory and renown (κλέος) earned by the deed of assassination. In this rhetorical construction it represented an action firmly in the past, and was accompanied by its obsolescence in securing any benefit for the community in the present. This directly opposed the driving characteristics of utilitatis communio which was so important to Cicero’s notion of the republic. Likewise, the term tyrannoctoni created a sense of polarisation centred on the very act of assassination so aptly declared in its name. Intrinsically it was used as a term of separation, indicating the impossibility of middle ground: one was either with the assassins or against them. This held particular relevance to those personalities
who on occasion held sympathies for both sides of the conflict, such as Servilia, who was both the lover of the slain tyrant and the mother of his killer.

Of all the terms which need readjusting in modern understandings of the Late Republican period, the most significant is *liberator*. Long held as the primary catchphrase which embraced completely the motive of the conspirators in the assassination, it can now be suggested that this term had little to do with the lofty claims of the restoration of the republic through political *libertas*. Rather it seems limited to the fleeting freedom from the rule of Caesar. Competing ideas of *libertas* aside, this collective noun seems to represent largely a defence against the absence of the conspirators from Rome. Therefore, rather than being the all-encompassing political slogan of freedom restored, it was probably used, at least in part, to convert the appearance of a shameful departure into an unjust exile following the conspirators’ noble act of liberation from Caesar’s autocracy.

Further areas for study have also presented themselves out of this chapter. Of particular interest is the application of *heros* to living people in Cicero’s letters. This seemingly unique and intriguing manipulation of the tradition of the hero as the ‘powerful dead’ requires additional time and effort. The possibility that the term *liberator* represents an attempt to reclaim the title from Caesar and to give it to a Brutus requires not only further exploration of Cicero’s use, but also of
other sources, such as Livy, to see if additional evidence can increase the probability that titles such as *liberator urbis* or *liberator patriae* can be firmly applied to L. Iunius Brutus. Finally, the complex, yet intriguing idea that solecism may be contained in some of Cicero’s use of Greek words and phrasing, possibly identified in his use of the term *tyrannoctoni*, needs further investigation.

The second difficulty which faced this study was the level to which Cicero’s depiction of the characters of Cassius and Brutus contributed to the ‘odd couple’ appearance that these two instigators of the assassination had in later literature. The extent of this influence, and its impact on our understanding of these two men beyond the context of the Late Republican period was unfortunately outside the scope of this thesis, but possibly contains fruitful grounds for further studies. What this chapter did provide, however, was a glimpse into the rhetorical and dramatic techniques that Cicero employed in his depictions of the character of Cassius and Brutus. One such technique that stood out in its effectiveness, and may in fact be a contributing factor for their characterisation in the later sources, was the use of comparative portraiture.

It should be stated that what Cicero is doing here is not inventing personality, but rather presenting and highlighting particular aspects and characteristics in a way in which an exaggeration or slight caricature of actual persona emerges.
CONCLUSION

After all, in order to be believable and accepted, these depictions must in some way resemble or mirror the actual person. The image may be distorted, but it needs to be still recognisable.

It was shown that Cicero uses a plethora of techniques in order to establish these depictions in contrast. Hyperbole, historical infinitive, litotes, polyptoton, anaphora, and chiasmus are a few of the devices highlighted within these letters. Add to this the positioning and editing of reports, interjections, direct and indirect speech, effective use of impersonal verbs, and emotive and dramatic language, and the rhetorical and literary elements of the letters become immediately apparent. The presence of such literary devices indicates the art of rhetoric in the letter, but rhetoric devoid of the spectacle of the physical performance that Cicero would have had in his repertoire in the law courts, the senate and the *contiones*. Thus, even in the letters, Cicero can express anxiety, guilt, jealousy, and a myriad of other emotions, but he is limited to literary techniques in his quest to persuade and direct the recipients of his letters towards a certain opinion or action. This adaptation of performance rhetoric would certainly help to explain the density of devices and theatrics in some of the letters.

---

5 This will be examined again below in relation to rhetoric in general.
6 On the performance of oratory in Cicero see Hall’s recent work on judicial theatre (2014); cf. Bell (2013).
CONCLUSION

Much of the second chapter focused on the meeting at Antium which was to decide the next course of action after the proposal of the corn acquisition commission for Cassius and Brutus. This episode was a paradigmatic example of Cicero’s use of comparative portraiture with Cassius’ aggressive and impulsive persona juxtaposed to Brutus’ cautious and contemplative personality. One of the most profound examples was seen in the directness of Cassius’ answers to Cicero’s enquiry, compared to Brutus’ rambling dialogue set in hypotheticals and questions. Morello states that expressions of spoken language suggest realism, and this would certainly have been necessary in the reporting to Atticus of the sequence of events at the meeting at Antium. In this way Cicero could sustain a construction of realism within the portraiture of the aggressive and defiant Cassius in comparison to the wary and passive Brutus.

This episode also allowed Cicero to introduce another point of comparison for Brutus, that of his mother Servilia. It has been suggested that she and Brutus swapped roles in some aspects of their behaviour, with Brutus becoming the complacent and passive entity, all the time as his mother became, or at least Cicero presented her as, the active participant in politics. This discussion has brought up questions and doubts about her importance and level of actual influence beyond her immediate family (materna auctoritas), particularly after the death of Caesar.

Morello (2013: 188-9).
CONCLUSION

One unexpected discovery was the reporting of the success of Brutus to Cassius and vice versa. The hyperbolic recording of the other’s achievements in comparison to the downplaying of the recipient’s praises, often surrounded in rumour and expectation, was unanticipated. It would again seem to point towards some form of rhetorical device for persuasion. In these cases it was suggested that the establishment of a rivalry of sorts could provide an impetus for the recipient to act in a manner which was not only appropriate to the situation, but also in the best interest of the State. It could be further suggested that Cicero in these instances was demonstrating the behaviours which he wished the recipient to exhibit by holding up a portraiture of his rival for comparison.

The final chapter examined Cicero’s last attempts to salvage the republic despite the absence of Cassius and Brutus from Rome. It was during these times that he turned towards concepts of popularity, universal consent and appeals to duty and reciprocity in order to achieve his desire to see the conspirators, preferably with armies, returning to Rome to save the State and restore libertas and the republic. Ultimately it did not work, but Cicero’s success or failure is not at question here, only his use of these techniques.

The crisis in the republic would again help to explain this new tactic in rhetoric. This period saw a rapid sequence of events, including the defeat and escape of
Antonius, the death of both consuls, the defection of Lepidus, and the murder of Trebonius at the hands of Dolabella. In addition to this was the growing complication of Octavian, including divided loyalties and questionable intentions. It is no wonder that Cicero sought a safeguard in the conspirators and the potential of their aid and armies.

It is seen in this last chapter that Cicero turned to the Stoic concepts of universal consent and, within this, the idea of overwhelming popularity in Rome. The conspirators in many ways take on an almost popular hero persona, particularly as Cicero occasionally reveals that the dissent in Rome was most felt within the senate, and particularly with the consulares. However, even as he expresses this popularity, he only uses the term *popularis* in relation to himself, and not to the conspirators. It was suggested that this was to avoid confusion with Caesarian popularity. Nevertheless, it can be shown that he still sought a distinction between what he saw as the ‘true’ *popularis*, the man who had the benefit of the people at heart and in mind, and the ‘false’ *popularis* who pleased the crowd for his own benefit.

The role the *contio* took in expressing the view of the people is tied to the notion of universal consent. The *contio* was seen as representative of the general feeling of the people, despite problems with it actually being an accurate demographical representation. To Cicero, there was a complex link between
liberty and the power of the people, and by seeking approval in the *contio* as the voice of the Roman populace he could add legitimacy to his claims and opinions. By drawing on a *consensus gentium* argument, he could demonstrate to Cassius and Brutus that what he was requesting of them was the will of the people and, therefore, of the State.

Finally, appeals to the duty that the Roman statesman had towards his country was Cicero's final rhetorical device of persuasion. A common theme detectable throughout the letters under study was the perception that the assassination alone had not completed the desired goal. In this was the opinion that as long as political *libertas* remained unachieved, the obligation and duty to the State which began on the Ides of March also remained unsatisfied. The fact that the death of Caesar had not only failed to remove the tyranny, but had actually made life in Rome worse under Antonius, lies at the heart of Cicero's belief in a duty unfulfilled.\(^8\) In this role, Cicero makes Cassius and Brutus the figureheads and saviours of the State, intrinsically linking them to the safety and survival of the Roman republic even in their absence. Thus, their obligation remained to fulfil this mission, starting with their return to defend the State, physically if necessary, but otherwise with leadership and their strength of character. This opinion was heavily influenced by Cicero's understanding of how the republic

\(^8\) It has been demonstrated that this must have reminded Cicero of the actuality of the outcome in Athens following the murder of Hipparchnus by Harmodius and Aristogeiton.
might be restored. Just as the current crisis was not caused through the inadequacies of the system, but rather because of the degenerate and self-centred ‘leaders’ who treated the Roman citizens and State like slaves, so too could the State be restored by noble Romans who placed Roman values, equity in justice and community welfare before their own personal interests. This would appear to be Cicero’s intended role for Cassius and Brutus, but unfortunately for him and for the republic, the conspirators did not respond to this rhetoric.

Perhaps one of the more interesting questions that this study uncovers is in regard to Cicero’s purpose for characterisation in the correspondence. Of course it is impossible to establish Cicero’s motivations and motives in writing in a particular way with any degree of certainty. However, if we can establish that Cicero is indeed employing rhetorical techniques in his letters in order to depict Cassius and Brutus in a particular light, does this necessarily mean that he was being purposefully and maliciously disingenuous in order to manipulate people to do his bidding? As Powell writes, ‘artistry does not necessarily imply artificiality’.9 Whilst a deceptive and manipulative Cicero is certainly a possibility given the evidence, it would appear that the art of rhetoric itself may have more to do with his approach. Indeed, the familiarity that many Romans would have had with these rhetorical techniques may have been a contributing factor in the failure of the conspirators to respond to it.

9 Powell (2013: 50).
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As a point of comparison, Socrates in Plato’s *Phaedrus* states that the rhetorician should always keep probability rather than the truth in sight, even to the point of omission (272d-e). Similarly he states that in order for the orator to construct a resemblance of the facts he must know the actual truth. This held true not just in the political and forensic fields, but in all spoken communications (261e-262b). Of course, Cicero’s opinion of rhetoric was far removed from that of Plato, but what becomes apparent is the expectation that rhetoric could allow a mirroring of events, viewed through a particular perspective in order to depict a person or situation in a certain light. The nature of the letter is not different. As an affected medium, it constructs a ‘reality’ based on the perspective of the writer. As mentioned in the introduction, it is Cicero’s account of history and the individuals of this period that is presented in the letters.

As such, the depictions of characters in Cicero’s correspondence place Cassius and Brutus in specific roles firstly to express opinions on their obligation, duties, mistakes, and actions. However, the identification of rhetoric within the letters would also indicate an attempt to persuade. Deep within Roman thought was the awareness that the power of rhetoric was in its ability to distort and manipulate, and in this regard, there was no difference between a standard

\hspace{1cm}

10 A famous passage from the *De Oratore* has Crassus neutralise Plato’s invective against rhetoric by expressing the fact that he was an excellent orator even in his ridicule of orators - *quod mihi [in] oratoribus inridendis ipse esse orator summus videbatur.* (*De or.* 1.47; cf. 3.129).

11 Hall (2007).
oratory presentation before the senate or the law courts and that which appeared in these ‘persuasive’ letters. However, just as standard rhetorical devices were well known and identifiable in speeches, so too would they be identifiable in the letters to those involved in the vast networks of amicitia and the subsequent literary activities of the upper-classes in Roman society. Cassius and Brutus would have read Cicero’s letters fully aware of the rhetorical legitimacy of expressions of popularity and universal support. Atticus would have been familiar with the use of hyperbolic praise or juxtaposition to create extremes of expression in order to increase pathos in an argument.

What may have differed somewhat though is its expression in the conversational language of the correspondence. It is this identification of extensive rhetoric in the letters of Cicero that provides the greatest contribution of this thesis. The realisation of the extent of epistolary persuasion in the correspondence should produce a reconsideration of the historicity of the letters. Included in this is the reconstruction not only of events, but also of the personalities that created this history. Whilst many of the motives behind these persuasive arguments may forever lie in obscurity as ‘unknowable’, the consideration and understanding of this further complexity in Cicero’s letters provides ample opportunities for the betterment of our understanding of rhetoric, history and historical personalities of the Late Roman Republican period. More
CONCLUSION

fundamentally, it provides a more complete consideration and appreciation of
the intricacies of the great Roman statesman himself.
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