



<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz>

ResearchSpace@Auckland

Copyright Statement

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

This thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of this thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from their thesis.

To request permissions please use the Feedback form on our webpage.

<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/feedback>

General copyright and disclaimer

In addition to the above conditions, authors give their consent for the digital copy of their work to be used subject to the conditions specified on the [Library Thesis Consent Form](#) and [Deposit Licence](#).

Note : Masters Theses

The digital copy of a masters thesis is as submitted for examination and contains no corrections. The print copy, usually available in the University Library, may contain corrections made by hand, which have been requested by the supervisor.

A Commentary on Cicero's *Philippics* 10 and 11

by
Tia Dawes

A thesis
submitted in fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Ancient History,
The University of Auckland, 2010

Abstract

The *Philippic* speeches, save *Philippic 2*, have received relatively little attention from scholars, despite providing an almost continuous narrative of the tumultuous year following Caesar's assassination. *Philippics 10* and *11* are amongst the least studied of the *Philippic* orations and no commentary deals specifically with the two speeches, either together or individually. I have aimed to fill that gap. In *Philippics 10* and *11* the focus turns away from Marcus Antonius, the principal target of Cicero's ire, to Brutus and Cassius, the assassins of Caesar and Cicero's champions of the republican cause who were seeking to gain control of the eastern provinces in order to prevent them from falling into the hands of Antonius' supporters. Cicero presents their actions as an *ad hoc* response to the manoeuvrings of Antonius' agents, and attempts to show their actions as being conducted in the best traditions of the republic.

The thesis has three introductory chapters. The first of these covers, in brief detail, the historical circumstances immediately after the assassination and the events leading to the conflicts in the east. The second relates to the delivery and dissemination of *Philippics 10* and *11*, and the questions of form and purpose that arise from this enquiry. The third introductory chapter looks at praise and blame and the way Cicero manipulates these rhetorical *loci* in the presentation of Brutus and Cassius. The two following chapters form the commentaries on *Philippics 10* and *11* respectively, in which the focus is firstly upon Cicero's method of persuasion, and then in placing the orations in a broader context of the failing Roman republic.

For my parents

Preface

The *Philippics*, the last of Cicero's published speeches, are an urgent and compelling depiction of the Late Republic once more bracing itself for civil war. Such a description of events makes it somewhat surprising that the *Philippics* have been slow to receive much critical attention (with the almost sole exception of *Philippic 2*). Indeed, during the twentieth century, the *Philippics* were disparaged as an unreliable and cantankerous record of events following the assassination of Caesar, and consequently dismissed as such. The *Philippics* have, however, received a renewed surge of interest following this long period of comparative neglect. This interest was perhaps sparked when Shackleton Bailey produced a newly edited text and translation in 1986, which he had hoped would provide the basis for future commentators.¹ This challenge has since been taken up by a number of scholars who have produced a series of commentaries to answer this call.²

Cicero's often repeated aim within the *Philippics* was to defend the *res publica* against the tyrannical aspirations of M. Antonius and any with him who were prepared to take up arms against the *patria*. *Philippics 10* and *11* are expressions of this aim, but the subject matter now takes on broader consequences as Cicero shifts the focus from Antonius in Italy to the provinces where Antonius' satellites were laying claims. A new impetus was given to Cicero's fight against Antonius in February 43, when M. Iunius Brutus, the co-leader with C. Cassius Longinus in the conspiracy against Caesar, informed the senate that he had taken possession of Greece, Macedonia and Illyricum, and that he was placing himself at the disposal of the senate. Cicero was delighted at the news; he delivered *Philippic 10* proposing that Brutus be granted official command. On this occasion, Cicero's proposal was duly passed, and Brutus' appointment a political victory for the aged consular. Brutus' legal title however was dubious; Cicero argued that Brutus had taken control of the Greek provinces in the interests of the *res publica*, and that he had done so in order to

¹ Shackleton Bailey 1986: vii.

² Lacey (1986) coincidentally began the process with a commentary on *Philippic 2*. Novielli (2001) produced a commentary on *Philippic 13*, and Ramsey (2002), in quick succession, followed with commentaries on *Philippics 1* and *2*. Monteleone (2003 and 2005) produced a commentary on *Philippic 3*, followed by a work on *Philippic 4*. More recently, Manuwald (2007) has provided an authoritative study of the *Philippics* with accompanying commentaries on *Philippics 3-9*. No English commentaries on *Philippics 10* and *11* have appeared since J. R. King's 1878 annotated edition of *Philippics 1-14*.

deny Macedonia to Antonius. At the heart of Cicero's argument was that all law could be laid aside if public interest was served; similarly, Antonius forfeited all legal right when he turned his army against the *res publica*.

News soon followed that P. Cornelius Dolabella, Antonius' consular colleague, had put to death C. Trebonius, the governor of Asia and one of Caesar's assassins, while en route to his province of Syria. The senate was outraged and immediately declared Dolabella a public enemy. This forms the occasion of *Philippic* 11. To meet this new menace, Cicero proposed an extended command for Cassius, who had secretly departed for the east after leaving Italy in the wake of Caesar's assassination. Cicero believed he was in the region and in the process of raising arms and supplies in anticipation of a likely conflict (although Cicero avoids broaching the question of why Cassius was there). On this latter occasion Cicero's proposal was opposed and the consuls instead were commissioned to go east against Dolabella once their campaign in Italy was brought to a conclusion.

These two orations outline the changing situation in the east, and trace the emergence of Brutus and Cassius from a period of self-imposed exile, to a position in which they were now potent obstacles to Antonius. Irrespective of senatorial instruction, Brutus and Cassius colluded in securing the eastern provinces. The impetus towards civil war was now almost immutable. To what degree their actions were preconceived is not clear; but what is clear is that when the liberators acted, they did so with ambitious purpose, quickly securing a sizeable military force which they would continue to augment until the battles of Philippi. The emergence of Brutus and Cassius in the eastern provinces marks a decisive point in Cicero's promotion of war against Antonius. The two orations trace the shift in senatorial debate from Antonius in Italy to the rejuvenation of what Cicero could present as a spontaneous response to the illegal activities of Antonius' colleagues. My aim has been to trace this development throughout *Philippics* 10 and 11, to relate the two speeches to the *Philippic* corpus and to the wider historical context. Either of the two speeches can be read on its own; but only when read together are the anxieties regarding the liberators made clear. This has much to do with the respective characterisations of the leading figures within Cicero's narrative. Cicero left an indelibly negative portrait of Antonius that has influenced both ancient and modern perceptions. Less noticeably, though no less influential, was Cicero's portrayal of Brutus, whose enlightened and philosophically motivated characterisation within *Philippic* 10 has coloured

subsequent depictions of him. Less appealing was the character of Cassius, who provoked fear and hostility among his contemporaries and indeed to succeeding generations. He emerges as a far more ambiguous figure, lurking in the shadows of his more illustrious counterpart. This compels Cicero to approach the two speeches in dissimilar ways. This difference in approach allows us to compare Cicero's strikingly different arguments aimed at legitimizing the conduct of Brutus and Cassius, the way Cicero moulds his arguments to the respective characterisation of his protagonists, and to the changed circumstances between the two speeches' delivery. In *Philippic* 10, Cicero was speaking to the senate with the knowledge that he had the support of the presiding consul, Pansa, and therefore he could tailor his speech to an already receptive audience. However, in *Philippic* 11, Cicero faced a more hostile audience, anxious about the growing strength of the liberators and their intentions; Cicero shifts the focus of his argument accordingly, fashioning his argument to suit the newly developed situation in such a way as to placate anxieties among his senatorial peers.

Cicero's immediate audience might well appreciate the vigour, humour and performative aspects of the oration, but Cicero also had to communicate his intentions, or even satisfy the expectations of a distanced audience who would read the speeches long after their delivery. In this way the dissemination of *Philippics* 10 and 11, as written texts, allowed Cicero to operate beyond the immediate senatorial context. To those who were to receive copies, Cicero was able to outline the political situation, as he perceived it, and to articulate a policy that might encourage a particular response that supported his own position.

The commentary is prefaced by an introductory section which serves to orient the reader to the commentary, covering material related to an understanding of Cicero's rhetorical aims and methods. Themes and relationships, established in the introductory sections, are addressed in more detail within the commentary proper when they relate to specific lemmata. Within the commentaries themselves I have focused primarily upon providing historical comment and rhetorical structure in relation to Cicero's persuasive aims. Only occasional attention has been given to linguistic questions.

I do not provide a critical text, but rely primarily upon Shackleton Bailey's text of 1986. Where necessary I refer to other editions; notably Clarke's 1918 OCT edition; Fedeli's 1982 Teubner edition; and the recently published Loeb edition of Manuwald and Ramsey 2009. Fedeli, in particular, provides an extensive apparatus

criticus, which complements Shackleton Bailey's text and provides a less judgmental assessment of the various MSS. There is little textual comment, save where I have altered the text; and where I have altered the text, I have drawn attention to this within the corresponding lemma.

Acknowledgements

Finally, it is a pleasure to acknowledge those who have supported this work during its various stages. I owe a debt of gratitude to my supervisor, Marcus Wilson, whose turn of phrase revealed an astute understanding of Cicero's method and whose many observations proved a stimulus to a greater appreciation of Cicero's work. Tom Stevenson provided the initial encouragement and enthusiasm for this thesis, for which I will always be thankful. Mark Davies and Julian Larsen have read sections of my work and provided a welcome source of discussion and helpful advice. I would like to thank Hugo Messer, who has proven in many ways to be the inspiration for this project, despite never knowing it. And finally, I offer my deepest thanks to Penelope Lindsay for her continual support throughout this seemingly never-ending process.

Table of contents

Abstract	i
Dedication	ii
Preface	iii
Acknowledgements	vii
Table of contents	viii
References and abbreviations	ix
A note on the manuscript tradition	xii
Textual variants	xiii
Introduction	
1. The historical background to <i>Philippics</i> 10 and 11	1
2. The inclusion of <i>Philippics</i> 10 and 11 within the <i>Philippic</i> corpus	15
3. Praise and blame	28
Commentaries	
Introduction to <i>Philippic</i> 10	41
Commentary	44
Introduction to <i>Philippic</i> 11	173
Commentary	176
Bibliography	302

References and Abbreviations

Cited editions of the *Philippics*

- King King, J. R. ed. *The Philippic Orations of M. Tullius Cicero* (Oxford 1878).
- Clark Clark, A. C. ed. *Cicero, Orationes Philippicae I-XIV*, OCT. (Oxford 1918).
- Ker Ker, W. A. ed. *Cicero, Philippics*, Loeb (Cambridge 1926).
- Fedeli Fedeli, P. ed. *M. Tullius Cicero, in M. Antonium Orationes Philippicae XIV*, Teubner (Leipzig 1982).
- Shackleton Bailey Shackleton Bailey, D. R. ed. *Cicero, Philippics* (Chapel Hill and London 1986).
- M-R Manuwald, G. and J. T. Ramsey edds. Revised edition of Shackleton Bailey's 1986 text and translation. *Cicero, Philippics*, Loeb (Cambridge, 2009).

Standard works

- A-G *Allen and Greenough's New Latin Grammar*. B. Greenough et al. edds. (Boston, 1903).
- CIL *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* (1863-).
- FIRA *Fontes Iuris Romani Ante Iustiniani*. S. Riccobono ed. (Florence, 1941-3).
- G-L Gildersleeve, B. L., and G. Lodge, *Latin Grammar*, 3rd edn. (London, 1895).

- IDélos* *Inscriptions de Délos* (Paris, 1926-1972).
- IVO* *Inchriften von Olympia*. W. Dittenberger and K. Purgold eds. (Berlin, 1896).
- Lausberg Lausberg, H. *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*, tr. M. T. Bliss, A. Jansen, D. E. Orton, ed. D. E. Orton and R. D. Anderson (Leiden, 1998).
- L-S Lewis, C. T. and C. Short. *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford, 1879).
- LSJ Liddell, H. and R. Scott. *Greek-English Lexicon*, rev. H. Stuart Jones; suppl. E. Barber et al. (Oxford, 1968).
- MRR* Broughton, T. R. S. *Magistrates of the Roman Republic*. 3 vols. (New York, 1951 – Atlanta, 1986).
- OLD* *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. P. G. W. Glare ed. (Oxford, 1982).
- RE* *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. F. Pauly and G. Wissowa eds. (Stuttgart, 1893-1980).
- RRC* Crawford, M. H. *Roman Republican Coinage*. 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1974).
- SVF* Arnim, H. von *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta* (Stuttgart, 1903-).
- TLL* *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (Leipzig, 1900-).
- T-P Tyrell, R. Y. and Purser, L. C., eds. *The Correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero*. 6 vols. 2nd edn. (Dublin, 1904-33).

All dates are BC unless otherwise stated. Ancient authors and their works are abbreviated as in the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (*OCD*³). The works of Cicero, however, are given by title only, followed by book and section number. For clarity, all references to the *Philippics* are given in full, including the orations under discussion, and for ease of reference I have included line numbers within the commentary; these

correspond to the line numbers within Shackleton Bailey's edition and do not refer to a standardized numbering. Additionally, Cicero's letters are referred to by traditional Book and letter number, not Shackleton Bailey's renumbering. References to Appian without title are to the *Civil Wars* unless otherwise stated. Similarly, references to Quintilian are to the *Institutio Oratoria*. References to secondary scholarship are referred to in abbreviated form (name and year of publication); full publication details are supplied within the bibliography.

Nomenclature of the Late Republic poses some problem in terms of clarity, given the duplication of many of the *nomina*, particularly in relation to the Bruti and Antonii. For precision I refer to both Marcus Brutus and Marcus Antonius by their cognomen and nomen respectively, since they form the principal characters within *Philippics* 10 and 11; but I include *praenomina* when referring to any of the other Bruti or Antonii (for example, when referring to Decimus Brutus I refer to D. Brutus throughout). At times, I include *praenomina* when referring to M. Antonius and M. Brutus, but this is generally to clarify a particular context.

All Latin translations are my own unless otherwise stated. However, I have left some terms untranslated (such as *res publica*), since they depend very much on context to supply the particular meaning of the term.

A note on the manuscript tradition

The text of the *Philippics* is based on the following manuscripts (the *sigla* are taken from Fedeli 1982):

<i>V</i>	=	cod. tabularii Basilicae Vaticanae H 25, saec. IX
<i>b</i>	=	cod. Bernensis 104, saec. XIII-XIV
<i>c</i>	=	familia Colotiana, i.e. codicum Paris. Lat. 5802 (saec. XIII), Paris. Lat. 6602 (saec. XIII), Berolin. Philipp. 1794 (olim 201, saec. XII) consensus
<i>n</i>	=	cod. Vossianus Lat. O 2, saec. X-XI
<i>s</i>	=	cod. Vaticanus Lat. 3228, saec. X
<i>t</i>	=	cod. Monacensis 18787 (olim Tegernseensis 787), saec. XI
<i>v</i>	=	cod. Vaticanus Lat. 3227, saec. XII
<i>D</i>	=	codicum <i>bcnstv</i> consensus

The textual tradition of the *Philippics* has been shown to belong to two independent branches (*V* and *D*), which descend from a single archetype (no longer extant). For a detailed discussion of the textual tradition see the preface to Fedeli's 1982 edition; but see also the introductory comments by M-R 2009: xxxvii-xxxix; Shackleton Bailey 1986: xiii-xv; and Clark 1900: 39-48. Of particular note, however, is the lacunae in *V* where no text is preserved for *Phil.* 11.22-40. Conversely, a gap in *D* exists at *Phil.* 10.8-10 for which we are reliant on *V*.

Textual variants

The text used for this commentary is based on Shackleton Bailey's 1986 edition of the *Philippics*. Departures from Shackleton Bailey's text are minimal and, where I have diverged from his text, I have made note both below and within the commentary. Shackleton Bailey's textual emendations are justified by him in either the *apparatus criticus*, the appendix of his edition, or in his articles from 1979 and 1982 respectively (see bibliography).

<i>Shackleton Bailey</i>	<i>Dawes</i>
<i>Phil.</i> 10.9.1 <i>po<s>t</i>	<i>post</i>
<i>Phil.</i> 10.9.5 <i>ut potuisset</i>	<i>potuisset autem</i>
<i>Phil.</i> 10.11.6 <i>elusi sumus</i>	<i>extrusimus</i>
<i>Phil.</i> 10.22.6 <i>Saxa et Cafo</i>	<i>Saxae et Cafones</i>
<i>Phil.</i> 10.25.3 <i>auxilia</i>	<i>exercitus</i>
<i>Phil.</i> 11.15.12 <i>[res] acta[s]</i>	<i>acta</i>
<i>Phil.</i> 11.23.3 <i>ulla[m]</i>	<i>ulla</i>
<i>Phil.</i> 11.27.3 <i>iudicabit</i>	<i>iudicavit</i>