

Marcus Antonius' Funeral Oration for Iulius Caesar: Fragments and Testimonies in Classical Literature: Modes of Citation and Representation¹

Nurit Shoval-Dudai

Abstract: Marcus Antonius' lost works serve as instructive case studies to review ancient citing practices. His eulogy in honour of Iulius Caesar, the exchange of political invective with Cicero, and the war of propaganda against Octavian, illustrate different modes of reported speech or text. These works, which reflect the political strife of the late Roman Republic, enable us to reveal specific characteristics of testimonies and fragments.

The importance of literary remains for the study of the ancient world has long been acknowledged by classical scholars. Nevertheless, the practice of collecting fragments and testimonies still lacks systematic theorization. This study aims to provide a comprehensive discussion of fragments and testimonies and classify them into their different types.

Keywords: fragments; reported speech; Classical literature; Marcus Antonius; Iulius Caesar's eulogy; Cicero's *Philippics*; Octavian's propaganda; Roman history

Introduction

The importance of testimonies and fragments for the study of the ancient world was recognized by classical scholars already at the beginning of the modern era. Nevertheless, the specific status and nature of these remains have not received due attention until recent decades. The long-standing practice of collecting fragments and testimonies has lacked systematic theorization, and written remains have not been properly identified. This study aims to provide a comprehensive discussion of fragments and testimonies and a preliminary sketch of their classifications. We will seek to determine more precise definitions of the terms 'fragment' and 'testimony' and the notions underlying these terms, review ancient citing practices, and discover what small-scale case studies can tell us about the bigger picture of these remains.

The bulk of Graeco-Roman literature has come down to us via the copying of manuscripts. Much of this literature includes references, both explicit and implicit, to lost works and their contents. Just as the remains of a building, a tool, or an artwork may inform us about the whole object and the circumstances of its time, the remains of writings may teach us about the original documents and the cultural activities of their

¹ I am most grateful to the lector for the important comments which clarified and improved both argument and presentation. I wish to thank Alexandra Trachsel as well for her helpful observations on the subject of fragments and testimonies.

time. These remains, which make up a large portion of the sources we possess, are referred to by scholars as “fragments” and “testimonies”.

To help sharpen our definition of these terms, I briefly present the issue of fragments and testimonies as a means of mining information concerning things said or written. To begin with, I situate such written remains within the framework of the philological tradition as sources of information about the ancient world. Then, I probe the manner in which information was transmitted by considering three cases from the end of the Roman Republic. In so doing, I examine various modes of the transmission of information in the unique socio-political situation of that period, when factions with different political leanings and ambitions jockeyed for power. I then inquire into the reliability of the sources and discuss the relative value of verbal tradition transmitted in writing and of written documents. Finally, I evaluate the testimonies and fragments as sources for political propaganda and as means for reconstructing historical events. These historical case studies, presented in literary texts, illustrate a variety of modes of reported information from both oral and written contexts. By scrutinizing samples from several prose genres, we can reach a more precise definition of fragments and testimonies.

Fragments and Testimonies as Modes of Information Transmission

The earliest traces of a deliberate process of collecting texts in Greek scholarship can be found in the fifth century BC. Authors and scholars gathered choice selections of their predecessors' works in anthologies or abstracts. Verses, sayings and maxims, speeches and letters, as well as philosophical and technical excerpts were collected for various ends, whether as textbooks for education, choice literary selections, or compendia for authors and scholars.²

In subsequent Roman times the Latin term *fragmentum* refers to a sherd, a piece, a fraction, or a crumb of something tangible in the material sense: stone, metal, wood, or any other substance.³ There is no record in antiquity of the word *fragmentum* being used or semantically defined as a technical term having to do with writing, save for a reference to ‘fragments’ by the ecclesiastical writer, Marius Mercator, in an essay dated to 431 CE. Here it may connote ‘sections’ in the writings of Julian, bishop of Eclanum.⁴ The term *testimonium*, by contrast, was used by ancient writers to strengthen their claims by recourse to other authors, often by quoting sections of their work or drawing examples from them.⁵ Other terms as well were used in relation to literary works. The simile of a *membrum*, a limb, for a line or paragraph of an essay appeared in ancient authors in relation to existing complete works. A technical use of the term in rhetorical,

² Marrou 1956, 41-42; Reynolds and Wilson 2013⁴, 1-5; Pfeiffer 1968, 1.25-56; Dickey 2007, 3-17; Novokhatko 2015, 5-41; Iglesias-Zoido and Pineda 2017, 4-7.

³ Lewis & Short 1879, s.v. *fragmentum*.

⁴ See *ThLL* VI 1913, s.v. *fragmentum*, 1233.1-2, *t.t. de libris* (Marius Mercator, *Liber Subnotationum in Verba Juliani* 9.13 = Migne, *PL* 48 (1862), 170-171). This is the only instance of this meaning noted in the *Thesaurus*. Estienne Baluze (1630-1718) called into question the received text, and emended it in his edition of Mercator's work (Paris 1684).

⁵ Lewis & Short 1879; *OLD* 1976, s.v. *testimonium*.

grammatical, or poetical writings referred to a part of a sentence, a verse, or a colon.⁶ The simile of a body (*corpus*) for works and their authors, and of limbs (*membra*) for parts of works, was common among humanistic scholars to describe mutilated texts (*mutili*) before the use of the simile of fragments (*fragmenta*) became common. The plural form *reliquiae*, ‘remains’, included both a materialistic meaning like that of *fragmenta*, to denote leftovers of food, sacrifices, or remains of a corpse, but encompassed also a more abstract meaning of remnants, survivors.⁷ In relation to writings, the term *reliquiae* was used in various meanings already in early humanistic scholarship. Along with it, the use of the relative clause *quae supersunt*, ‘the things which remained, survived’, became common in relation to writings which were preserved complete or in part.

Early Christian writers applied to the word *fragmentum*, used to describe the miracle of bread and fish in the Gospel of St. John in the Vulgate, an allegorical meaning of spiritual sustenance. This idea was developed into a comparison between the breadcrumbs and the breaking up of the holy writings,⁸ and into a comparison of such crumbs to the actions of figures who were moral role models, which the Church saw fit to document and gather. A tentative association may be made between this use of the term and the word *fragmenta* employed in the Middle Ages to describe collections of sayings, proverbs, and wisdom assembled in anthologies and encyclopedias. The redactors of these collections, like their ancient predecessors, assembled passages using different approaches, usually the thematic method, from previous collections or complete works. These compilations attest the use of the term *fragmenta* to refer to the purposeful breaking up of texts and the selective choosing of passages from them.⁹

The burgeoning of scholarship during what is referred to as the “Twelfth-Century Renaissance” led scholars to collect writings and search for missing works, processes that paved the way for the collection of fragments later on. An early example of an attempt to gather the remains of lost ancient writings is the work of William of Malmesbury from the twelfth century. This Benedictine monk compiled works by Cicero, including passages from the writings of Augustine, who had preserved some of Cicero’s texts.¹⁰ During the thirteenth century, such quotation from lost texts alongside

⁶ A simile of a verse or paragraph to a limb see *invenias etiam disiecti membra poetae* (Hor., *Sat.* 1.4.62); *ne universitas inchoati operis nostri, velut membro aliquo reciso, mutila atque imperfecta conspiceretur* (Colum., *de Re Rustica* 9.2.2); see *ThLL*, s.v. *membrum*, 638.33-34, 40-41; de Hor., *ibid.*, 33-34, ‘audacter pro poematis’); a technical use of the term see *ThLL*, *ibid.*, 644.69-645.30.

⁷ Lewis & Short 1879, s.v. *reliquiae ~ animae* (Lucr., *RN* 3.656); *exercitus* ([Caesar], *BAlex.* 40); *Danaum* (Verg., *Aen.* 1.30); *belli* (Liv., 9.29.3). Cicero used the double meaning of the word: *vellem Idibus Martiis me ad cenam invitasses: reliquiarum nihil fuisset* (Cic., *Fam.* 12.4.1).

⁸ “Gather up the broken pieces that are left over, so that nothing be lost” “συναγάγετε τὰ περισσεύσαντα κλάσματα ἵνα μήτι ἀπόληται”; “*Colligite quae superaverunt fragmenta, ne pereant*” (*Joh.* 6:12); see Zinn 1959, 161-162, 165.

⁹ See Dionisotti 1997, 15-16; a variety of collections documented even at the time of Gellius in the second century CE. See Vardi 2004.

¹⁰ Biography and essays, see Thomson 1987, 1-38; Ouellette 1982, 9-25; Winkler and Dolmans 2017. The passage is quoted in Heck 1966, 246. Scholars agree that William was

existing works became more widespread in various encyclopedic collections. The popularity of the term *fragmenta* to describe these collections indicates a lack of interest in their original context and formulation.¹¹

With the advent of the Renaissance, more critical philological principles began to be formulated and the importance of fragments and testimonies for the history of the ancient world began to emerge. This “philological turn” included a conscious search for texts as close to the original as possible, and for remnants of lost works. Already in the fourteenth century, Petrarch introduced a new methodology for dealing with the literary traditions of the ancients, which led to a more clearly defined relationship between bibliographies, anthologies, and fragments.¹² The corpus of Classical texts, whether surviving or known to have been lost, was thus assessed and catalogued. In the fifteenth century, Angelo Poliziano skillfully wielded the philological tools available to him to restore lost documents and also used his techniques to gather remains of texts, as part of an attempt to recreate the ancient world.¹³

Following the invention and popularity of print, in the sixteenth century *opera omnia* editions that attempted to embrace the complete work of a particular writer, including fragments of lost writings, became popular. Robert Estienne’s 1544 edition of the writings of Sallust included, for the first time, fragments culled from the works of other writers, alongside speeches and letters that had been excerpted and separately transmitted.¹⁴

Starting with the editions of Cicero published in the sixteenth century, a typographic differentiation was adopted: the Aldine edition of Asconius’ commentary on Cicero’s speeches published in 1522 treated the quotes of the first words of the passages discussed in the commentary of Asconius (the *lemmata*) as fragments and distinguished between Cicero and Asconius in font type.¹⁵ In 1559, Carlo Sigonio published in Venice a collection of Cicero’s fragments, the first collection composed entirely of literary fragments that had been preserved as quotations in the works of others. Cicero’s standing among classical writers, the variety and volume of his output and the frequency with which it was quoted, justified the creation of a composition of this sort. Later

the first to make explicit use of indirect tradition, but disagree as to the nature of its use. Reynolds and Wilson 2013⁴, 114 surmised that his goal was to create a comprehensive edition of the writings of Cicero, while Oullette 1982, 15-16 regards the collection as an assortment of writings William composed of pre-existing essays and passages quoted through indirect tradition. See also Nikasen 2017, 118, 127; Thomson 2005, 385; 2017, 219-220 “...pulls from the pie plums such as William’s great collection of Cicero’s works, including the passage in which the monk defends his love of pagan literature, and the *polyhistor*, which gathers together extracts from this literature ...”.

¹¹ Grafton 1997, 143 on collection of historical fragments around 1800 concludes that only the fragment, not its wider context, mattered.

¹² Dionisotti 1997, 10-11; Pfeiffer 1976, 2.3-20, esp. 7-8.

¹³ For more details about Poliziano’s innovations concerning humanistic research methods see Grafton 1991.

¹⁴ Stephanus noted that he culled them from the works of Festus, Nonius, Priscian, and Gellius, see Dionisotti 1997, 29.

¹⁵ Dionisotti 1997, 22; Andreas Naugerius’s edition was first published in 1519 and printed by a number of publishers; see Clark, ed. 1905, 1.xii.

editions had to take into account the precedents that had been set for dealing with fragments by identifying them in the text using a reference to the source and often by using typographic methods to differentiate fragments from the rest of the text.¹⁶

The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries saw the critical methods that had emerged during the Renaissance take root and spread north. The works of Richard Bentley stand to this day as a model of the critical method.¹⁷

Yet it is only fairly recently that a systematic method for dealing with fragments and testimonies, including definitions of these terms, methodological principles, and compilation techniques, was developed. In a 1959 article discussing “the unwhole” as an art form, Ernst Zinn pointed out for the first time the lack of definitional and etymological clarity for the term ‘fragments’. He reconstructed the metaphorical use of the word in Latin, from which the technical term employed since the Renaissance had developed.¹⁸ Editors of collections and scholars dealing with the fragments and testimonies of a certain writer or of several writers on a certain subject began dealing with modes of transmission, asking questions about inclusion and the categorization of fragments and testimonies with respect to their content and source. An extreme example of differences in the definition of fragments and testimonies, even of the same writer, may be seen in the two collections of the fragments of the Stoic philosopher Posidonius, published only ten years apart. While the first compilers adopted a more traditional, minimalistic approach and included only fragments and quotes explicitly attributed to Posidonius by name, the latter adopted a maximalistic approach and included all texts that he believed had been influenced by the philosopher.¹⁹

By the 1980s, the methodological aspects of collecting fragments and testimonies gained further insight. As John Marincola put it, “The era of caution in the handling of fragments may be said to have opened with Brunt in 1980”. In his pioneering article dedicated to historical fragments, Brunt tackled both the use of the term ‘fragments’ and the practice of collecting fragments. His contribution was nothing less than a set of principles for the methodology of assembling *reliquiae*, principles which are applicable to other genres as well.²⁰

These methodological considerations were discussed in a volume on the collection of fragments which also contained a paper by A. Carlotta Dionisotti on the history of

¹⁶ Dionisotti 1997, 24; Heck 1966, 276-280 noted two editions, in 1559 and in 1560.

¹⁷ Particularly the *Epistula ad Joannem Millium* 1691 and the *Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris* 1699, see Pfeiffer 1976, 2.149-152. Bentley’s achievements with regard to the collection of fragments and the reconstruction of lost works were immediately recognized upon publication of his essay on Callimachus, see Sandys 1908, 2.402, n. 5; also see Pfeiffer 1976, 2.152-153.

¹⁸ Zinn focused in his essay on the unique development of the term in German, which he attributed to Luther’s translation of a sentence from the Epistle to the Corinthians “ἐκ μέρους γὰρ γινώσκομεν”, “*ex parte enim cognoscimus*”, “Denn unser Wissen ist Stückwerk” (M. Luther, übersetz., *Kor.* 1.13.9), and to the development of a literary genre of incomplete works, see Zinn 1959, esp. 161.

¹⁹ Edelstein and Kidd 1972-1999; Theiler 1982. In a later article, Kidd elaborated upon different approaches to defining a fragment of Posidonius, see Kidd 1997.

²⁰ Marincola 2016, 239, n. 19; Brunt 1980.

fragment collection.²¹ In considering the various aspects of fragment collection in classical scholarship, Dionisotti distinguished between three modern meanings for the term 'fragments' used since the sixteenth century.²² The first concerns sherds of an object or material that was preserved in its original form, and the second relates to purposefully chosen sections collected in anthologies. A third category contains excerpts preserved in other works, either literally or as a summary of the contents of the original, references, or allusions. The writer doing the quoting may have had no interest in literal accuracy and may even have had reason to distort the original meaning. Fragments belonging to the latter two categories would likely have undergone some degree of conscious or unconscious change by the writer or redactor.

Whereas the term 'fragmentum' today still points to literal citation, neither the minimalist nor the maximalist approach to Posidonius nor Dionisotti's threefold definition of a fragment as a concrete remnant, a purposeful choosing of a text, and excerpts in other works, quite settles the issue of definition.

In his methodological essays which accompanied the continuation project of F. Jacoby's *FGrHist*, Guido Schepens brought to the fore the notion of 'cover text'.²³ A productive discussion of the nature of quotations and of ancient authors' manner of citation sheds light on the 'cover text' as well as on the cited author.²⁴ The study of intermediate authors and their role in the interpretation of fragments won attention in prose genres.²⁵ The complexities involved particularly in the transmission of prose fragments and criticism concerning the traditional approach of extracting these fragments received renewed discussion in relation to the digital humanities. Fresh solutions to the methodological difficulties in handling these fragments were offered in the context of digital editions. These editions may represent more precisely the multiple phases of both ancient and modern choices made in embedding another author's words in a text and in revealing them.²⁶

The editors of *The Fragments of the Roman Historians* (2013) made an effort to address all the relevant aspects of the methodology of collecting fragments. They gave the transmission context its due recognition both in the mode of presentation and by way of commenting upon it. In a detailed introduction, they defined precisely the terms *testimonium* and *fragmentum* and, with striking caution, they offered a typographic recognition to the borders of the reported information and to the mode of reporting. All

²¹ Dionisotti 1997.

²² See Dionisotti 1997, 1-2.

²³ On the methodology of collecting fragments of the Greek historians, see Jacoby 1909; Schepens 1997a, esp. 166-168; 1997b, 72; 2000. Cf. Darbo-Peschanski 2004b, 291-300; Baron 2011, 87-88; Berti 2012a.

²⁴ Concerning the copious scholarship on citation in classical prose, see Tischer and Binternagel 2010; Tischer 2010; Cf. also Darbo-Peschanski 2004a, 9-21.

²⁵ Lenfant 2013, 289-293, 301-303; On the degree of preservation and transtextual relations among genres, see Berti 2013, esp. 282-285. On the function of citation practices as literary devices in Livy's *AUC* and the definition of the specific dynamics of historical citation against the broader categories of intertextuality and allusion, see Lushlov 2013, esp 21-28.

²⁶ For a discussion of digital fragment editions, see Berti et al. 2009, 261-262; Romanello et al. 2009, 158-168; Romanello 2011, 152-155; Trachsel 2012, 425-427; 2017, 18-25.

these efforts aim at supplying the reader with the tools required to evaluate the credibility of the information transmitted and its affinity to the original phrasing.²⁷

In scholarly works, the term *fragmentum* is used to denote literal citation. Yet fragment collections are often packed with allusions, paraphrases, and summaries that may not reflect the original phrasing of the author. The definitions proposed by Dionisotti and others for the term 'fragment' describe different types of fragments and testimonies.²⁸ Adopting a minimalist definition of fragments, even if critically justifiable, causes significant loss of potential information, as testimonies pertaining to literary works and their contents contribute greatly to our often poor knowledge of the lost works.²⁹ The maximalist approach, by contrast, does not always clearly distinguish between different fragments and testimonies. Lenfant aptly noted that the word *fragmentum* erases the difference between direct and indirect tradition.³⁰ Berti suggested the expression 'text re-use' as a preferred alternative to 'fragmentum' which recalls something material and implies the preservation of an original text that is, in fact, lost.³¹

Hence, alongside the traditional approach of extracting fragments from their transmitting context in order to reconstruct the original text as closely as possible, a scholarly scrutiny of the context in which the fragments were transmitted has been proposed. The more information we have about the identity of the author who delivers the information, the time and place in which he worked, his sources, and the customs and goals relevant to his literary work, the more confident we can be in evaluating the authenticity of the content and form of the information he transmitted.

It seems that when compiling a collection of fragments and testimonies, two different yet complementary approaches are called for. On the one hand, we ought to include as many fragments and references to an author's work as possible, even general and spurious ones. The fragments and testimonies should be presented as preserved, as mediated information, accompanied by the relevant context of their transmission. The redactor is, of course, obliged to abide by strict philological principles, utilizing linguistic, literary, and historiographical methods, when categorizing fragments and testimonies by their different types. A thorough examination of the components of each individual case will allow us to gauge the reliability of the text transmitted and the relationship of its contents to their original formulation.

The ancient literal meaning of the word *fragmentum* as referring to an original portion of a text may be misleading when the term is used to refer to the content of lost works received through indirect transmission. It must be emphasized that even a quotation in direct speech does not, in and of itself, indicate a literal quotation. Phrasing ideas as direct speech was acceptable in certain contexts as a rhetorical device for different purposes. In such cases, both the author and his public normally identified the expression as fabricated.

²⁷ Cornell et al., 2013, esp. 4-19. A conference was recently dedicated to the subject, introducing various aspects of the study of fragments; see the report by Trachsel 2014.

²⁸ For the conventional distinction between *fragmenta* and *testimonia*, whose characteristics are very difficult to define and keep separate, see Berti 2012a, 282 and n. 47.

²⁹ As illustrated in the case of Posidonius; see note 19 above.

³⁰ Lenfant 2013, 289.

³¹ Berti 2012a, 444-446.

The above principles and methods for dealing with fragments and testimonies come with many reservations. The choice of different verbs introducing the fragment reveals the use of various modes of transmission. Moreover, establishing the limits of what is considered "quotation" creates complex problems. Differentiating paraphrase from summary or from quotation in indirect speech is a further issue, and other tools, be they linguistic, literary, or historiographical, may aid us in determining whether we are dealing with fragments or testimonies of other types.

Before turning to our case studies, I will introduce the definitions I suggest to use. *Fragmentum* refers to incomplete texts we received directly, as well as to passages of works preserved in an indirect manner in the works of others, when the probability is high that they are either quotations in *oratio recta*, or a more or less exact recreation of the original phrasing in *oratio obliqua*. The term *testimonium* refers to two categories: the first includes general testimonies concerning the author, his education, and his literary activities, while the second refers to testimonies to particular works. Within the second category, I make a further distinction between testimonies that refer to the existence or character of certain works, and passages testifying to their content. In the last group, I include passages, transmitted in direct or indirect speech, whose relationship to their original formulation one cannot evaluate. This category also includes passages that were transmitted in translation. Among the categories transmitted in indirect speech, one may sometimes differentiate between more or less literal formulations, summations, paraphrases, and general references to content. I believe that this broadening of the meaning of the term *testimonium*, at the expense of the term *fragmentum*, is customary in collections of fragments and testimonies and accords well with the ancient meaning and the practice of authors when relying on their predecessors.

Case Studies: Fragments and Testimonies as Sources of Information about Roman Politics

Our case studies are texts dealing with politics in the waning days of the Roman republic (50-30 BCE). The numerous sources from that period, including fragments and testimonies, preserve very different versions of the events. In many cases, this plurality of sources enables us to evaluate the reliability of the information and examine issues pertaining to the transmission of knowledge in the context of political and social change.³² Roman society of the republic was characterized by changes in economic, social, and governmental structures, along with a gradual transition from a city-state to an empire surrounding the Mediterranean. These processes led, in the era of the late republic and particularly in its last generation, to severe political struggles and to a move from republic to autocracy.

The Roman political system, shaped by the balance of power amongst the aristocracy and between them and the lower classes, had long used rhetoric as a means of gaining and maintaining political influence. Speeches were addressed to the members of the Senate, the people in the Assembly, or to soldiers, in various political contexts,

³² Beard 2015, 22.

including elections and legislation. Roman political speeches were often marked by invective, including personal attacks on political rivals.³³

Marcus Antonius stood out during the period following the assassination of Iulius Caesar in 44 BC as the leader of the Caesarian faction, which was opposed by the rival faction of Cassius and Brutus and their spokesman Marcus Tullius Cicero.³⁴ Antonius allied with Caesar's adopted son and heir, Octavian, in order to defeat the camp of the "liberators" and Cicero. Once they had defeated the rival party, relations between Antonius and Octavian deteriorated as they competed for leadership, ending in the total victory of Octavian at Actium in 31 BCE.

During his lifetime, Antonius made enemies of the greatest of Roman orators, Cicero, and of Octavian, the future Augustus. In his biography of Antonius (c. 110-115 CE), Plutarch described him and his counterpart Demetrius Poliorcetes of Macedon as negative examples. Antonius' central position in the political storms in the last days of the Republic and his role as the leader of the defeated side contributed to his defamation. Yet alongside the significant influence of Cicero's writing in the shaping of Antonius' memory, some favourable or at least neutral ancient accounts of Antonius were also preserved, if somewhat obscured.

As Ronald Syme stressed, it is both appropriate and necessary to use fragments and testimonies to extract the facts about Antonius, his political activity, and his behaviour, beyond the heavy veil of propaganda created by his political rivals and the intellectuals working to glorify the regime of Augustus.³⁵ Our present aim is to reveal the manner in which information was transmitted.

I. Antonius' Eulogy for Caesar

Our first case study is the eulogy for Caesar. Conflicting reports have reached us regarding the very existence and the nature of a eulogy delivered by Antonius for Iulius Caesar. Contemporary and later sources about the funeral include a variety of testimonies that refer to the existence of a eulogy and its contents. There are no fragments of that eulogy, a fact which highlights the importance of testimonies to its existence and contents. I will discuss this case in detail and present the textual evidence. As Monica Berti has noted, gathering ancient sources by topic enables us to put together fragments and testimonies that modern editors used to collect and classify into distinct categories.³⁶

³³ For the political and oratorical situation in the period 50-30 BC, see Gruen 1974, 138-143; Steel 2006, esp. 3-43; 2013, 226-253; Hölkeskamp 2010, 102-103; Mouristen 2017, esp. 85-94; van der Blom 2016, 23-66; on the political elite's rhetorical maneuvers, see Morstein-Marx 2004, 1-34; id. 2013, 43-47; for the theory and practice of Ciceronian invective see Powell 2007, 1-16. See Mahy 2010, 19-83 for the period following Caesar's assassination specifically.

³⁴ For the influence of Cicero's *Philippics* on Antonius' image in the literary tradition, see Butler 2002, 120-123; Lintott 2008, 339-407, 440-445; Stevenson and Wilson 2008, 4-8; Stevenson 2008 and 2009, 98-102 for Cicero depicting Antonius as stock figure of 'tyrant'.

³⁵ Syme 1939, 104-105. Mahy 2013 and van der Blom 2016 demonstrated this methodology.

³⁶ Berti 2013, 269.

In the words of George Kennedy, “To posterity Antony’s most famous speech, and one of the most famous speeches of all time, has been the masterpiece of demagoguery composed by Shakespeare for the scene of Caesar’s funeral”.³⁷ Ancient authors, however, disagree on whether Antonius delivered a eulogy at all, and the existing reports of the event actually differ substantially regarding the nature of this speech.³⁸ A close reading of these reports may suggest that already the ancients sought to find a compromise between the contradicting testimonies regarding the very existence of the eulogy and its contents.

The earliest testimony to Antonius’ speech is that of Cicero, who was present in Rome at the time of the funeral and could have been an eyewitness to the events. We must consider, however, in some of the reports, the political discord between Cicero and Antonius, and the hostile invective of his *Philippics*.

Cicero used three rhetorical terms to describe the organization of Caesar’s funeral, by which Antonius incited the crowd to act against the assassins:

tua illa pulchra laudatio, tua miseratio, tua cohortatio; tu, tu, inquam, illas faces incendiasti, et eas quibus semustilatus ille est et eas quibus incensa L. Bellieni domus deflagavit. tu illos impetus perditorum et ex maxima parte servorum quos nos vi manumque reppulimus in nostras domos immisisti.

(Cic., *Phil.* 2.90-91; *laudatusque miserabiliter Att.* 14.10.1, cf. *Phil.* 3.30)

That beautiful tribute to the deceased, the pathos, the incitement — they were yours. It was you, yes, you, who set the light to the firebrands, both those with which Caesar was half-cremated, and those others which set fire to Lucius Bellienus’ house and burned it down. It was you who directed those onslaughts of desperate characters, mostly slaves, against our houses, which we repelled by force of arms.

(trl. D.R. Shackleton Bailey)

Let us note the different contexts relating to Cicero’s testimonies to the speech: the undelivered *Second Philippic* circulated probably in December 44, the delivered *Third Philippic* of 20 December 44, and the earlier (semi-)private letter to Atticus dated a month after the event.³⁹ Presumably, the different contexts, audiences, and timings of these three testimonies have implications for the credibility of the testimony regarding Antonius’ speech. Cicero’s letter to Atticus (*Att.* 14.11.1) supports Cicero’s public descriptions in the *Philippics* of the funeral as well as the existence of a speech.⁴⁰

Concerning the contextual contents of the report, Cicero gave his most detailed description of the funeral in the framework of his examination of Antonius’ record from boyhood (*Phil.* 2.44-119). Cicero noted, when describing the crimes Antonius

³⁷ Kennedy 1968, 99.

³⁸ For the importance of the eulogy in interpreting Antonius’ political strategy see Matijević 2006, 96-104; for the ancient sources see 101-102, n. 168; Mahy 2010, 40-46; id. 2013, 339-340, n. 66 for previous literature; Van der Blom 2016, esp. 264-267; for the dramatical aspects of Antonius’ speech see Hall 2014, 134-140.

³⁹ For the dates of the *Second* and *Third Philippics*, see Mahy 2010, 106, n. 86; cf. also Ramsey 2003, 158; Steel 2005, 27-28; Lintott 2008, 378; Shackleton Bailey 2009, 50. For Cicero’s letter to Atticus dated to 19 April 44 from Cumae, see Shackleton Bailey 1965-1970, vol. 6 (1967), 221-223.

⁴⁰ See Butler 2002, 106, and n. 24.

committed after Caesar's death, that Antonius sought to make the funeral a pretext for massacre and arson, criticizing Antonius' intention to replace D. Brutus in Cisalpine Gaul (*Phil.* 3.30). In his letter to Atticus (14.10), Cicero lamented the course of action taken by the "liberators" after Caesar's murder and its consequences.

Suetonius, in his biography of Caesar of a century and a half later, actually denied the existence of the first term used by Cicero:

laudationis loco, consul Antonius per praeconem pronuntiavit senatus consultum, quo omnia simul ei divina atque humana decreverat, item ius iurandum, quo se cuncti pro salute unius astrinxerant; quibus perpauca a se verba addidit.

(Suet., *Iul.* 84)

Instead of a eulogy, the Consul Antonius caused a herald to recite the decree of the Senate in which it had voted Caesar all divine and human honors at once, and likewise the oath with which they had all pledged themselves to watch over his personal safety; to which he added a very few words of his own.

(trl. J.C. Rolfe)

The different genre of a chronological survey of Caesar's biography and the later date of composition may suggest here a somewhat more objective report than that of Cicero, who was an active antagonist in the events. As an imperial secretary and archivist, Suetonius had access to formal materials he could use in the framework of his biographical scheme.⁴¹ The description of Antonius' part in the funeral follows the reference to citations from Pacuvius and Atilius, suited to 'rouse pity and indignation' at Caesar's murder (*ad miserationem et invidiam caedis eius*) and precedes the carrying of the bier from the rostra to the forum and its burning.⁴²

Modern scholars have sought to account for the discrepancy between the testimonies of Cicero and Suetonius in relation to the existence of a *laudatio*, understood as a *terminus technicus* for a *laudatio funebris*, a funeral oration.⁴³ Monroe Deutsch, for example, has argued that Antonius did not deliver a eulogy at all. In the circumstances of extreme political crisis, Antonius sought a compromise between the rival factions, ruling out the possibility of an elaborate laudation. Antonius achieved his goal of inciting the crowds against the assassins by means other than verbal.⁴⁴ George Kennedy, for his part, insists that Cicero referred to Antonius' speech in rhetorical terms, whose components must be identified in the eulogy. Cicero, Kennedy suggests, labeled as *laudatio* that part of the speech where the decrees of the Senate and the oath of the senators were read out and commented upon.⁴⁵

⁴¹ Wallace-Hadrill 1983, 61.

⁴² Butler and Cary 1982, ad loc.

⁴³ On the nature and definition of *laudatio funebris* and specifically on Antonius' oration in honour of Caesar, see Kierdorf 1980, 150-158; Gotter 1996, 26-28, 267; Sumi 2005, 100-112; Matijević 2006, 101-104; Ramage 2006, 48-51; Strauss 2015, 171-178; Russell 2016, 58.

⁴⁴ Deutsch 1928, 127-148. Recently, two works discussed Antonius' eulogy in detail, trying to evaluate his oratory as a component of his political career: Mahy 2013, 339-340; van der Blom 2016, 264-267.

⁴⁵ Kennedy 1968, 99-106.

It is important to mention Quintilian's instruction, *non solum autem dicendo sed etiam faciendo quaedam lacrimas movemus*, which was illustrated by the display of the bleeding garments in Caesar's funeral.⁴⁶ Quintilian's reference to the influence of sorrow is analogous to Cicero's *miseratio* and matches all ancient descriptions of Antonius' management of the event. This point, at which Antonius exhibited Caesar's bleeding garments, is the crucial turn which kindled the crowd to action both to set fire to the bier in the forum and act against the conspirators.⁴⁷

Although they appear to have based their reports, like Suetonius, on Asinius Pollio's *Historiae*,⁴⁸ Greek authors have all attributed to Antonius a funeral speech.

Plutarch referred to Caesar's funeral in four biographies, adapting the material to his ends in each life (Plut., *Ant.* 14.5-8; *Brut.* 20.3; *Cic.* 42.3; *Caes.* 68). In the biographies of Antonius and of Brutus, the description follows closely Cicero's terms: Antonius pronounced at length the customary eulogy over Caesar in the forum (διεξιὼν ἐγκώμιον *Ant.* 14.6; cf. *Brut.* 20.3). When he saw that the people were mightily swayed and charmed by his words, he mingled with his praises sorrow and indignation over the dreadful deed. At the close of his speech, Antonius shook on high Caesar's garments, enraging his hearers. Plutarch did not convey Antonius' words except for having him call the assassins 'villains and murderers' *παλαμναῖοι καὶ ἀνδροφόνοι* (*Ant.* 14.7).⁴⁹ Remarkably, in his biography of Caesar, there is no mention of any of this. The vision of Caesar's body alone sufficed for the multitude to burn his body in the forum and pursue the assassins in order to tear them to pieces (*Caes.* 68).⁵⁰

In his narration of Antonius' speech, Appian inserted citations in direct speech and reported content. He depicted the manner of delivery and the scenery, and recounted their effect on the audience (App., *BC* 2.143-146). Having seen the events, says Appian, Antonius again 'employed his skill cunningly', characterizing his mode of action by way of his rhetorical habits and style. According to Appian, Antonius read the decrees that the Senate and the people voted in relation to Caesar in a severe and gloomy manner. His utterances were accompanied by gestures, and at each decree he added some brief remark full of grief and indignation. Appian highlighted the points stressed by Antonius,

⁴⁶ Quintilian's testimony suggests that the tradition of the props Antonius used was well established. This tradition developed over time and other props Antonius may have used were perhaps added by later authors, see Hall 2014, 136-137.

Not only words, but some actions are used to produce tears ... These things commonly make an enormous impression, because they confront people's minds directly with the facts. This is how Caesar's toga, carried in his funeral, covered in blood, drove the Roman people to fury. It was known that he had been killed, his body lay on the bier, but it was the clothing, wet with blood, that made the image of the crime so vivid that Caesar seemed not to have been murdered, but to be being murdered there and then.

(Quint., *Inst.* 6.1.30-31, trl. D.R. Shackleton Bailey)

⁴⁷ Nicolaus of Damascus, discussing the reaction against the tyrannicides after Caesar's death, already stressed that the populace was enraged especially when they had seen his bloody garment and newly slain body brought to burial (Nic. Dam. *FGrH* 90 fr. 130.17.50).

⁴⁸ For Pollio as a source of these authors on the period, see Morgan 2000, 51.

⁴⁹ The word *παλαμναῖος* 'sinner, with blood on his hands' is attested mostly in tragedy, rarely in prose. See Pelling's 1988 discussion ad loc.

⁵⁰ See Pelling 2011 ad loc.

including the senators' oath to defend and revenge Caesar, in direct speech. This description accords well with Suetonius' report of reading the decrees and the oath, and Antonius adding few words of his own. But Appian's narration proceeds. Antonius invites the audience to chant the accustomed hymn and lamentation, and he recites Caesar's birth, wars, battles, victories, vanquished nations, and spoils. But, as Appian tells it, Antonius performs this part of the oration 'with rapid speech' and 'as on the stage' ὡς ἐπὶ σκηνῆς, turning it into a kind of divine frenzy which included dramatic actions, tones, and gestures towards Caesar's body and blood-stained robe.⁵¹

To be sure, Antonius, the grandson of the great orator of Cicero's youth, had mastered the elements of a traditional laudation and merged them skillfully with other components of tragic drama, most relevant to the rhetoric of a funeral oration. This middle way, or walking along two paths, according to Appian, characteristic of Antonius' policy, agrees in rough lines with both Cicero's and Suetonius' description of his management of the funeral. Antonius did open with reading the formal decrees but proceeded with the traditional elements of a eulogy accompanied by dramatic performance.

Antonius' mode of action is formulated most patently in another speech attributed to him by Appian, in reply to Octavian's accusations (*BC* 3.33-38). In this complete oration, presented in direct speech, Antonius explained how he undermined his compulsory action to grant amnesty to the assassins in exchange for the ratification of Caesar's acts, not by votes and decrees, not feasible at the time, but by influencing the people imperceptibly:

τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Καίσαρος ἐπὶ προφάσει τῆς ταφῆς ἐς τὴν ἀγορὰν ἐκφέρων καὶ τὰ τραύματα ἀπογομνῶν καὶ τὸ πλῆθος αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν ἐσθῆτα ἐπιδεικνὺς ἠμαγμένην τε καὶ κατακεκομμένην καὶ τὴν ἀρετὴν καὶ τὸ φιλόδημον αὐτοῦ παλιλλογῶν, ἐκπαθῶς ἐν μέσῳ καὶ ὀδυρόμενος μὲν ὡς ἀνηρημένον, κατακαλῶν δ' ὡς θεόν. Τάδε γάρ μου τὰ ἔργα καὶ ῥήματα ἠρέθισε τὸν δῆμον, καὶ τὸ πῦρ ἤψε μετὰ τὴν ἀμνηστίαν, καὶ ἐς τὰς οἰκίας τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἔπεμψε καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας ἐξέβαλε τῆς πόλεως.

(App., *BC* 3.35)

I brought Caesar's body into the forum under pretense of a burial, I laid bare his wounds, I showed the number of them and his clothing all bloody and slashed. In public speech I dwelt on his bravery and his services to the common people in pathetic terms, weeping for him as slain but invoking him as god. These acts and words of mine stirred up the people, kindled a fire after the amnesty, sent them against the houses of our enemies, and drove the murderers from the city.

(trl. H. White)

This declaration, which Appian placed in Antonius' mouth, adds to the understanding of his portrayal of Antonius' funeral oration, conveying his exact mode of action at the time of the funeral. When he could not, as Deutsch noted, deliver an elaborate laudation, he managed to accomplish his ends 'under pretense of a burial'.

⁵¹ For Appian's handling of the events and his technique in the use of speeches, see Gowing 1992, 101, 225-245; Jehne 1987, 109, 255-260; Osgood 2006, 12-14; for the suspected authenticity of the dramatic characteristics and terminology of Antonius' oration described by Appian, see Hall 2014, 135-140.

Remarkably, Appian chose not to write a complete, polished oration, preferring to make use of different modes of citation and presentation in order to achieve an effect suitable to the occasion of Caesar's funeral. Appian's merging of conveying content in paraphrase or summary with quotations in direct speech produced a composition that may have seemed more authentic than set speeches were generally thought to be.

Scholarship has long considered as fictitious Cassius Dio's version of Antonius' speech at Caesar's funeral. Dio attributed to Antonius an oration of fifteen pages (in modern print), indeed composed according to rhetorical conventions (Cass. Dio, 44.35-50).⁵² Yet Dio definitely based his composition on previous descriptions, integrating the elements which characterized Antonius' management of the funeral and the contents of his speech. Whereas most scholars dismiss Dio's oration as a traditional Roman laudation, a careful reading of the speech reveals that there may be more there than meets the eye.

Dio informs us that Antonius aroused the people by his actions, bringing Caesar's body most inconsiderately into the Forum, exposing it all covered in blood and with gaping wounds, and then delivered over it a speech — a very ornate and brilliant one, to be sure, but one that was wholly out of place. Most remarkably, Dio concluded that, at this speech, the crowd was at first excited, then enraged, and finally so inflamed with passion that they sought out his murderers and the senators who had sworn to protect Caesar, in order to avenge him. These stages of Dio's description precisely parallel Cicero's characterization of the phases in Antonius' eulogy, *laudatio*, *miseratio*, *cohortatio* (Cic., *Phil.* 2.91 above).⁵³

Interestingly, while largely constructing Antonius' speech in line with the traditional conventions of a Roman funeral speech, that is, a laudation, Dio digressed from these conventions in almost every paragraph. In this way, he heightened the already sharp contrast between tradition and Antonius' unusual conduct. The speech is laden with rhetorical decoration, opposites in particular;⁵⁴ by inserting rhetorical effects in direct speech, Dio has Antonius appealing to the audience and to Caesar in the second person, thus demonstrating the dramatic effect on the crowd.

Caesar's funeral and Antonius' laudation hit the highest point of aristocratic funeral ceremonies of the Republic. The participation of the crowd that came to escort the public figure attests to the experience of the spectators with the different elements of the

⁵² Fomin 2016, 233 recognized in Antonius' eulogy for Caesar tropes which go back to Pericles' speech in Thucydides; Burden-Strevens 2016, 193-194 for the speeches as portraying the collapse of the Republic; for a general appreciation of Dio's speeches, see Millar 1961, 22; id. 1964, 83; Gowing 1992, 101, 225-245; applicable to Greek as well as to Latin historians: Miller 1975, 56-57; Pausch 2010; Laird 2009, esp. 204-208.

⁵³ For Dio's sources for the period, see Lintott 1997, 2519-2520; Westall 2016. For Dio's knowledge of Cicero's *Philippics*, see Millar 1964, 46-55, esp. 54. See Burden-Strevens 2015, 58-72 for Dio's direct use of the *Philippic* orations; 223-229 for an analysis of Antonius' funeral speech as paired with Cicero's speech on the amnesty to demonstrate the use and abuse of oratory in the late Republic; cf. id. 2016, 201, 209-214.

⁵⁴ See Millar 1964, 43: 'Antithesis was a favourite trick, used above all in his summings-up of the careers of famous men, where he presents his own political views, and in his speeches'. Cf. Gowing 1992, 96.

funeral procession and laudation.⁵⁵ The aforementioned ancient versions of the funeral agree that Antonius knew quite well how to manipulate the Roman political mechanism to his ends. Dio's elaborate fictitious oration seems to hint to the actual events, whereas Appian's version represents a middle ground between Cicero's and Suetonius' accounts of the eulogy.

The ancient sources that related to the historical episode of Antonius' handling of Caesar's funeral supplied various types of testimonies concerning his eulogy for Caesar. A comparison of the versions concerning the existence of a *laudatio funebris* and the critical analysis of their authors' modes of reporting helped us to gauge the testimonies' credibility. It must be emphasized, however, that of all these versions, not a single fragment, according to the definitions I suggested above, has survived from Antonius' eulogy for Caesar, and I reiterate the need for the careful treatment of testimonies to content that are difficult to distinguish from fragments.

I conclude this case study with Shakespeare's use of sources in *Julius Caesar*, despite a yawning chronological gap and the fact that it is manifestly exempt from the historiographic restrictions operative in the literary genre of Roman tragedies.

Shakespeare is commonly believed to owe his knowledge of the classics mostly to second- and third-hand works, in particular, to Sir Thomas North's translation of Plutarch's *Vitae* (1579), which was based on the French translation of Jacques Amyot (1559-1565). Moreover, it has been plausibly suggested that Shakespeare used, especially in his *Julius Caesar* and specifically in the portrayal of Antonius and in his eulogy for Caesar, William Barker's English translation of Appian's *Bellum Civile*.⁵⁶

However, Shakespeare's leading structural motif, repeated no less than eleven times in Antonius' speech, "For Brutus is an honourable man", appears to go back to Cicero as a source.⁵⁷

... The Noble *Brutus*,
Hath told you *Caesar* was Ambitious:
...
(For *Brutus* is an Honourable man,
So are they all; all Honourable men)

William Shakespere, *The Tragedie of Iulius Caesar*
(S. Wells, G. Taylor, et al. eds., ll. 1464-1470)

⁵⁵ On the funeral procession, see Weinstock 1971, 350-355; Flower 1996, esp. 122-127.

⁵⁶ For Shakespeare's knowledge of classical literature, see Walker 2002; Martindale and Taylor 2004; Barkan 2006; Braden 2010, esp. 883; for Shakespeare's use of Appian's *BC* in this specific tragedy, see Schanzer 1956, esp. xix-xxiii; Setaioli 2017, 286-289; for Shakespeare's version of the eulogy see Wills 2011, 79-112.

⁵⁷ Suggested already by Furness 1913, ad l. 109 in his commentary to Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* but having seemingly escaped the notice of most scholars of classical reception. In her last chapter, Tempest 2017 gives different versions of *Brutus* current since antiquity, using Antonius' eulogy from Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*. As the anonymous lector suggested, it would be interesting to see how far the understanding of Brutus as a man of *honos* was not only a Ciceronian presentation but one suggested by Brutus himself, who, after all, wrote a work *de virtute* and the later reception of Brutus, including the fictitious letter exchange between Brutus and Mithridates now undergoing research by Tempest.

The recurrent phrasing in Shakespeare's speech is reminiscent of a specific passage in Cicero's *Second Philippic*, which also forms the basis for the conflict set at the very core of the play:

Sed stuporem hominis vel dicam pecudis attendite. sic enim dixit: "M. Brutus, quem ego honoris causa nomino, cruentum pugionem tenens Ciceronem exclamavit: ex quo intellegi debet eum conscium fuisse." ergo ego sceleratus appello a te quem tu suspicatum aliquid suspicaris; ille qui stillantem prae se pugionem tulit, is a te honoris causa nominatur. ... Constitue hoc, consul, aliquando, Brutorum, C. Cassi ... reliquorum quam velis esse causam; ... Numquamne intelleges statuendum tibi esse utrum illi qui istam rem gesserunt homicidaene sint an vindices libertatis? 31 ... si parricidas, cur honoris causa a te sunt et in hoc ordine et apud populum Romanum semper appellati? ...

(Cic., *Phil.* 2.30-31)

Observe the stupidity of the man, or of the brute, I should rather say. For this is what he said: "**Marcus Brutus, whose name I mention with respect**, called on Cicero as he held his bloodstained dagger: hence it ought to be inferred that Cicero was in the plot." So then: you call *me* a criminal because you suspect that I suspected something, whereas **Brutus**, who brandished his dripping weapon, **is named by you with respect!** ... Make up your mind, consul, at long last: decide what you want the status of the Bruti, Gaius Cassius ... and the rest to be. ... Will you never understand that you have to make up your mind whether the authors of that deed are murderers or champions of freedom? 31 ... **If you regard them as parricides, why have you always named them with respect both in this body and before the Roman people?** ...

(trl. D.R. Shackleton Bailey)

Cicero's words, *et in hoc ordine et apud populum Romanum semper appellati*, indicate Antonius' repetitive use of the phrase '*honoris causa*' on public occasions. Cicero presented Antonius' respectful mention of Brutus by name (*quem ego honoris causa nomino*) as a sign of Antonius' approbation of the deed.

Shakespeare's phrase, 'for Brutus is an honourable man', represents the principal conflict of the tragedy and guides the audience by dramatic irony through the same phases of the eulogy described by Cicero.

It was Cicero who presented the extreme contrast of Antonius' naming the conspirators *parricidae*, Caesar having been honoured by the Senate as *pater patriae*, and at the same time, referring to them as 'honourable men', *honoris causa*.

Shakespeare's evidence for questions of transmission and *Quellenforschung* shows that although he definitely relied on Plutarch and, in all likelihood, Appian, we recognize Cicero at the heart of the oration. This example illustrates the benefits of the maximalistic approach to the collection of fragments and testimonies. Gathering all ancient testimonies to Antonius' eulogy or texts believed to have been influenced by the original, may serve us in its turn in tracing its literary reception as well.

II. *Philippicae*: Cicero vs. Antonius

Our second case study is related to the political struggle between Antonius and Cicero in the months following Caesar's assassination and is reflected in the fragments and testimonies in Cicero's *Second* and *Thirteenth Philippic* orations.

Cicero composed the *Philippics* against Antonius between September 44 and April 43 BCE.⁵⁸ In the *Second Philippic*, Cicero surveys Antonius' career and responds to Antonius' speech of September 19, in which he attacked Cicero in response to the *First Philippic*. It is most likely that the oration, which was apparently never delivered but was composed for publication, was put into circulation after Antonius left Rome for Cisalpine Gaul at the end of November 44, about the same time that the *Third* and *Fourth Philippics* were delivered on 20 December or slightly before.⁵⁹ Cicero delivered the *Third Philippic* immediately after the arrival of D. Brutus' edict announcing his refusal to turn the province over to Antonius. Cicero referred in the *Second Philippic* both to the manner and to the content of Antonius' speech, although he declared that he was not present at the event (Cic., *Phil.* 5.20, 3.33). He did not find it necessary to explain how he was so well informed, whether by a written version or by oral reports. The section of the speech in which Cicero refuted the claims made against him by Antonius (Cic., *Phil.* 2.3-43) includes fragments and testimonies of Antonius' speech.

Similarly, in the *Thirteenth Philippic*, although in an actual oration in the Senate, Cicero scrutinised a letter Antonius had sent Hirtius and Octavian. The *Thirteenth Philippic* was delivered no later than 20 March 43, when Cicero informed L. Munatius Plancus, proconsul of Gallia Comata, that the Senate rejected his and M. Lepidus' letters advocating settlement with Antonius, to one of which letters he referred in this speech (Cic., *Fam.* 10.6). The consuls Pansa and Hirtius were most likely already in the field, on campaign against Antonius, who was besieging D. Brutus in Mutina.⁶⁰

Distribution of the *Second Philippic* in written form, or the analysis in a speech of the letter Antonius publicized, was Cicero's rhetorical method of responding to Antonius' allegations before the Senate. This technique, which allows us to restore parts of two of Antonius' lost works, functions like an annotated text in which a *lemma* is followed by an explanation or response. The likelihood that Cicero quoted Antonius' words out of context or distorted them otherwise is slightly diminished by the fact that Cicero was addressing the very Senate that had heard Antonius' speech, or could have read his letter.⁶¹

Alongside the consideration of the different contexts of the *Second* and *Thirteenth Philippics* as undelivered and delivered speeches and their audiences, the different political situations should also be taken into account. Moreover, let us bear in mind the question whether we can be assured that anything delivered in direct speech is a credible fragment from another speech. The following examples suggest otherwise.

⁵⁸ For the political situation and the *Philippics* at the time of crisis, see Hall 2013, 223-229; Steel 2005, 140-146.

⁵⁹ See note 39 *supra*.

⁶⁰ Lintott 2008, 399; Shackleton Bailey 2009, 2.221; Mahy 2010, 192-193; Ramsey 2010, 156, n. 4.

⁶¹ For Cicero's *Philippics* as a source, see Frisch 1946, 119-292; Lintott 2008, 406-407; Stevenson and Wilson 2008. See n. 34 above regarding the *Second Philippic*. Butler 2002, 122 examined two principal relationships between speech and writing in Roman oratory: the use of documentary evidence by orators and the 'publication' of both delivered and undelivered speeches. He concluded that the success of a Roman orator depended as much on writing as on oral delivery; he also argued against the convention that Rome was an 'oral society', in which writing was rare and served only practical, secondary purposes.

The first section of the *Second Philippic* contains Cicero's description of the preparations Antonius made for his speech as well as the circumstances of the speech, its nature and content (Cic., *Phil.* 2.1-43). Most of our data concerning Antonius' rhetorical talents derive from this speech. Cicero detailed Antonius' accusations, and responded to each one, point for point. Antonius' words were referenced in several ways: 1) remarks about the nature of the speech, e.g., "you have assailed me with unprovoked abuse, as though you wished to look more reckless than Catilina and madder than Claudius" (Cic., *Phil.* 2.1 trl. D.R. Shackleton Bailey); 2) testimonies concerning its content, both in direct and in reported speech, and different types of summation, including paraphrasing and literal citation; and 3) Cicero's rebuttals that contain an extensive list of charges, including violation of friendship, incitement to murder Caesar, using force to intimidate the Senate and more.⁶²

The new context makes it impossible to reconstruct with certainty Antonius' speech. Cicero's depiction, including his manner of citation as well as his emphasis on certain ideas and lack of emphasis on others, created new information. We see this clearly when Cicero addresses Antonius in the second person, as if the speech had been delivered orally, while in reality it was disseminated in written form.⁶³ From Cicero's report, it is understood that, in the following passage, the first sentence was stated by Antonius, while the second, as the word "credo" ('I believe') inserted before it demonstrates, was Cicero's ironical annotation:⁶⁴

16 at etiam **ausus es** — quid autem est quod tu non audeas? — *clivum Capitolinum dicere me consule plenum servorum armatorum fuisse. ut illa, credo, nefaria senatus consulta fierent, vim adferebam senatui.*

(Cic., *Phil.* 2.16)

But you [Antony] even **dared** — and what is there you would not dare? — **to say that, when I [Cicero] was Consul, the slope of the Capitol was full of armed slaves. In order, I suppose, that those nefarious resolutions [against the Catilinarian conspirators] of the Senate might pass I was offering violence to the Senate!**

(trl. D.R. Shackleton Bailey; my emphases and italics)

⁶² Frisch 1946, 133-140 dealt directly with the speech as a reflection of Antonius' speech on 19 September and how far it might be taken to reflect truthfully Antonius' words and meaning. At 135, he judges Cicero as 'too deeply involved to be a good witness'; van der Blom 2016, 270-271; at 270, 'we should be very cautious about taking these passages at face value. At most they show us the themes which Antonius used to attack Cicero and Cicero's refutation'.

⁶³ See Shackleton Bailey 2009, 50-51:

Although the work is a pamphlet in oratorical form, it strives throughout to maintain the fiction that it was an actual speech delivered in Antony's presence on 19 September. Cicero conveys this impression by means of such devices as frequent allusions to the physical setting, both the day itself (110, 112) and the threatening conditions surrounding the place of delivery, especially Antony's armed followers (8, 46, 112); by repeatedly addressing his fellow senators (1, 10, 25, etc.) and requesting a friendly hearing (47); and by imagining that Antony has suddenly shown signs of dismay or anger or alarm ...

⁶⁴ See also Ramsey 2003, ad loc.

Within the span of two passages, Cicero quoted twice, using direct speech, Antonius' accusation that he had been involved in the plot against Caesar. The differences between the two quotes indicate an open and conscious disregard for the accuracy of the quote, this time in the third person:

"Caesare interfecto", inquit, "statim cruentum alte extollens Brutus pugionem Ciceronem nominatim exclamavit atque ei recuperatam libertatem est gratulatus."
(Cic., *Phil.* 2.28)

"When Caesar had been slain", he says, "Brutus, at once lifting high his bloody dagger, shouted for Cicero by name, and congratulated him on the recovery of freedom."
(trl. D.R. Shackleton Bailey)

Sic enim dixit: "M. Brutus, quem ego honoris causa nomino, cruentum pugionem tenens Ciceronem exclamavit: ex quo intellegi debet eum conscium fuisse."
(Cic., *Phil.* 2.30)

For this is what he said: *"Marcus Brutus, whose name I mention with respect, called on Cicero as he held his bloodstained dagger: hence it ought to be inferred that Cicero was in the plot."*
(trl. D.R. Shackleton Bailey)

To proceed to Cicero's analysis of Antonius' epistle, the *Thirteenth Philippic*, delivered in all probability on 20 March 43 BCE, quotes sentence after sentence from Antonius' letter to Hirtius and Octavian from the 13th or 14th of March from Mutina. The letter seems to have been intended for wide circulation, perhaps encouraging military mutiny by bringing up the memory of Caesar. While the letter is addressed to particular individuals, its public nature is evident from its style and contents.⁶⁵

A famous phrase in the letter demonstrates Cicero's manner of playing with the fine lines between quoting a fragment, interpreting a message, and conveying information:

"— et te, o puer —" puerum appellat quem non modo virum sed etiam fortissimum virum sensit et sentiet. Est istuc quidem nomen aetatis, sed ab eo minime usurpandum qui suam amentiam puero huic praebet ad gloriam.

"— qui omnia nomini debes —" debet vero solvitque praeclare. si enim ille patriae parens, ut tu appellas — ego quid sentiam videro — cur non hic parens verior a quo certe vitam habemus e tuis facinerosissimis manibus ereptam?

(Cic., *Phil.* 13.24-25)

"— And you, O boy —"

He (Antony) **calls him** (Octavius) **a boy** whom he has felt, and shall feel, to be not only a man, but a very brave man too. That name indeed belongs to his age, but it is one not to be employed by a man who bestows his own madness on this boy as material for glory.

"You who owe everything to a name —"

⁶⁵ See Ramsey 2010 specifically for a discussion of the *Thirteenth Philippic* and Antonius' letter; for an analysis of Antonius' quotations see 170-174. See also Frisch 1946, 248-266, 252-255 for a reconstruction of Antonius' letter; Lintott 2008, 399-401, as well for a reconstruction of Antonius' letter 445-447; Van der Blom 2016, 252, n. 23, 275.

He owes certainly, and discharges the debt nobly. **For if Caesar were the father of his country, as you (Antony) name him** — my sentiments I will reserve — why is this youth (Octavius) not more truly her father from whom we certainly receive our lives rescued from your most criminal hands?

(trl. D.R. Shackleton Bailey)

As is apparent from these examples, Cicero composed the *Philippic* orations with great care (Plut., *Cic.* 24.6) and seems to have published them not long after delivering them (Cic., *Fam.* 12.2.1, *ad Brut.* 2.3.4) both because of their potential to influence public opinion and because of their literary value (Juv., *Sat.* 10.125 “*divina Philippica*”).

While the *Philippics* are political attacks and, as such, are likely to distort facts and convey information in a biased manner, they remain a historical source of value for the events of that period. Carefully contextualized, the speeches may provide us with a wealth of information about Antonius' actions and writings. Lintott, for example, noted that the *Second Philippic* is a riposte in kind and that a number of Antonius' charges can be discerned in it, charges which Cicero could answer. Only the charge of plotting Caesar's murder is confirmed elsewhere by Cicero (*Phil.* 2.25-28; *Fam.* 12.3.1).⁶⁶ Frisch had already pointed out that Cicero ‘is too deeply involved to be a good witness’ about the effect of Antonius' violent attack, and concludes that this second speech is not substantial as a historical source.⁶⁷ In regard to Antonius' letter in the *Thirteenth Philippic*, Frisch found the report highly credible, preserved in a curious manner as Cicero himself recites it in order to refute it clause by clause.⁶⁸ Lintott suggested that the text can be recovered from the *lemmata* in the speech, which he judged, in itself, as a powerful piece of rhetoric. He questioned Cicero's wisdom in reading Antonius' letter to the Senate, among other considerations, as Cicero's exostulations which punctuate his reading do not match the pungency of Antonius' allegations.⁶⁹ Ramsey interpreted the unique form and function of Cicero's speech as a delayed response to Antonius' invective of 19 September 44 in view of the impressive number of arguments and themes, occasionally even with a verbal echo, that are common to the *Thirteenth* and *Second Philippics*. The verbal altercation represents a bold innovation, without precedent, in deliberative oratory.⁷⁰

As noted above, the *Second Philippic* strives throughout, by means of various devices, to maintain the fiction that it was an actual speech delivered in Antonius' presence. This dramatic scenery is recognizable also in the variety of versions and different manners in which Cicero reported Antonius' speech.

The structure of the *Thirteenth Philippic* is different in offering a more literal presentation of Antonius' words as verbatim citations. Shackleton Bailey already noted that this speech is unique in devoting so much space to the quotation of the words of another one, nearly 550 words of Antonius. He warned, however, that close examination shows that the speech borrows heavily from material contained in the *Second Philippic* (which was composed to simulate in the Senate a direct reply to Antonius' invective

⁶⁶ Lintott 2008, 378-379.

⁶⁷ Frisch 1946, 135, 139.

⁶⁸ Ibid. 252.

⁶⁹ Lintott 2008, 399, 400-401 and the recovered speech 445-447.

⁷⁰ Ramsey 2010, 156-158, 160-161, 163-170.

against Cicero on 19 September 44), an affinity too striking to be dismissed as a mere coincidence.⁷¹

To conclude this case study, even a proclaimed use of documents, such as a written speech or a written letter, does not, in itself, demonstrate that the testimony or fragment is accurate. Examples of similar but not verbatim passages suggest that we cannot trust everything delivered in direct speech to be a credible fragment from another report, whether oral or in writing. We must consider Cicero's rhetorical strategies for using different referencing devices (direct speech vs. indirect speech, paraphrase and summation), including the possibility that the difference derives from Cicero's messages rather than from any textual affinity to Antonius' speech or letter. These complexities relate directly to the question of what counts as a *fragmentum* or as a *testimonium*, however defined. This rhetorical technique of Cicero's, demonstrated by the use of documents in the *Philippics*, coheres with the conclusion that ancient authors employed lax habits of citation and the various uses of direct speech.⁷²

Cicero's usage of Antonius' writings or orations illustrates the re-contextualization and reinterpretation of an intermediate source in a commentary-like situation where parts of an absent work are quoted as *lemmata* but with the enormous difference of a political context which influences the reader's access to the original text. Even a close rendering can be distorted, which must be taken into account with regard to the definitions and different categories of fragments and testimonies.

III. The Propaganda War between Antonius and Octavian

History, memory, and propaganda witness and transmit information in different ways. This will become evident in our third case study, which deals with a propaganda war waged between Antonius and Octavian. An evaluation of the evidence as source for political propaganda is necessary to reconstruct the historical events.

Records of the propaganda war between Antonius and Octavian were preserved in the biographies of Plutarch and Suetonius, by later historians, and by prose writers and poets of the Augustan era. Some propaganda supported Augustus after the death of Antonius. Surprisingly, though not inexplicably, remnants of vilifying anti-government messages from the defeated party were preserved in pro-Augustan sources. Suetonius, secretary and archivist under Trajan and Hadrian, had access to the imperial archives. His biography of Augustus (121 CE) is the richest and perhaps even the most reliable source for the exchange of slanders.⁷³ Among Antonius' accusations in Suetonius's biography of Augustus, the claim that Octavian prevented the republican regime from

⁷¹ For the reversion of topics, see Shackleton Bailey 2009, 2.224-225 and n. 1: 'The way in which Antonius' letter is refuted in the *Thirteenth Philippic*, point by point, produces the illusion of a genuine confrontation in the Senate between two bitter antagonists'. See also the detailed interpretation of Ramsey 2010.

⁷² See our discussion on pp. 6-10 and n. 24 above; for Cicero's habits of citation in his letters to Atticus see Mikulová 2018a, 204-208; 2018b, 212.

⁷³ See Wallace Hadrill 1983, 61; Baldwin 1983, 123-149, esp. 140-141.

being restored is the most noteworthy (Suet., *Aug.* 28.1; for other accusations, see 2.3; 4.2; 7.1; 10.4; 16.1-2; 63.2; 68; 69.1, 2; 70.1; 77; *Iul.* 52.1-2).⁷⁴

The next example demonstrates Suetonius' use of direct quotations along with a general conveyance of the character and content of the vilification.

M. Antonius super festinatas Liviae nuptias obiecit et feminam consularem e triclinio viri coram in cubiculum abductam, rursus in convivium rubentibus auriculis incomptiore capillo reductam; dimissam Scriboniam, quia liberius doluisset nimiam potentiam paelicis; condiciones quaesitas per amicos, qui matres familias et adultas aetate virgines denudarent atque perspicerent, tamquam Toranio mangone vendente.

2 Scribit etiam ad ipsum haec familiariter adhuc necdum plane inimicus aut hostis: "Quid te mutavit? Quod reginam in eo? Uxor mea est. Nunc coepi an abhinc annos novem? Tu deinde solam Drusillam inis? Ita valeas, uti tu, hanc epistulam cum leges, non inieris Tertullam aut Terentillam aut Rufillam aut Salviam Titiseniam aut omnes. An refert, ubi et in qua arrigas?"

(Suet., *Aug.* 69.1-2)

Mark Antony charged him, besides his hasty marriage with Livia, with taking the wife of an ex-consul from her husband's dining room before his very eyes into a bed-chamber, and bringing her back to the table with her hair in disorder and her ears glowing; that Scribonia was divorced because she expressed her resentment too freely at the excessive influence of a rival; that his friends acted as his panders, and stripped and inspected matrons and well-grown girls, as if Toranius the slave-dealer were putting them up for sale. Antony also writes to Augustus himself in the following familiar terms, when he had not yet wholly broken with him privately or publicly: "what has made such a change in you? Because I am humping the queen? She is my wife. Am I just beginning this, or was it nine years ago? What then of you — do you hump only Drusilla? Good luck to you if when you read this letter you have not been in Tertulla or Terentilla or Rufilla or Salvia Titisenia, or all of them. Does it matter where or in whom you have your stiff prick?"

(trl. J.C. Rolfe)

These different modes of citation and presentation used by Suetonius add to the rhetorical effect of the information transmitted and may contribute to the credibility of the witness.

The report opens with a reference to the content of Antonius' charge, as the verb 'obiecit' itself defines. Four subjects are conveyed in indirect speech, 1) **besides his hasty marriage ...** 2) **also with taking the wife of an ex-consul ...** 3) **that Scribonia was divorced ...** 4) **that his friends acted as his panders ...** . Whereas the first charge is described in general terms, the three other accusations are highly detailed and give the impression of following an original phrasing. However, the indirect mode of report does not allow us to judge the affinity to the source, and we must consider these four sentences as testimonies to contents.

The next item is presented by Suetonius as a quotation from a letter and is described with respect to its character and to the circumstances of its writing: **Antony also writes to Augustus himself in the following familiar terms, when he had not yet wholly**

⁷⁴ For a discussion of these fragments and testimonies preserved in Suetonius, see Charlesworth 1933.

broken with him privately or publicly. This time, not only the detailed manner, but also the vocabulary, pungency, and rhetoric, depicted by other authors as characteristic of Antonius' style, support the direct speech quotation as genuine.⁷⁵ If we add to these internal qualities the external elements concerning the reliability of Suetonius as the mediate source, we may suggest that the quoted passage from Antonius' letter meets the definition of a fragment.

This third case study, which was the most extreme in terms of personal slanders in the propaganda war between Antonius and Octavian, exhibited various testimonies to circumstances, to character, to contents, and to a quoted fragment. Among the testimonies to contents, we can discern various levels of affinity to the original wording.

One final, general remark may be made concerning the setting of political propaganda. The preservation of these testimonies and fragments could happen quite randomly in a non-political context. We find one such case in a discussion of the grammatical form of the word *catillus* (Charis., *Instit. Gram. GLK* 1.80.2) and another in a passage of Pliny the Elder, referring to Antonius' *de sua Ebrietate* (Plin., *NH* 14.148, 77 CE, *Regarding his Inebriation*), which seems to belong to the political propaganda.⁷⁶

A story preserved about two crows trained to bless the victor upon his return from the Battle of Actium attests to Octavian's view of the rival camp's propaganda as non-threatening, although after the event (Macrob., *Sat.* 2.4.29). Ovid and Tacitus report on Caesar's and Augustus' attitude towards the writings of their rivals, noting that these writings were read and regarded by them with temperance and wisdom — "I hesitate whether to ascribe their action to forbearance or to wisdom. For things contemned are soon things forgotten: anger is read as a recognition" (Tac., *Ann.* 4.34, trl. J. Jackson; cf. Ov., *Pont.* 1.1.23). The two writers juxtapose Antonius and Brutus; perhaps they served already in the age of Augustus as historical examples of his tolerance regarding political attacks in the period prior to his absolute rule. This attitude of Augustus towards Antonius' writings is also relevant to the transmission of knowledge, and it must have affected the preservation of fragments as well. These examples of general external evidence may help us deal with such materials in historical contexts of controversy and must be regarded with the methodological guidelines for treating these fragments and testimonies.

Conclusions

Through an examination of case studies presenting texts which convey information on Marcus Antonius' orations and epistles, I attempted to demonstrate the complexity in collecting fragments and testimonies of lost works, especially in prose. In the past few decades, the important role of the intermediate sources in transmitting information has received substantial scholarly attention. The difficulty of distinguishing a fragment from a testimony has also been discussed by scholars of various branches of classics. I suggest a more precise definition of *fragmenta* at the expense of various *testimonia*.

⁷⁵ For a study of Antonius' style based on direct transmission mostly in his letters to Cicero and on indirect testimonies, see Calboli 1997; cf. Huzar 1982.

⁷⁶ Suet., *Aug.* 77. Geiger 1980 suggested associating this with a comment by Cornelius Nepos about moderation in drinking before the battle of Mutina, perhaps from his biography of Antonius.

When speaking of a fragment, as still understood in its literal sense, we refer either to a physical remainder or a passage that exhibits a well-founded resemblance to the original. This evaluation should include all criteria, whether external or internal, for gauging the affinity of the text to the original phrasing. We must take into consideration the aims of the intermediate author in referring to the lost work, his habits of alluding to written or verbal information, the rules of the genre and its stylistic obligations, the linguistic mediums employed, the boundaries of reported speech, possibilities of comparison, and external testimonies to stylistic characteristics, which will all figure into the appraisal of the text.

These considerations for working with fragments and testimonies need to be explicitly stated. This strict definition of "fragment" is not meant to reduce the importance of testimonies to contents. On the contrary, collections ought to include all testimonies, together with the spurious and even fictitious. I believe that we can also learn from fabricated composition, which were often inspired by the original essays or through intermediate sources. When the boundary between fragments and testimonies is fuzzy, whether in direct or indirect speech, the editor must work in a transparent way with respect to assigning the testimony or fragment to a class or category.

The comparison of testimonies concerning Antonius' eulogy for Caesar, of fragments and testimonies in the political invective exchanged between Antonius and Cicero, and the like in the propaganda war with Octavian, exposed the reporting habits of the 'cover texts' and enabled us to gain a better understanding of their citation practices. The shifting aims and rhetorical means of various literary genres led to different modes of reporting Antonius' words and often made it impossible to recover the original phrasing. Again, however, we saw a distinct difference between the various contexts of the testimonies and the quotations, impacting significantly on their degree of reliability. These influences become more obvious when different reports are carefully compared against one another, and they ought to be borne in mind when the remains of lost works of a specific author or literary genre are collected.

Both the precise definition of the terms with the strict classification of fragments and testimonies to their kinds and the comparative study of the intermediate authors' habits of reporting proved helpful in our investigation of Antonius' lost works. One may draw some insights from these small-scale case studies to the bigger picture of using fragments and testimonies in classical studies. Marcus Antonius is an example of a figure that underwent an extreme process of *damnatio memoriae*: an adversary of Rome's most celebrated speaker on the one hand and rival of her most successful statesman on the other. The remains of his works preserved in other authors' compositions supplied us with a wide range of the textual maneuvers facilitated by modes of citation and representation.

The Academy of the Hebrew Language and Ben-Gurion University of the Negev

Bibliography

- Baldwin, B., *Suetonius*, Amsterdam 1983.
- Barkan, L., 'What did Shakespeare read?', M. de Grazia and S. Wells, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare*, Cambridge 2006, 31-47.
- Baron, Ch.A., 'The Delimitation of Fragments in Jacoby's FGrHist: Some Examples from Duris of Samos', *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 51 (2011), 86-110.
- Beard, M., *SPQR. A History of Ancient Rome*, London 2015.
- Berti, M., Romanello, M., Babeu, A., Crane, G., 'Collecting Fragmentary Authors in a Digital Library', *Proceedings of the 2009 Joint International Conference on Digital Libraries*, Austin TX, New York 2009, 259-262.
- Eadem, 'Citazioni e dinamiche testuali. L'intertestualità e la storiografia greca Frammentaria', V. Costa, ed., *Tradizione e trasmissione degli storici greci frammentari II*, Tivoli (Roma) 2012a, 439-458.
- Eadem, 'Collecting Quotations by Topic: Degrees of Preservation and Transtextual Relations among Genres', *Ancient Society* 43 (2013), 269-288.
- Eadem, 'Representing Fragmentary Texts', N. Filatkina, Cl. Moulin and M.-S. Ortola, eds., *Exploring Formulaic Knowledge through Languages, Cultures, and Time*, Nancy (forthcoming).
- van der Blom, H., *Oratory and Political Career in the Late Roman Republic*, Cambridge 2016.
- Braden, G., 'Shakespeare', A. Grafton, G. Most, S. Settis, eds., *The Classical Tradition*, Cambridge MA and London 2010, 881-884.
- Brunt, P.A., 'On Historical Fragments and Epitomes', *CQ* 30 (1980), 477-494.
- Butler, H.E. and Cary, M., *Suetonius, Divus Julius, edited with commentary, with new introduction, bibliography & additional notes by G.B. Townend*, Bristol 1927.
- Butler, Sh., *The Hand of Cicero*, London 2002.
- Burden-Strevens, Ch.W., *Cassius Dio's Speeches and the Collapse of the Roman Republic*, PhD Dissertation, University of Glasgow 2015.
- Idem, 'Fictitious Speeches, Envy, and the Habituation to Authority: Writing the Collapse of the Roman Republic', C.H. Lange, J.M. Madsen, eds., *Cassius Dio, Greek Intellectual and Roman Politician*, Historiography of Rome and its Empire I, Leiden-Boston 2016, 193-216.
- Calboli, G., 'The Asiatic Style of Antony: Some Considerations', B. Czaplá, T. Lehmann and S. Liell, eds., *Vir Bonus Dicendi Peritus. Festschrift für Alfons Weische zum 65. Geburtstag*, Wiesbaden 1997, 13-26.
- Charlesworth, M.P., 'Some Fragments of the Propaganda of Mark Antony', *CQ* 27 (1933), 172-177.
- Darbo-Peschanski, C., 'Introduction. Les citations grecques et romaines', C. Darbo-Peschanski, ed., *La citation dans l'Antiquité. Actes du colloque du PARSA Lyon, ENS LSH 6-8 novembre 2002*, Grenoble 2004a, 9-21.
- Eadem, 'La citation et les fragments: les Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker de Felix Jacoby', C. Darbo-Peschanski, ed., *La citation dans l'Antiquité. Actes du colloque du PARSA Lyon, ENS LSH 6-8 novembre 2002*, Grenoble 2004b, 291-300.
- Deutsch, M.E., 'Antony's Funeral Speech', *University of California Publications in Classical Philology* 9.5 (1928), 127-148.

- Dickey, E., *Ancient Greek Scholarship. A Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica, and Grammatical Treatises, from their Beginnings to the Byzantine Period*, Oxford 2007.
- Dionisotti, A.C., 'On Fragments in Classical Scholarship', G.W. Most, ed., *Collecting Fragments-Fragmente sammeln* [= Aporemata. Kritische Studien zur Philologiegeschichte 1], Göttingen 1997, 1-33.
- Edelstein, L., Kidd, I.G., *Posidonius, The Fragments*, Cambridge 1972-1999, 3 vols.
- Flower, H.I., *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, Oxford 1996.
- Fomin, A., 'Speeches in Cassius Dio', C.H. Lange, J.M. Madsen, eds., *Cassius Dio, Greek Intellectual and Roman Politician*, *Historiography of Rome and its Empire I*, Leiden-Boston 2016, 217-237.
- Frisch, H., *Cicero's Fight for the Republic: The Historical Background of Cicero's Philippics*, Copenhagen 1946.
- Furness, H.H., ed., *William Shakespeare, The Tragedy of Julius Caesar*, New Variorum edition of Shakespeare vol. 17, Philadelphia 1913.
- Geiger, J., 'An Overlooked Item of the War of Propaganda between Octavian and Antony', *Historia* 29 (1980), 112-114.
- Gotter, U., *Der Diktator ist tot! Politik in Rom zwischen den Iden des März und der Begründung des Zweiten Triumvirats*, *Historia Einzelschriften* 110, Stuttgart 1996.
- Gowing, A.M., *The Triumviral Narratives of Appian and Cassius Dio*, Ann Arbor 1992.
- Grafton, A., 'The Scholarship of Poliziano and its Context', id., *Defenders of the Text. The Traditions of Scholarship in an Age of Science, 1450-1800*, Cambridge MA 1991, 45-75.
- Idem, 'Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum: Fragments of Some Lost Enterprises', G.W. Most, ed., *Collecting Fragments-Fragmente sammeln* [= Aporemata. Kritische Studien zur Philologiegeschichte 1], Göttingen 1997, 124-143.
- Gruen, E., *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*, Berkeley 1974.
- Hall, J., 'Cicero and Political Crisis', C. Steel, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Cicero*, Cambridge 2013, 215-229.
- Idem, *Cicero's Use of Judicial Theater*, Michigan 2014.
- Heck, E., *Die Bezeugung von Ciceros Schrift De re publica* [= Spudasmata 4], Hildesheim 1966.
- Hölkeskamp, K.-J., *Reconstructing the Roman Republic. An Ancient Political Culture and Modern Research*, rev. ed., transl. H. Heitmann-Gordon, Princeton 2010 (first ed. 2004).
- Huzar, E., 'The Literary Efforts of Mark Antony', *ANRW* 2.30.1 (1982), 639-657.
- Iglesias-Zoido, J.C. and Pineda, V., *Anthologies of Historiographical Speeches from Antiquity to Early Modern* (*International Studies in the History of Rhetoric* 7), Leiden 2017.
- Jacoby, F. 'Ueber die Entwicklung der griechischen Historiographie und den Plan einer neuen Sammlung der griechischen Historikerfragmente', *Klio* 9 (1909), 80-123.
- Jehne, M., *Der Staat des Dictators Caesar*, Köln-Wien 1987.
- Kennedy, G.A., 'Antony's Speech at Caesar's Funeral', *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 54.2 (1968), 99-106.

- Kidd, I.G., 'What is a Posidonian Fragment?', G.W. Most, ed., *Collecting Fragments-Fragmente sammeln* [= Aporemata. Kritische Studien zur Philologiegeschichte 1], Göttingen 1997, 225-236.
- Kierdorf, W., *Laudatio Funeris. Interpretationen und Untersuchungen zur Entwicklung der römischen Leichenrede* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 106) Meisenheim am Glan 1980.
- Laird, A., 'The Rhetoric of Roman Historiography', A. Feldherr, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians*, Cambridge 2009, 197-213.
- Latham, J.A., *Performance, Memory, and Processions in Ancient Rome. The Pompa Circensis from the Late Republic to Late Antiquity*, New York 2016.
- Lenfant, D., 'The Study of Intermediate Authors and its Role in the Interpretation of Historical Fragments', *Ancient Society* 43 (2013), 289-305.
- Lewis, Ch.T., Short, Ch., *A Latin Dictionary*, Oxford 1879.
- Lintott, A.W., 'Cassius Dio and the History of the Late Republic', *ANRW* II, 34.3 (1997), 2497-2523.
- Idem, *Cicero as Evidence: A Historian's Companion*, Oxford 2008.
- Lushlov, A.H., 'Citation and the Dynamics of Tradition in Livy's *AUC*', *Histos* 7 (2013), 21-47.
- Mahy, T.B., *After the Daggers: Politics and Persuasion after the Assassination of Caesar*, PhD Dissertation, University of St. Andrews 2010.
- Idem, 'Antonius, Triumvir and Orator: Career, Style, and Effectiveness', C. Steel, H. van der Blom, eds., *Community and Communication: Oratory and Politics in Republican Rome*, Oxford 2013, 329-344.
- Marincola, J., Review Article of 'Shored against Our Ruines [T.J. Cornell (ed.); E.H. Bispham, J. Briscoe, T.J. Cornell, A. Drummond, B.M. Levick, S.J. Northwood, S.P. Oakley, M.P. Pobjoy, J.W. Rich and C.J. Smith, *The Fragments of the Roman Historians. Volume I: Introduction; Volume 2: Texts and Translations; Volume 3: Commentary*, Oxford, 2013]', *JRS* 106 (2016), 237-246.
- Marrou, H.I., *A History of Education in Antiquity*, Trl. by G. Lamb, New York 1956.
- Martindale, Ch., Taylor, A.B., *Shakespeare and the Classics*, Cambridge 2004.
- Matijević, K., *Marcus Antonius, Consul-Proconsul-Staatsfeind. Die Politik der Jahre 44 und 43 v. Chr.*, Osnabrücker Forschungen zu Altertum und Antike-Rezeption 11, Rahden 2006.
- Mikulová, J., 'Direct Speech and Diversity of Voices in Selected Letters of Cicero to Atticus I (Direct Speech)', *Studia Linguistica Universitatis Jagellonicae Cracoviensis* 135 (2018a), 201-209.
- Eadem, 'Direct Speech and Diversity of Voices in Selected Letters of Cicero to Atticus II (Indirect Speech, Mixed Quotations and Comparison with Direct Speech)', *Studia Linguistica Universitatis Jagellonicae Cracoviensis* 135 (2018b), 211-217.
- Migne, J.P., *Marii Mercatoris S. Augustino aequalis Opera omnia sive Monumenta ad Pelagianam Nestorianamque Haeresim pertinentia*, PL 48 (1862).
- Millar, F., 'Some Speeches in Cassius Dio', *Museum Helveticum* 18 (1961), 11-22.
- Idem, *A Study of Cassius Dio*, Oxford 1964.
- Miller, N.P., 'Dramatic Speech in the Roman Historians', *Greece and Rome* 22 (1975), 45-57.
- Morgan, L., 'The Autopsy of C. Asinius Pollio', *JRS* 90 (2000), 51-69.

- Morstein-Marx, R., *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic*, Cambridge 2004.
- Morstein-Marx, R., “Cultural Hegemony” and the Communicative Power of the Roman Elite’, C. Steel, H. van der Blom, eds., *Community and Communication: Oratory and Politics in Republican Rome*, Oxford 2013, 29-48.
- Most, G.W., ed., *Collecting Fragments-Fragmente sammeln* [= Aporemata. Kritische Studien zur Philologiegeschichte 1], Göttingen 1997.
- Mouristen, H., *Politics in the Roman Republic*, New York 2017.
- Niskanen, S., ‘William of Malmesbury as Librarian: The Evidence of his Autographs’, R.M. Thomson, E. Dolmans, E.A. Winkler, eds., *Discovering William of Malmesbury*, Woodbridge, Suffolk 2017, 117-127.
- Novokhatko, A., ‘Greek Scholarship from its Beginnings to Alexandria’, F. Montanari, S. Mattaios, A. Rengakos, eds., *Brill’s Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*, Leiden and Boston 2016, vol. 1, 3-59.
- OLD = *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, ed. P.G.W. Glare, Oxford 1976.
- Osgood, J., *Caesar’s Legacy. Civil War and the Emergence of the Roman Empire*, New York 2006.
- Ouellette, H.T., ed., *William of Malmesbury, Polyhistor Deflorationum*, Binghamton 1982.
- Pausch, D., ‘Und seine Worte waren ungefähr die folgenden: ...“ Reden in der antiken Geschichtsschreibung zwischen Verwendung und Problematisierung’, U. Tischer, A. Binternagel, eds., *Fremde Rede — eigene Rede. Zitieren und verwandte Strategien in antiker Prosa*, Frankfurt a.M. u.a. 2010, 35-57.
- Pelling, C.B.R., ed., *Plutarch. Life of Antony*, Cambridge 1988.
- Idem, ed., *Plutarch. Life of Caesar*, Cambridge 2011.
- Pfeiffer, R., *History of classical scholarship from the beginnings to the end of the Hellenistic Age*, Oxford 1968.
- Idem, *History of Classical Scholarship from 1300 to 1850*, Oxford 1976.
- Powell, J.G.F., ‘Invective and the Orator: Ciceronian Theory and Practice’, J. Booth, ed., *Cicero on the Attack. Invective and Subversion in the Orations and beyond*, Swansea 2007.
- Ramage, E.S., ‘Funeral Eulogy and Propaganda in the Roman Republic.’ *Athenaeum* 94 (2006), 39-64.
- Ramsey, J.T., *Cicero. Philippics I-II*, edited, Cambridge 2003.
- Idem, ‘Debate at a Distance: A Unique Rhetorical Strategy in Cicero’s Thirteenth Philippic’, D.H. Berry and A. Erskine, eds., *Form and Function in Roman Oratory*, Cambridge 2010, 155-174.
- Reynolds, L.D., Wilson, N.G., *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature*, Oxford 2013⁴.
- Romanello, M., Berti, M., Boschetti, F., Babeu, A., and Crane, G., ‘Rethinking Critical Editions of Fragmentary Texts by Ontologies’, S. Mornati, ed., *Rethinking Electronic Publishing: Innovation in Communication Paradigms and Technologies — Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Electronic Publishing held in Milano Italy 10-12 June 2009*, Milano 2009, 155-174.

- Idem, 'The Digital Critical Edition of Fragments: Theoretical Problems and Technical Solution', P. Cotticelli Kurras, ed., *Linguistica e filologia Digitale: Aspetti e Progetti*, Alessandria 2011, 147-155.
- Russell, A., *The Politics of Public Space in Republican Rome*, Cambridge 2016.
- Sandys, J.E., *A History of Classical Scholarship, 1908-1921* (1921², vol. 1; 1908, vols. 2-3).
- Schanzer, E., *Shakespeare's Appian*, Liverpool 1956.
- Schepens, G., 'Jacoby's *FGrHist*: Problems, Methods, Prospects', in G.W. Most, ed., *Collecting Fragments — Fragmente sammeln* [= *Aporemata. Kritische Studien zur Philologiegeschichte* 1], Göttingen 1997a, 144-172.
- Idem, 'Timaeus *FGrHist* 566 F28 Revisited: Fragmenta or Testimonia?' *Simblos* 2 (1997b), 71-83.
- Idem, 'Probleme der Fragmentedition (*Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*)', C. Reitz, ed., *Vom Text zum Buch*, St. Katharinen 2000, 1-29 [n.v.].
- Setaioli, A., 'Antony's speech in Shakespeare's Julius Caesar and the Ancient Sources', *Prometheus* 43 (2017), 283-389.
- Shackleton Bailey, D.R., ed., *Cicero's Letters to Atticus*, Cambridge 1965-1970, 7 vols.
- Idem, *Cicero, Philippics, edited and translated*, Chapel Hill/London 1986.
- Idem, *Cicero, Philippics, edited and translated*, rev. by J.T. Ramsey and G. Manuwald, Cambridge MA and London 2009, 2 vols.
- Steel, C., *Reading Cicero: Genre and Performance in Late Republican Rome*, London 2005.
- Eadem, *Roman Oratory* (Greece and Rome New Surveys in the Classics 36), Cambridge 2006.
- Eadem, 'Lost Orators of Rome', W. Dominik, J. Hall, eds., *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric*, Oxford 2007, 237-249.
- Eadem, *The End of the Roman Republic 146-44 B.C.: Conquest and Crisis*, Edinburgh 2013.
- Stevenson, T., and Wilson, M., 'Cicero's *Philippics*: History, Rhetoric and Ideology', T. Stevenson, M. Wilson, eds., *Cicero's Philippics. History, Rhetoric and Ideology*, Auckland 2008, 1-21.
- Idem, 'Tyrants, Kings and Fathers in the *Philippics*', T. Stevenson, M. Wilson, eds., *Cicero's Philippics. History, Rhetoric and Ideology*, Auckland 2008, 95-113.
- Idem, 'Antony as 'Tyrant' in Cicero's *First Philippic*', *Ramus* 38 (2009), 174-186.
- Strauss, B., *The Death of Caesar. The Story of History's Most Famous Assassination*, New York 2015.
- Sumi, G.S., *Ceremony and Power: Performing Politics in Rome between Republic and Empire*, Ann Arbor 2005.
- Syme, R., *The Roman Revolution*, Oxford 1939.
- Tempest, K., *Brutus: The Noble Conspirator*, New Haven-London 2017.
- Theiler, W., *Poseidonius, Die Fragmente*, [= *Texte und Kommentare. Eine altertumswissenschaftliche Reihe* 10.1], Berlin 1982, 2 Bdd.
- ThLL = Thesaurus Linguae Latinae, editus auctoritate et consilio academiarum quinque germanicarum berlinensis gottlingensis lipsiensis monacensis vindobonensis*, Leipzig 1912-1924.
- Thomson, R.M., *William of Malmesbury*, Woodbridge 1987.

- Idem, 'William of Malmesbury and the Latin Classics revisited', *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose* (Proceedings of the British Academy 129), T. Reinhardt, M. Lapidge, J.N. Adams, eds., Oxford 2005, 383-393.
- Idem, 'Epilogue. The Rediscovery of William of Malmesbury', R.M. Thomson, E. Dolmans, E.A. Winkler, eds., *Discovering William of Malmesbury*, Woodbridge, Suffolk 2017, 219-224.
- Tischer, U., 'Aspekte des Zitats. Überlegungen zur Anwendung eines modernen Konzepts auf antike lateinische Texte', U. Tischer, A. Binternagel, eds., *Fremde Rede — Eigene Rede. Zitieren und verwandte Strategien in antiker Prosa*, Frankfurt a.M. u.a. 2010, 93-109.
- Eadem, Binternagel, A., 'Einleitung: Fremde Rede — Eigene Rede', U. Tischer, A. Binternagel, eds., *Fremde Rede — eigene Rede. Zitieren und verwandte Strategien in antiker Prosa*, Frankfurt a.M. u.a. 2010, 7-16.
- Trachsel, A., 'Collecting Fragments Today: What Status will a Fragment have in the Era of Digital Philology', C. Clivaz, J. Meizoz, F. Valloton, and J. Verheyden, eds., *Lire demain — Reading Tomorrow*, Lausanne 2012 (e-book version), 415-429.
- Eadem, 'Fragments, Holes, and Wholes: Re- Constructing the Ancient World in Theory and Practice: Warsaw 12-14 June 2014: A Report', *Bollettino di studi latini* 44 (2014), 668-680.
- Eadem, A., 'Presenting Fragments as Quotations or Quotations as Fragments', *Digital Classics Online* 3.2 (2017), 17-27.
- Vardi, A., 'Genre, Conventions, and Cultural Programme in Gellius' *Noctes Atticae*', L. Holford-Strevens, A. Vardi, eds., *The Worlds of Aulus Gellius*, Oxford 2004, 159-186.
- Walker, L., ed. *Shakespeare and the Classical Tradition: An Annotated Bibliography 1961-1991*, New York and London 2002.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A., *Suetonius: The Scholar and his Caesars*, London 1983.
- Weinstock, S., *Divus Iulius*, Oxford 1971.
- Westall, R., 'The Sources of Cassius Dio for the Roman Civil Wars of 49-30 BC', C.H. Lange, J.M. Madsen, eds., *Cassius Dio, Greek Intellectual and Roman Politician* (Historiography of Rome and its Empire I), Leiden-Boston 2016, 217-237.
- Wills, G., *Rome and Rhetoric: Shakespeare's Julius Caesar*, New Haven and London 2011.
- Winkler, E.A. and Dolmans, E., 'Discovering William of Malmesbury: The Man and his Works', R.M. Thomson, E. Dolmans, E.A. Winkler, eds., *Discovering William of Malmesbury*, Woodbridge, Suffolk 2017, 1-12.
- Zinn, E., 'Fragment über Fragmente', J.A. Schmoll, gen. Eisenwerth, ed., *Das Unvollendete als künstlerische Form*, Bern 1959, 161-171, 176-178.