

The Philippics have a varied audience, both across the fourteen speeches they comprise and as a published tradition reaching all the way to the present day. The ostensible audience is for twelve of the speeches the Roman senate, and for the two *contiones* the *populus Romanus*; but the second Philippic, though written as if it were, was never delivered orally before the Senate, and it is this anomaly which raises the question of the publication of these speeches. Was Cicero's motive to make a simple record of the speeches, to have a second weapon with which to attack Antony, or, indeed, to condemn Antony not just for the immediate purpose of keeping him from power, but for all eternity. As with the question of audience, the answer to each disjunct in this question is affirmative to varying degrees. This essay uses some elementary statistics to begin an answer to the question of who the audience is or is intended to be in the Antonian Orations and then hopes to round out this answer by an investigation into Cicero's motive for publication, with reference to his life and other writings.

To first look simply at the speeches themselves, it will be noted that each has an address in the first sentence. The most common of these is *patres conscripti*, occurring early in speeches 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, and 14; in the two *contiones*, speeches 4 and 6, the phrase is *Quirites*; The remaining speeches, speeches 8 and 10, address consul Gaius Pansa, as *C. Pansa* and *Pansa* respectively. These initial addresses suggest the intended audience for the speech as a whole, with a few exceptions: *patres conscripti* in the Second Philippic addresses an imaginary audience, since the reader knows that this speech was never delivered in the senate; [*C.*] *Pansa* is something of a synecdoche, addressing one man, if not in place of the senate as a whole, at least before them. The first exception is certainly a result of the peculiar nature of the delivery of that speech; does the second exception signal any difference with the rest of the senatorial speeches in each of the speeches in which it occurs?

First it should be noted that the addresses to Pansa at the beginning of speeches 8 and 10 are the only such addresses in those speeches. By comparison, *patres conscripti* occurs eight and five times in each respectively. This seems to indicate that these speeches are as a whole still directed towards the entire senate. Elsewhere, Pansa is addressed a full five times in the twelfth speech and once in each of the seventh, ninth and eleventh; *patres conscripti* occurs eight, twelve, seven, and twelve times respectively, easily outweighing the singling out of the consul from the rest of the meeting.

Rather than as a consistently unique audience, it seems Cicero addresses Pansa only as and when it will aid his argument, otherwise being happy to let him count as one amongst the other senators. Hence, in the case of each of the speeches in which Pansa is the first to be addressed, Cicero is responding to a particularly relevant act of Pansa's: in the eighth his willingness the previous

day to yield to those "*_quibus cedere non soles_*", Antony's supporters, that is, in the matter of declaring either *_bellum_* or *_tumultum_*; in the tenth his praise of Brutus and alacrity in calling the meeting of the senate. The argument itself is consistently directed towards the senate as a whole; addressing individual senators is only a rhetorical device, which finds its force in the presence of the man being addressed, in the second person immediacy of the vocative form of the noun as opposed to the third person other cases.

Another reason for Cicero to address Pansa separately lies in the fact that Pansa was consul, and so had different responsibilities to the senators; thus "*_Sed vos moneo, patres conscripti... Te ipsum, Pansa, moneo..._*" (VII, 27) focuses from the general responsibility of the senate to the personal burden which Pansa bears as consul. From a pragmatic point of view, being consul also meant that Pansa would have convened and opened most of the senate meetings in which the Philippics were given. Thus it is fitting both that Cicero should acknowledge Pansa's remarks, as was appropriate for any speaker following on from another, and that he should show some respect in addressing him. Thus, in recognizing the praise Pansa has given Servius Sulpicius, Cicero flatters the consul by addressing him as *_C. Pansa praeclare_* (IX, 3). In giving him advice ("*_moneo..._*" above) he is sure to say, "*_quamquam non eges consilio, quo vales plurimum_*".

This type of politeness was not restricted to the consul, but was called for even when addressing one's opponent. The other main individual addressee in the senatorial Philippics was Q. Fufius Calenus, a man obstinately opposed to Cicero's point of view. Cicero addresses him directly four times in the eighth speech and thrice in the tenth. In the case of both speeches Cicero is singling Calenus out for his actions immediately preceding; for much the same reason, that is, that he singles out Pansa. However, Cicero generally approves of Pansa (as shown above, except for the address at the beginning of speech 8); with Calenus he is "*_a te sentiens_*" (X, 5): Nevertheless, Calenus is referred to as "*_vir fortis ac strenuus amicus meus_*" (VIII, 11). It seems that although he was quite happy to admit that Calenus was actually "*_mihi inimicissimus_*" in a private letter (*_ad Att._* xiv. 8), Cicero felt that in the presence of the senate he had to disagree with him "*_sine offensione nostrae amicitiae_*" (X, 5).

As hinted at above, these individual addresses account for only a part of the immediate audience for most of the speeches. The combined addresses to Calenus and Pansa come to less than twenty in number, compared to the 125 instances of *_patres conscripti_*. The 32 instances of *_Quirites_* are restricted to the *_contiones_*, speeches 4 and 6, in which there are no instances of *_patres conscripti_*. It is clear that in the speeches which were orally delivered the audience is the senate, except when it is the people, and that any other addresses, though directed they may be at any single person, are intended to be heard and understood by one of these larger audiences.

The second Philippic, on the other hand, was not only directed towards

Antony and the senate (the individual and group addressees whom Cicero identifies and divides his attention between in this unique speech), but also towards the general public, the true audience of any speech which is published but not delivered. It could perhaps be argued that Cicero published the second Philippic for the same reason that he had the second *actio* of the Verrines: the speech he published would have been the speech he had given had he felt safe to attend the meeting of the senate at which Antony was present with an armed bodyguard, just as the second *actio* of the Verrines represents what would have been the rest of Cicero's case had Verres not abandoned his defence. Just as he did not want the hard work he had put into his prosecution to go to waste, Cicero, while unable or unwilling to face Antony, could not allow him to have the last word either, to assault his character without reproach.

The second Philippic, then, was not a speech so much as a political pamphlet designed to publicize and criminalize Antony's behavior. Its subsequent publication amongst the rest of the speeches is therefore unexceptional, since it is in keeping with its original delivery; but how to account for the publication of the rest of the speeches, which originally were delivered orally? Obviously the Philippics are not the only work of his to have been circulated; it is due to his habit of self-publishing that Cicero's is the largest body of surviving ancient literature. Jane W. Crawford addresses the reason for Cicero's prolific publication: "Cicero was a *novus homo*, and as such had to rely heavily on the reputation that oratory could win for him in order to build his career."^[1] The nature of oratory is transitory, and so Cicero maintained his reputation by both a sustained habit of speaking and also by publishing his speeches.

Cicero himself, and, indeed, Roman authors in general, realized the enduring nature of the written word. The ninth Philippic addresses a matter somewhat separate to the usual anti-Antonian concern of the work as a whole (although he does manage to slip in an attack where one makes itself available^[2]); rather, in this speech Cicero is concerned with appropriately honoring the envoy Servius Sulpicius Rufus who died on the embassy to Antony. In terms of the speech at the point of delivery, the honor in question was a statue; but just as Horace erected a *monumentum aere perrenius*, so in publishing this speech Cicero has secured for Sulpicius a memorial to outlast even that honor. In reading that speech one may replace several instances of the word *statua* with "this speech" and obtain a good sense of how Cicero regarded the lasting quality of his words.

This notion may be extended to the purpose of the Philippics as a whole. "*his enim honoribus habitis Ser. Sulpicio repudiatae reiectaeque legationis ab Antonio manebit testificatio sempiterna*" (9.15); the statue will function not just to honor Sulpicius but also to condemn Antony. By extension, Cicero's speech, though ostensibly praising an envoy, implicitly functions as testament against Antony. This concept operates in the same way as Cicero's argument in

the fourth Philippic that since the senate had awarded honors to those who fought against Antony, Antony had implicitly become a *_hostis_*. Whether Cicero actually believed in these implications or they were only the device of rhetoric, that he uttered and published these arguments is good evidence that he intended to convince not just the senate of Antony's perfidy, nor just the attendees of his *_contiones_*, but all Romans, all men, both contemporary and in ages to come.

For the Philippics differ from Cicero's other published works in the conviction with which they are given: the period after Caesar's assassination was for Cicero an opportunity to restore the type of participatory government in which his oratorical skills could flourish; the (comparatively) stripped back style of the Philippics and the willingness to bring every topic of debate around to Antony reflect the industry and single-mindedness which Cicero applied himself during this period. The publishing of these speeches ensured that such effort would not go unnoticed; evident would be both Cicero's conviction and Antony's guilt.

But the recognition of this power to have influence beyond the speeches' immediate audience, both in popular and temporal terms, betrays by its evidence in the speeches (some instances of which have been noted above) the possibility that Cicero pushed the effect further than was natural in his editing of the speeches. This brings up the question of how conscious Cicero was of the lasting nature of what he said as he actually delivered the speeches in the senate: whether the thread of anti-Antonian sentiment which unifies the speeches as they stand today was an element of the original speeches or was later woven in before publishing.

That Cicero considered the Philippics a unified whole may be borne out by something he says in the tenth Phillipic: "*_me puderet, patres conscripti, in eam urbem redire ex qua [Brutus et Cassius] abirent; sed quo consilio redierim initio audistis, post estis experti._*" The word *_initio_* apparently refers to the first Philippic where Cicero justifies his departure from and return to Rome. Was this statement made "on the fly"? or in the editing of the speeches for publication, with a copy of the first speech before him? It is impossible to know for sure: the neatness of the *_initio... post_* construction may suggest editing, while it is equally possible that Cicero in recalling his absence from Rome also recalled his apology for it. In any case, his diction here implies that he considered there to be some continuity in his motive from the speech he makes in his first Philippic.

Some scholars disagree on this point. There is an argument that the "real" Philippics begin with the speech conventionally known as the third Philippic^[3]. In this view of the orations, the first two speeches are part of a to-and-fro between Antony and Cicero, but once Antony begins the siege at Mutina the rest of the speeches are unified by the goal of defending Decimus Brutus. Cicero himself makes this point over and over again in the final Philippic:

"_Confectio autem huius belli est D. Bruti salus_" (XIV, 1), *_et passim_*. Such a view encourages a more conservative concept of Cicero's motives in publishing the Philippics; perhaps they were published not as an eternal condemnation of Antony but, taking literally Cicero's insistence in the final Philippic on his purpose, as if Mutina were another court case and the Philippics only another testament to Cicero's prowess in that arena.

But if the first two Philippics are to be excluded from the collection, how is their publication or eventual inclusion to be accounted for? The published version of the second Philippic is easy to conceive of, since that is the only form in which it has ever existed, and it may well have originally been excluded from the later speeches which center around Mutina: it has certainly always been recognized as the most remarkable of the Philippics; perhaps it was indeed once separate. But the first speech must have been published at some point, and it is hard to see how it can have existed in isolation. It makes sense, then, to include both of the first speeches amongst the Philippics, and such a choice is supported by Cicero's reference in the tenth to the first, whether such a reference existed in the oral delivery or not.

It is unlikely, however, that the speeches were not published until all had been given. Each was probably written up and circulated some time after their delivery, so that their publication was periodical. Evidence for this is that Cicero had no idea of what or how far away any eventual conclusion to the events might be, and so it made no sense to hold off on publishing the speeches: the benefit of being able to impose a unification of theme and intent upon the complete set of speeches would come at the cost of that intent being lost on past events. Especially after the publication of the second Philippic, it was important to keep those outside the senate up to speed on the situation. Cicero depended on the support of the people in the face of a conservative Senate unwilling to see Antony as wholly evil, as Cicero himself did and argued: hence the *_contiones_*, where Cicero refers constantly to the conviction of the people in Antony's enmity.

Even within that conservative senate Cicero was willing to publish a picture more black and white than it actually was. So in the tenth Philippic he laments that Calenus is the only senator opposing his sentiment, and fears "*_efferi hoc foras et ad populi Romani auris pervenire_"* (X, 6): and yet Calenus (and so Antony) did have support in the senate; and the only reason (at least certainly for the present day reader) that anybody would recognize Calenus as an outlier would be that they had read the published version of this very speech of Cicero's. Cicero claims support in the *_contiones_* as resounding applause, in the senatorial speeches as the senate's consent (bar Calenus), and in the second Philippic as matter of fact following on from his invective. The image of support was important for support to actually be gained, and so the publication of the speeches whilst events were presently unfolding was a crucial part of Cicero's campaign.

In his final great political act, Cicero, though the speeches present a victory, ensured by his industrious self-application that even in the case of failure his dissenting voice would still be heard. The Philippics therefore have an audience larger than the immediate two presented in the speeches themselves: they have shaped people's opinions of Antony ever since they were published; they are a testament for some to the tenacity of an idealist in the face of adversity, for others to the stubborn poisoning of history. As one reads the speeches today one is aware not only of the senate and Cicero's audience at the *_contiones_*, but of how these audiences actually responded, of how the speeches were received. For Cicero is not the ancient equivalent of Parliament Television: the action may be presented as if the reader were omniscient (the audience of the published speeches is never addressed directly), as if only recording what actually happens, but when Cicero tells the people in the forum, "*_sic arbitrabar, quirites, vos iudicare ut ostenditis,_*" (IV, 7) or asserts that "*_numquam tam frequens senatus fuerit ut unus aliquis sententiam [Caleni] secutus sit,_*" (X, 3) the reader is presented with the question of whether indeed Cicero had the whole-hearted support which he attests. In this way the reader becomes an influencable audience of the speeches in the same way that the original listeners had been; a fact which Cicero recognized and made use of in editing and publishing the Philippics, and a good part of the merit of the work itself.

notes

[^1]: Crawford, 3

[^2]: e.g. "*_notetur etiam M. Antoni nefarium bellum gerentis scelerata audacia_*" (IX, 15)

[^3]: see Manuwald, whose commentary begins with the third Philippic

bibliography

* Butler, S., "The Hand of Cicero", 2002

* Crawford, J. W., "M. Tullius Cicero: The Lost and Unpublished Orations", 1984

* Krostenko, B. A., "Cicero, Catullus, and the Language of Social Performance", 2001

* Manuwald, Gesine (ed.), "Cicero, Philippics 3-9", 2007

* Millar, F., "The Crowd in Rome in the Late Republic", 1998

* Nisbet, R. G. M., "The Speeches", in T. A. Dorey (ed.), "Studies in Latin Literature and its Influence: Cicero", 1964, 47-69