

Cicero's (S)Trumpet: Roman Women and the *Second Philippic*

By: Nancy Myers

Myers, Nancy. "Cicero's (S)Trumpet: Roman Women and the *Second Philippic*." *Rhetoric Review*. 22.4 (2003): 337-52. DOI: [10.1207/S15327981RR2204_1](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327981RR2204_1)

Made available courtesy of Taylor & Francis:

<http://www.informaworld.com/openurl?genre=journal&issn=0735-0198>

*****Reprinted with permission. No further reproduction is authorized without written permission from Taylor & Francis. This version of the document is not the version of record. Figures and/or pictures may be missing from this format of the document.*****

Abstract:

Focusing on the references to women and the feminine in The *Second Philippic Against Antony*, I argue that Cicero's female allusions open up a rhetorical space that exposes the subtle tensions within the Roman social dynamic of men and women. This historically contextualized rhetorical analysis offers a complex understanding of Roman women as both historical entities and rhetorical representations. The article illustrates the importance of understanding not only women in the rhetorical tradition but also mythical portrayals of women as an argumentative strategy.¹

Article:

"Yes, and I should be happy to offer my body if my death can purchase immediate liberty for the Commonwealth, and the suffering of the Roman People thus at length bring to birth what has so long been in the womb" (2.118).² With this feminine metaphor of the womb and birth, Cicero ends the vitriolic *Second Philippic* against Mark Antony (Marcus Antonius) by calling for a return to the republic even at the expense of his own life. As both a productive and generative act, this climactic moment, in which the male body politic fuses with the politic of the female body, operates as the nexus of masculine and feminine, public and private, and oration and circulated pamphlet in the Roman society of the first century BCE. Moreover, of all the female allusions Cicero employs in the *Second Philippic*, it is the only one that focuses on the feminine as the potential for rebirth, rejuvenation, and renewal of what had been the Roman republic. The longstanding republic had been disrupted in the first century BCE with the short but influential dictatorships of Sulla, Caesar, and, within a few years after this polemic, Octavian. Appearing at the end of the text, this procreative metaphor counters and complicates all of Cicero's earlier uses of feminine allusions. All tied to Antony, these earlier references turn real women's lives into myth; furthermore, unlike the example above, they operate to defame and condemn the public and private life of Mark Antony by employing the traditional and tired *topoi* of both the judicial and deliberative oral discourses of the public sphere. In the *Second Philippic*, Cicero uses feminine allusions as both trumpet for defamation of the other and trumpet to associate himself with the renewal of the republic.

As a reply to Antony's senate speech on 19 September 44 BCE, the *Second Philippic* counters Antony's claims through a defense of self and through a political and personal vilification of Antony. Of the fourteen extant speeches of the *Philippics* delivered between 2 September 44 and 21 April 43 BCE, this statement was not delivered in the male-dominated and factioned senate or public forum but was intended for circulation as a pamphlet across the private domains of Rome. The *Philippics* mark Cicero's return to active senate participation preceded by years of disenchantment. Since C. Julius Caesar's bid for domination across the 50s and although Cicero made peace with him in 47, Cicero had moved away from active senate involvement, instead focusing on composing his academic treatises such as *De Republica* in 51, *Brutus* in 46, and *Orator* and *Topica* in 44.³ A staunch believer in the republic as the only appropriate form of Roman government, Cicero was relieved to hear of Caesar's assassination in March 44, which resulted in immediate civil upheaval, opening the way for Mark Antony's takeover. On his way to visit his son studying in Greece, Cicero turned back in August 44 after receiving the news that Antony was losing favor in the senate, as demonstrated by Lucius Calpurnius Piso

Caesoninus's speech against him, and that Octavian—Caesar's great-nephew, adopted son, and heir—was beginning to rival Antony through military force, rhetoric, and politics. Cecil W. Wooten explains Cicero's return to Rome:

He decided, therefore, to return to the city, which he did in August of 44. This was the transition to the final phase of his career, the most glorious and courageous of his life, a period in which he put forth all his talents and all his energy in one last desperate attempt to save the republic to which he had dedicated so much of his life and from which he had derived most of his own reputation. (14)

In his last bid to save the republic and without Antony's presence in the senate, Cicero spoke against him in a subtle, controlled yet critical argument on 2 September 44. This speech, now known as the *First Philippic*, was quickly followed by Antony's reply to the senate just over two weeks later, delivered during Cicero's absence. The cat-and-mouse attacks continued with the *Second Philippic*, which was written during October, never delivered, but probably began circulating in late November after Antony departed for Gaul.⁴ Cicero's *Third* and *Fourth Philippics* were delivered to the senate and forum respectively on 20 December, while Antony was away.⁵

Although the politics of this historical moment seem somewhat straightforward—within the public, male-dominated governmental sphere, Cicero advocated a return to the republic while Antony sought sole control—they were more complicated because Cicero used rhetoric while Antony primarily employed military force. Both men's actions in the public realm implicated the private sphere of the *domus* and women's roles in that sphere. While it is easy to say that the private always influences the public, it cannot be argued cleanly that at the end of the republic, women directly influenced the governmental politics of their husbands or that women regularly had a voice in public spaces. What can be and has been demonstrated is that women more likely influenced their fathers, uncles, brothers, and male cousins—the males tied to the women's family names—and that women's power was more in the realms of property and commerce with their spouses' *clientes* and *amici* than in government and law (see Cracco Ruggini; Dixon; Thomas). Besides family members, slaves, and freedmen, most noble and equestrian households included a vast array of clients, friends of various types, and followers—all from different social levels and all seeking patronage of one type or another.⁶ Politics, then, has the more global meaning of "pursuit and exercise of real power," but this power was acted out in local ways involving situations and people in the private sphere (Dixon 91). It is those specific realms of women's political influence that reverberate across the *Second Philippic*. For it is the control and influence with personal property through freedom of marriage and divorce, with social and family contacts through the Roman *paterfamilias* or head of the family, and with the spouse's *clientes* through the previous two routes that make Cicero's use of feminine references in the *Second Philippic* interesting as a possibly circulated text in the private sphere—a realm that included women and that mingled political discourses. So the private politics of property and commerce impact the civic politics of government and law. The political feminine references of the *Second Philippic* play through society and rhetoric in at least two ways: First, they operate in the male-dominated public context by turning contemporary women into myths and by reinforcing the status quo of the public sphere through invoking the private one; and second, like the *domus* or private household, they become a meeting point for the different but compatible politics of both male and female Romans. Both of these means complicate as well as illuminate the codependency and intermingling of public civic and private social spheres, masculine and feminine roles, and oral and written discourses.

The *Second Philippic* vindicates Cicero's public career while systematically maligning Antony's public and personal life. Operating within the usual rhetorical strategies of Roman defamation, Cicero employs female references via three associations: through direct references and amplification of supposedly disreputable women in Antony's life, through invocations of Antony's mother and second wife Antonia, and through the use of female metaphors. These female allusions underlie and support Cicero's twofold purpose in composing the *Second Philippic*. First, he wanted "to establish firmly the character of the major participants in the conflict" in order to sway an audience already "willing to accept the supremacy of Antony" (Wooten 156, 162). By identifying himself with the state, Cicero rhetorically conflated arguments for his survival with the republic's reinstitution. He also knew this would not be an easy victory, particularly since his war was one of words, while

Antony's depended on physical force. Thus, he needed to establish quickly and directly Antony's designs as not only working against the good of the state but also working toward personal power and glory. By contrast, Cicero represented himself as a statesman upholding the long and noble traditions and laws of the Roman republic. Second, Cicero employed this rhetorical approach of oppositional characterization as one means to rally support for his cause. Since shifting civic politics operated so regularly through compromises and the constant realigning of factioned groups, he needed to turn enough of the senators against Antony to create legislation that would undermine his military power. Therefore, Antony had to play the public enemy to Cicero's savior. Establishing this opposition in the *Second Philippic*, Cicero's focus continues throughout the *Philippics*. According to James M. May in *Trials of Character: The Eloquence of Ciceronian Ethos*:

The point at issue throughout the speeches is reduced, in a way, to a conflict between two characters writ large: Antony, who personifies the forces of despotism, madness, evil, darkness, hostility, and inhumanity, and Cicero, who represents constitutionally, the Republic, and the forces of tradition, goodness, and right. (149)

Besides misrepresenting some of Antony's military and political actions, Cicero's *Second Philippic* includes the common and expected Roman *Oratorical* attacks on his youthful lasciviousness and dissipation.⁷ Outlining and exaggerating male debauchery was a standard tactic in public *Oratory*. As Jasper Griffin notes in *Latin Poets and Roman Life*, this approach was "to arouse in the audience a prurient envy," but more importantly if absent, this strategy would be missed (38). Of course, this tactic was intended for a male audience and deployed *Oratorical* allusions implicating women from all social classes. To mock, ridicule, embarrass, and malign his opponents, Cicero had used feminine allusions in many of his earlier judicial and deliberative speeches (see Griffin). So the Roman women Cicero invokes in his attack on Antony must add to this vitriolic characterization of a corrupt youth devolving into a venal man. It is in these references that the women of Antony's life move from the three-dimensionality of the private sphere to the one-dimensionality of the rhetorical text. Women become mythic representations—disembodied whores and androgynes pitted against suffering gentle noble wives and mothers. All but one of the feminine references in the *Second Philippic* are connected to Antony, and all assume the traditional vein of character defamation. Throughout the text Cicero regularly refers to three of Antony's wives (Fadia, Antonia, Fulvia), his mother (Julia), and one of his mistresses (Volumnia Cytheris). Cicero also compares Antony to Helen of Troy and to a prostitute. All of these attacks revolve around the concepts of male *dignitas*, "an aristocratic ideal of glory" and *auctoritas*, "personal influence" (Veyne 101; Enos 30). For the Roman male "had to prove, by means of his own actions or his ancestors", that his ethos deserved to be respected" (May 7). Thus family name, public offices, and education—as demonstrated through *Oratory*, debate, and service—affected the Roman male's marriages and his ability to garner *clientes* and *amici*.

Although public character attacks may invoke women from all levels of society, claims of *dignitas* and *auctoritas*, and the lack or loss of them, generally focused on those male citizens from the privileged noble and equestrian classes. Through his use of feminine references in the *Second Philippic*, Cicero systematically undermines Antony's public and private life, weakening his *dignitas* and *auctoritas*. Often invoked together, these terms imply a negotiation of individual character and social expectations. According to May, Romans believed that character was an innate stable entity that was complete at birth; it did not change or develop because of experience or education (6). Therefore, *dignitas* reflected breeding, social position, and public achievements as well as the male's commitment to the state, an assumed role and code of conduct (Enos 51–52; Veyne 101–02). As a complex matrix of attributes, *auctoritas* revealed itself through an individual's rhetoric and actions and was respected in "a person who exhibited wisdom gained through practical experience, expert knowledge, and a sense of responsibility in both private and public life" (May 6). Rhetorical attacks, then, on Antony's private life would challenge his public ability to lead the government and the military. Thus, mythologizing the women of his life provided one means to do that.

To create a formidable coalition against Antony, Cicero needed to undermine both a noble family background and a well-established public record, complete with numerous military honors and public offices. In the *Second Philippic*, Cicero challenges Antony's *dignitas* in two ways—through his family name and social standing and through his achievements.⁸ Both approaches employ female allusions as a means to weaken his public

auctoritas. Antony's family names come from two noble lines. He was the son of Julia, "a Julian, the *Third* cousin of Caesar," and Creticus Antonius, one of the two sons of Marcus Antonius, a renowned *Orator* and senator, whom Cicero memorialized in *De Oratore* (Huzar 97). In the *Second Philippic*, Cicero plays on the loss of family *dignitas* by claiming that Antony has degraded the Antonii name because his actions and decisions have not displayed the family's noble traditions. In the female references, both Julia and Antonia, Antony's second wife and first cousin, are represented as obedient and docile women, suffering public embarrassment. Cicero juxtaposes this retiring gentility with Antony's mistress Volumnia Cytheris, the famous actress and courtesan, whom Cicero transforms into a controlling harlot seeking public display. Cicero uses Antony's return to Rome from the victories in Gaul to set up this contrast between good and base women. In his portrayal of the procession, Cicero starts with a description of Antony then follows with

and in their midst [the procession] a comedienne carried in an open litter; and respectable folk from the country towns, [. . .] greeted her not by her well-known stage name [Cytheris] but as "Volumnia." [. . .] His mother, relegated to the rear, followed her rake of a son's mistress like a daughter-in-law. (2.58)

According to Cicero's characterization, Antony has debased his noble mother by putting her at not only the end of the procession but also behind a disreputable woman far beneath Julia's social standing. The "daughter-in-law" reference, of course, rings of the fact that Antony's wife Antonia was of equal social standing with his mother. Cicero vilifies Volumnia Cytheris in four ways: (1) for being an actress, (2) for being an ignoble prostitute with "respectable folk" having to acknowledge her, (3) for being a schemer and climber with the name change from Cytheris to Volumnia, and (4) for being publicly displayed, since female nobility usually were in closed litters. Cicero's little vignette quickly and successfully sets up the myths of three women while presenting only two. The suggestion is that Antony's outrageous behavior humiliates the Antonii women, thus diminishing the Antonii *dignitas* in both the public and private spheres. Moreover, by ignoring proper Roman decorum and protocol, Antony is disrespectful of the republic.

In some form Cicero's representation of Antony's celebratory return to Rome from the victories in Gaul is accurate; the facts about the women, however, are a bit more complicated than Cicero presents. All three women, while from much different social levels, had contact with many of the same upper-class men and probably the same types of influence. Volumnia Cytheris was a financially independent freedwoman, who had been an actress and had been a courtesan to several famous and influential senators besides Antony (Pomeroy 198). Through both word-of-mouth and public appearances, she was probably easily recognized and well known. Her independence and freedom allowed her to move within the upper classes, to choose her male companions, and to regularly attend parties with senators. In a letter to Atticus, Cicero even remarks on his self-consciousness when attending a dinner that includes the infamous Cytheris (Griffin 22). Cytheris' visibility in the procession, condemned by Cicero, could also be seen as Antony displaying a social conquest, thus building his social recognition, since it was acceptable for men to have mistresses and since she was the most famous of them. On the other side of the female binary are the docile and suffering Julia and Antonia. According to Eleanor G. Huzar in "Mark Antony's Wives," Julia, widowed early, had financial troubles and "three sons to educate and launch into the careers their family traditions expected" (98). As a noble woman with family traditions to continue, she used her contacts and her intelligence to promote her sons successfully. Antony's second marriage to Antonia, his first cousin, may have been arranged with Julia's help to bolster and consolidate the Antonii family fortunes. Although they were married for almost a decade, Antonia stayed in Rome while Antony was away for years at a time in military service (98). With no strong personal bonds to hold them, both may have looked elsewhere for social and personal contact. Just as Julia's strength and ingenuity in educating and actively promoting her sons in both public and private societies contradicts Cicero's portrayal of the quietly suffering mother, so Antonia's possible adultery with Dolabella speaks back to the image of the retiring proper wife that Cicero creates in a second reference to her.

In the *Second Philippic*, Cicero accuses Antony of fabricating the claim of Antonia's adultery while he was involved with Cytheris and while he was planning his next marriage to Fulvia: "You turned his daughter, your cousin, out of your house after you had looked for and previously inspected another match. That was not

enough: you accused her, a lady of the utmost propriety, of immoral conduct” (2.99). Although adultery was considered usual for males, it was less acceptable for females; women, however, could divorce as easily as men (Carcopino 96; Veyne 34). Antony’s charge of adultery between Antonia and Dolabella factored the Caesar coalition, weakening his influence. Antony’s public claim seems politically misguided if it were not true. By setting Antonia up as the female epitome of Antonii nobility, Cicero creates a series of male-to-male insults that filter through her representation. This portrayal of Antonia reinforces her connections to her father, Antony’s uncle, and the patterns of obedience and power in the Roman family line. With Antony’s uncle being the *paterfamilias*, eldest head of the Antonii, Cicero is invoking the importance of family loyalty and name, not the lines of inheritance. Being an Antonii, Antony’s responsibility and obedience is to his uncle, not himself. By accusing Antonia, Antony has insulted his uncle and the family.

The Antonia representation is further complicated and exaggerated through Cicero’s reference to Fadia at the beginning of the *Second Philippic*. He undercuts Antony’s private behaviors with his common-law marriage to Fadia, the daughter of a freedman. A freedman was a freed slave, so his daughter was one generation removed from that social ranking. Cicero refers to Antony’s first wife with the connection between her father and his children, “that your children were the grandchildren of a freedman, Quintus Fadius” (2.3). Again the implication is directed at the *dignitas* of the Antonii family, as Antony married a woman beneath his social station and claimed the children as his own. Because children of female slaves impregnated by male masters were also considered slaves, Antony’s acknowledgment of his children was unusual due to Fadia’s close proximity to a slave standing. However, Huzar argues that this early marriage, of which little is known, might have been a sign of social and family rebellion or might have allowed Antony financial security to build his career with Fadia’s dowry (98). But this marriage in Antony’s youth, before he was 25 years old, would have been dismissed and excused by the upper classes as part of his wanton excesses, in which Roman males were allowed and expected to engage. Although unusual, it is not inexplicable, so Fadia becomes mythologized because of slavery. To undermine the *dignitas* of Antony, Cicero sets up two binaries among women that play on female social positions. The first is between the respectable and retiring women of the Antonii, Julia and Antonia, juxtaposed with the notorious Volumnia Cytheris, and the second is between the appropriate wife, Antonia, and the objectionable wife, Fadia. Cicero’s female allusions play on Antony’s actions as lacking respect for the family name and position; thus Antony hurts his *dignitas* through his own choices as well as through his degrading the Antonii name and status.

The second approach Cicero deploys to damage Antony’s *dignitas* is through his use of female representation to emphasize Antony’s lack of *auctoritas* or personal wisdom as shown in deed and word in the private sphere. In these references Antony becomes the slave of love for Fulvia, his *Third* wife, and thus is controlled by her. This lack of authority over his *domus* transforms Fulvia into a scheming androgyne. According to Griffin, for a Roman man to be considered a slave to woman is the worst disgrace (43). Whether rhetoric, belief, or actuality, slavish emotion for a woman was dishonorable. In whatever terms Antony was at his most politically shrewd while married to Fulvia (Huzar 100). Fulvia was a strong and ambitious woman of the noble class. Following in her mother Sempronia’s footsteps, she had a “drive for and manipulation of political power” both domestic and civic (100). Both Cheryl Glenn and Huzar explain that Fulvia appeared a “virago,” a strong, courageous, domineering woman (Rhetoric 71; 100). While providing Antony with two sons, she acted in both interest and action not unlike a male working to influence the political sphere of government. Her character thus appeared more noble Roman male than female. The two combined produce Cicero’s androgyne. As Griffin points out, “It is tempting to connect this Roman obsession with dominant women, whether dreaded or desired, with the strong masculine ethos of Rome and the compulsion to manly behavior” (43).

Cicero plays on this male concern that ruthless women may influence the workings of the government in three of his references to Fulvia in the *Second Philippic*, mythologizing her, first as one who, like a black widow spider, is fatal for her mate, then as an androgyne who can mesmerize as well as manipulate. At both the beginning and end of the speech, he warns Antony to beware Fulvia, as being married to her is sure death. In both 2.11 and 2.113, Cicero makes references to Publius Clodius and Gaius Scribonius Curio, her former husbands who both died violently. The message to the receivers of the pamphlet is that Antony too will meet his

end married to her. The historical counterpoint to this portrayal shows that both of Fulvia's husbands were pro-Caesarian like Antony, both were enemies of Cicero, and both, with her financial and influential assistance, gained more governmental political power. Cicero sets himself apart from Antony and stresses Antony's fondness for strong, wealthy, and ambitious women by asking, "Who was ever heard abusing my consulship except yourself and Publius Clodius, whose fate awaits you, as it awaited Gaius Curio, since you have that in your house which proved fatal to them both?" (2.11). These references also insinuate that Antony cannot control his relationship with Fulvia—the "that in your house"—so his death like the two previous husbands is fated. Like the male black widow spider, his drive is biological, so he willingly sacrifices his life to her control, unable to help himself or to influence the outcome. If he cannot control his sexual desires, how can he control Rome? The emotional desire for women is considered the failing of the strong male, so Cicero weaves yet a more damning portrayal of Antony as her love slave. He asserts that Fulvia, as androgyne, controls Antony physically, emotionally, and intellectually. Cicero sets up the love letter scene in 2.77–78 as Antony's total subjugation to Fulvia. According to Cicero, Antony abandons his military duty and gives up his mistress to insure that Fulvia recognizes and accepts his love. In disguise he leaves his post to deliver his own letter. He announces himself to the *domus* and is presented to Fulvia. She reads his letter of undying passion and ardor and his immediate dismissal of Volumnia Cytheris. Her weeping so overcomes him that he falls "into her arms" (2.77). Although romantic, Roman male protocol would condemn this act because Antony not only leaves his military assignment to act as his own messenger but also is overcome by Fulvia's emotion. Moreover, if Fulvia and her female body have this much power in the private sphere, she must also have power and influence in the public sphere, thus steering Antony's mind and judgment. Since the demonstration of wisdom by the male Roman is a key factor of *auctoritas*, both Antony's *dignitas* and *auctoritas* are undermined by Cicero's rendition. His portrayal of Antony, as mesmerized and controlled by the androgyne Fulvia, highlights unacceptable character behavior in the private sphere, and that has direct impact on the public one. It threatens the state because Antony is no more than a slave being manipulated by Fulvia. The state is being led by a woman-androgyne, Cicero claims. Such a situation cannot be tolerated because it undermines the foundation, beliefs, and values of the republic.

In two other references, Cicero emasculates Antony, turning his public political and military actions into feminine issues of baseness through two negative comparisons to women. From his mid-twenties to mid-thirties, Antony was a distinguished military commander, a quaestor, a tribune, and a consul and worked in many capacities for Caesar. Cicero accentuates how Antony has not only sold his affiliation to the highest bidder, but he has also caused the downfall of the republic. He focuses on Antony's early activity in the senate, which was tainted with the bankruptcy of his deceased father. He attacks Antony's fiscal and moral bankruptcy and early participation in the senate due to his social status:

You donned the gown of manhood—and promptly it became the uniform of a harlot. You started out as a common whore. Your shame had a fixed price, and no mean one. But presently along came Curio. He took you out of the prostitute's trade, gave you a married lady's robe as it were, and settled you down in steady wedlock. (2.44)

Of course, Cicero is highlighting a homosexual relationship; however, he is also using the bankruptcy and early entry into the senate, both due to the death of Antony's father, as a means to accuse Antony of parlaying his vote and affiliation for money and favors. Since Antony was a spirited young man with major debts and little or no guidance, this indictment of his political dealings may have seemed feasible. By combining the references to homosexuality and money, Cicero is turning Antony first into a prostitute, then into a wife. As Shackleton Bailey points out: "The toga was worn by female prostitutes (as well as by men generally). Married women wore a robe (*stola*)" (Cicero: *Philippics* 59). Selling his affiliation is no worse than most of the senators, but the homosexual spin debases Antony because it is a common rhetorical insult damaging his *auctoritas*—to be controlled physically by another man. This accusation was even more damning for the strong and virile Antony. In Cicero's second comparison, Antony, already a base woman, becomes now the most notorious and politically destructive Helen of Troy. Cicero likens Antony's military career and successes to her: "As Helen of Troy, so was he to this Commonwealth, the cause of war, the cause of disaster and destruction" (2.55). In his

emasculated form, Antony has violated the commitment to public office and exhibits no signs of *dignitas* so should not command *auctoritas* or personal authority.

The character assassination through the use of feminine references is complete. Antony, lacking self-control through irresponsible acts with women in the private sphere, degrades the *dignitas* of the Antonii. His use of power as a military commander and as a public official has created chaos and turmoil in the public sphere, his positions now equated with vile women who cause disaster. Antony is without *auctoritas* in either the private or public spheres—his actions prove it. While these differing and complex relations with women are based in the facts of Antony's life, Cicero's exaggerations, innuendos, and implications escalate and shift the power of these women from the private sphere to the public, from the female to the male. Antony's *dignitas* was founded in the established nobility of his family lines and from his own military and governmental service. Since *dignitas* tied to family as well as achievement, Cicero chose carefully the several events to embarrass and humiliate Antony, his family, and his *clientes* and *amici*. Thus, with these mythic representations of private and public acts, Antony and his five female associations from multiple social classes become rhetorical players in Cicero's created character assassination. The message of Cicero's illustrated attack on Antony in the *Second Philippic* is philosophically stated in Pro P. Sestio:

But my entire speech is addressed to virtue, not to indolence; to dignity, not to desire, to those who consider themselves born for their country, for their fellow citizens, for esteem, for glory, not for sleep, for feasting, and for enjoyment. For if they are led astray by pleasures, and have given themselves up to the seductions of vice and the allurements of desire let them renounce public office, let them not touch the Republic, let them be content to enjoy their own ease and to owe it to the labor of brave men. (Qtd. in May 103)

Without *dignitas* and *auctoritas* in the public sphere, the republic is lost. At least in the private sphere, the men without these attributes do not do as much harm to the Roman people. But Cicero needs to form a coalition via this character assassination, so he must also portray himself as embodying *dignitas* and *auctoritas* in the public sphere in order to condemn those, including Antony, who are indolent.

Rhetorically, Cicero finishes the character assassination of Antony by offering himself as the epitome of dignity and authority through a patriarchal metaphor that plays on the Roman women's biological role of furthering the state through procreation. The rhetorical dynamics of the *Second Philippic* are now in place for Cicero to associate the last female reference with himself, not Antony:

Yes, and I should be happy to offer my body if my death can purchase immediate liberty for the Commonwealth, and the suffering of the Roman People thus at length bring to birth what has so long been in the womb. (2.118)

The act of birthing then becomes a social and political act, not just biological on the part of the mother or physical on the part of the midwife. Exposure was a common cultural practice, so to "bring to birth" was a biological, social, and political event. In his rhetorical strategy of presenting oppositional characterizations, Cicero, intentionally or unconsciously, associated a positive female metaphor with his identification to the state and with his goal and call for a return to a republican government. To "bring to birth" becomes a complicated phrase. Tied to Cicero's invocation of his death, the phrase means that Cicero is the woman dying in childbirth to offer new life to the republic, because the Roman practice was to cut out the fetus if a woman died in labor. A second interpretation implicates Cicero as midwife, aiding in the process of birthing the republic. Both of these interpretations invoke the private sphere and women's role in it, thus using female practices to implicate public male action, but they also work against the male Roman culture because they make men women—lesser beings. A *Third* interpretation supports the connections between *dignitas* and *auctoritas* as both public and private concepts. In the metaphor, Cicero, as senatorial *Orator*, embodies the male association of biological father and of *paterfamilias*. A newborn was not acknowledged socially until the father chose "to raise the child from the earth where the midwife had placed it" (Veyne 9). Thus the power and continuation of family name lies in the father's recognition of the child, not in the mother's delivery. As biological father, Cicero claims the rebirth of the republic. The *paterfamilias* or the oldest male had sole control over the *domus*, including properties, monies, and businesses. Until the death of the *paterfamilias*, a younger male could not be in command of any of the estate; male and female children were completely under the authority of their father, no matter what the age.⁹

As *paterfamilias*, Cicero claims political and social responsibility for the republic's rebirth. By assigning himself the male position in the social procreative processes of the private sphere, Cicero underscores his *dignitas* and *auctoritas* in his willingness for self-sacrifice for the good of the state.

Like his attacks on Antony, Cicero fuses the private with the public. The *Second Philippic* characterizes Cicero as the older, disciplined and dignified senator, thus the *paterfamilias* of Rome, rejecting and disinheriting the younger out-of-control son, Antony, to reestablish the *dignitas* and *auctoritas* of the *domus*. Establishing himself as a wise and noble senator working against the base and vile Antony, Cicero models for the senators the appropriate position and action and, by extension, implicates his noble character as the *paterfamilias* recognizing his responsibilities. In his discussion of Cicero's defense in Pro Plancio, Christopher P. Craig argues that Cicero presents the jurors with "both example and praise of the attitude which those under an obligation should assume" ("Cicero's Strategy" 81). Cicero's modeling of appropriate character is juxtaposed with his characterization of Antony. With this final reference to the dignity of the *domus*, he maintains that the glory of Rome lies in a controlled senate action to recognize and reinstate the republic. As the *paterfamilias* controlled the family and family estate in the private sector of commerce and property, so the patron, often a senator, spoke for the *clientes* in the civic realms of the law courts and senate. Without these authorities acting as both leaders and representatives, the private and public spheres could not operate productively. The mingling of public and private in the birth metaphor champions patriarchal authority in both spheres. In a curious reversal, this created myth through a female allusion becomes Cicero's reality; his self-characterization and beliefs become his actions. Wooten argues that underlying Cicero's rhetoric and aims of the *Philippics* was "the equation of his own survival with the survival of the republic" (161). In the *Second Philippic*, Cicero is the *paterfamilias* of the state and its only hope for social and political glory.

Even though across the centuries the *Second Philippic* has garnered another oppositional portrayal as both the best and the worst of Ciceronian *Oratory*, it offers a somewhat unique case in Cicero's corpus as it demonstrates the tensions of Roman culture between public and private spheres, male and female roles in politics, and oral and written rhetoric. These female references bring forward another set of tensions between the lived experience of Roman women and their representations. In "Fulvia Reconsidered," Diana Delia successfully argues that Cicero's exaggeration of Fulvia across the *Philippics*, combined with Octavian's propaganda toward her in the following years, have left an unrealistic and inaccurate portrayal of her character. She—and the four other women Cicero highlights in the *Second Philippic*—"did not escape those who defined her" (Glenn, "Sex" 193). The act of female representation, then, can help us recognize the rhetorical strategies employed to reinvent classical women.¹⁰ As classical studies continues toward a more complicated historical, anthropological, and archeological understanding of women during the first century BCE, those in the history of rhetoric must continue to examine Roman works by analyzing the use, excuse, and misuse of feminine references. While Glenn reminds feminist researchers in historical rhetoric that "the most powerful ramification is an awareness of women's place on the rhetorical terrain" ("Sex" 194), this article also argues for the meaning found through examining women's place in the rhetorical terrain.¹¹ For it is in that space between rhetorical strumpet and trumpet that a more complicated understanding of Roman women as both historical entities and rhetorical representations may emerge.

Notes

¹I thank *RR* peer reviewers George A. Kennedy and Richard Leo Enos for their careful reading and helpful comments.

²All quotes and citations from the *Philippics* are from Shackleton Bailey's 1986 translation.

³Although Cicero attended the senate across these years, he only occasionally spoke. Shackleton Bailey notes: "Back at the scene of his forensic triumphs, Cicero had found the courts 'a desert'; [. . .] and Cicero's voice was no more heard in the Forum than in the Senate-House" (Cicero 194).

⁴The actual circulation of the *Second Philippic* during late 44 and early 43 BCE is in question. Many scholars avoid the issue by simply referring to the fact that the speech was undelivered, while others divide over the pamphlet's circulation. For instance, Fuhrmann states that "Atticus no doubt advised his friend not to publish, for the *Second Philippic* was certainly not made public until after Cicero's death" (181), while Mitchell

balances Cicero's intent with political timing: "It was intended for publication, however, only in the event of a return to a free Republic" (303). On the other end of the spectrum, Frisch suggests that the pamphlet was circulated a month after it was originally sent to Atticus around 25 October and after Octavian revolted and Antony left Rome for Gaul in late November (143). Both Kennedy (270) and Wooten (155) concur with Frisch on the timing for the pamphlet's circulation. In his 1971 biography of Cicero, Shackleton Bailey states that "[i]t was never delivered, perhaps never published in the author's lifetime" (249), but acknowledges in his introduction to his 1986 translation of the *Second Philippic* that by the end of November "there would be no reason for further delay" in circulating the pamphlet (*Cicero: Philippics* 31), and, in a note of volume 4 in Cicero's *Letters to Atticus* published in 1999, he recognizes that the pamphlet was read not only by Atticus but also by Sextus in November 44 (367).

⁵For a detailed account of the political and social history of this time, see Brunt's *The Fall of the Roman Republic* and Scullard's *From the Gracchi to Nero*. For biographies on Cicero, see Mitchell's *Cicero, The Senior Statesman* and Shackleton Bailey's *Cicero*. For Cicero's role in the late republic and commentary on the *Philippics*, see Frisch's *Cicero's Fight for the Republic*, Fuhrmann's *Cicero and the Roman Republic*, and Wooten's *Cicero's Philippics and Their Demosthenic Model*.

⁶These categories and their relationships to the household are slippery, as a protected state could be considered a client and as the attorneys in law courts were the patrons of their clients. Identification was more a matter of social relationship rather than class (Veyne 103–15).

⁷For a political and rhetorical critique of the *Second Philippic*, see Kennedy's *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World*, 268–75.

⁸For an analysis of Cicero's use of *antikategoria* in the *Second Philippic* to prove Antony's inconsistency, see Craig's *Form as Argument in Cicero's Speeches: A Study of Dilemma*, 147–68.

⁹In *Daily Life in Ancient Rome*, Carcopino explains that over the next century the recognized authority of the mother's bloodline gradually usurped this system of "civil inheritance" (76–77).

¹⁰For another illustration of classical patriarchal essentialism through the use of female reference, see Halperin's "Why Is Diotima a Woman? Platonic *Eros* and the Figuration of Gender."

¹¹For arguments about researching the importance of women's influence "on the rhetorical terrain," see Glenn's *Rhetoric Retold: Regendering the Tradition from Antiquity Through the Renaissance* and Cape's "Roman Women in the History of Rhetoric and Oratory."

Works Cited

- Brunt, P. A. *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1988.
- Cape, Robert W., Jr. "Roman Women in the History of Rhetoric and Oratory." *Listening to Their Voices: The Rhetorical Activities of Historical Women*. Ed. Molly Meijer Wertheimer. Columbia: U of South Carolina P, 1997. 112–32.
- Carcopino, Jerome. *Daily Life in Ancient Rome: The People and the City at the Height of the Empire*. Trans. E. O. Lorimer. Ed. Henry T. Rowell. New Haven: Yale UP, 1940.
- Cracco Ruggini, Lellia. "Juridical Status and Historical Role of Women in Roman Patriarchal Society." *Klio* 71 (1989): 604–19.
- Craig, Christopher P. "Cicero's Strategy of Embarrassment in the Speech for Plancius." *American Journal of Philology* 111 (1990): 75–81.
- . *Form as Argument in Cicero's Speeches: A Study of Dilemma*. Atlanta: Scholars, 1993.
- Delia, Diana. "Fulvia Reconsidered." *Women's History and Ancient History*. Ed. Sarah B. Pomeroy. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1991. 197–217.
- Dixon, Suzanne. "A Family Business: Women's Role in Patronage and Politics at Rome 80–44 B.C." *Classica et Mediaevalia* 34 (1983): 91–112.
- Enos, Richard Leo. *The Literate Mode of Cicero's Legal Rhetoric*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1988.
- Frisch, Hartvig. *Cicero's Fight for the Republic: The Historical Background of Cicero's Philippics*. Trans. Niels Haislund. Copenhagen: Gyldendalske Boghandel, 1946.
- Fuhrmann, Manfred. *Cicero and the Roman Republic*. Trans. W. E. Yuill. Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.
- Glenn, Cheryl. *Rhetoric Retold: Regendering the Tradition from Antiquity Through the Renaissance*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1997.

- . “Sex, Lies, and Manuscript: Refiguring Aspasia in the History of Rhetoric.” *College Composition and Communication* 45 (1994): 180–99.
- Griffin, Jasper. *Latin Poets and Roman Life*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1986.
- Halperin, David M. “Why Is Diotima a Woman? Platonic *Eros* and the Figuration of Gender.” *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World*. Ed. David M. Halperin, John J. Winkler, and Froma I. Zeitlin. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1990. 257–308.
- Huzar, Eleanor G. “Mark Antony: Marriages Vs. Careers.” *Classical Journal* 81 (1986): 97–111.
- Kennedy, George A. *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World 300 B.C.–A.D. 300*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1972.
- May, James M. *Trials of Character: The Eloquence of Ciceronian Ethos*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1988.
- Mitchell, Thomas N. *Cicero: The Senior Statesman*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1991.
- Pomeroy, Sarah B. *Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity*. New York: Schocken, 1975.
- Scullard, H. H. *From the Gracchi to Nero: A History of Rome from 133 B.C. to A.D. 68*. London: Methuen, 1959.
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R. *Cicero*. New York: Scribner’s, 1971.
- , ed. and trans. *Cicero: Letters to Atticus*. Vol. 4. Loeb Classical Library 491. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1999. 4 vols.
- , ed. and trans. *Cicero: Philippics*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1986.
- Thomas, Yan. “The Division of the Sexes in Roman Law.” *A History of Women in the West: From Ancient Goddesses to Christian Saints*. Trans. Arthur Goldhammer. Ed. Pauline Schmitt Pantel. Cambridge: Belknap, 1992. 83–137.
- Veyne, Paul. “The Roman Empire.” *A History of Private Life: From Pagan Rome to Byzantium*. Trans. Arthur Goldhammer. Ed. Veyne. Cambridge: Belknap, 1987. 5–233.
- Wooten, Cecil W. *Cicero’s Philippics and Their Demosthenic Model: The Rhetoric of Crisis*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1983.