Performance and Rhetoric in Cicero's *Philippics* *

In recent years, the idea of 'performance' has become a more and more important concept for the analysis of literary texts, even if the notion of 'performance' in literary criticism still does not denote a single agreed theory, but is a collective term referring to a number of different aspects and methods. The performance approach seems obvious for some literary genres, like drama and also oratory, for which performance is an essential char-acteristic. In the case of orations, in antiquity already a detailed doctrine of the perfect performance was established, both in theory and practice. Building on this knowledge and trying to recover the quintessential context of a speech, people have successfully attempted to explore a Roman orator's potential and to contextualize Roman orations by reconstructing the delivery of sample speeches.[1]

However, there are further levels of performance to be looked at in a Roman speech if the term 'performance' is understood in a more specific way: there is not only the *actio* that determines the performance of a complete speech; the texts of transmitted speeches also exhibit passages where the wording shows that the orator bases his argument on the performance situation, particularly by making use of the active participation of the audience. Reactions from the audience are deliberately elicited by the orator, for instance by taking on certain roles; these techniques stem from his rhetorical training (for example, *ethopoiia*); however, considering and commenting on these reactions subsequently yield a performative dialogue with the audience, mirrored in the text. That opens up the opportunity to reconstruct a performance situation which goes beyond identifying how rhetorical techniques have been realized by the orator. And that is what this paper will focus on by analysing to what effect Cicero puts the possibilities given by such per-formance situations in his orations.

One might object that the preserved speeches typically are not those actually delivered, but versions reworked for publication (irrespective of the precise extent of this revision).[2] Nevertheless, it is safe to assume that the

[1] Cf. J. Hall, 'Performing Cicero in the Classroom', *CJ* 95 (1999) 163-72; J. Hall / R. Bond, 'Performative Elements in Cicero's Orations: An Experimental Approach', *Prudentia* 34.2 (2002) 187-228; S.M. Goldberg, http://cicero.humnet.ucla.edu.

[2] On this issue cf. e.g. the opposing views of J. Humbert, *Les plaidoyers écrits et les plaidoiries réelles de Cicéron* (Paris 1925; repr. Hildesheim / New York 1972) and W. Stroh, *Taxis und Taktik. Die advokatische Dispositionskunst in Ciceros Gerichtsreden* (Stuttgart

51

methods found in the published speeches reflect common practice with Roman orators for the actual delivery of speeches. For in order to draw up a convincing text in the course of revision, an author has to keep in mind that he is supposed to produce a written transcript of an orally delivered speech and can only use means of performance possible in that context so that the written speech might be delivered.[3]

Consequently, looking at the transmitted texts of the orations may show what aspects of performance can be highlighted in the actual delivery of a speech, how performative features are exploited to further the argument and how signs of performance may be employed in a written version for a reading public as well. Of course, no authentic transcript of a complete performance or a reliable record of the audience's opinion and conduct exist; there are only the orator's strategies and comments on the audience's reactions in the preserved speeches. All those mentioned in the orations are possible reactions of an audience (in this period); whether they actually occurred as described cannot be proved, and the report need not always be exactly true. At any rate, they point to the techniques used and reactions aimed at by the orator.

In view of the available evidence, it seems a good idea to look at all these questions by taking several speeches belonging to the same thematic context as sample texts. For when orations are connected by a common subject matter, similarities and differences between various performative acts may be interpreted against this background. If they have been published as a group, one may also ask whether the orator's attempts at interaction with the audience are paralleled by efforts to influence the readers in compiling a corpus.

That is why this study will analyse Cicero's *Philippics*, the largest co-herent group of Ciceronian political speeches extant. Besides, this corpus includes different kinds of speeches, and it contains a particularly great number of performative aspects owing to the difficult political situation. The corpus of the *Philippics* as transmitted consists of fourteen speeches Cicero composed between September 44 and April 43 BCE during the struggle

---

1975); cf. most recently A.M. Riggsby, *Crime and Community in Ciceronian Rome* (Austin [Texas] 1999) 178-84; R. Morstein-Marx, *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic* (Cambridge 2004) 25-30.

[3] The written texts are designed to be effective pieces as well, although Cicero himself is aware of the fact that written speeches do not convey the same spirit as the actual delivery (cf. *Orat.* 130: 'quae qualiacumque in me sunt – me [enim] ipsum paenitet quanta sint –, sed apparent in orationibus, etsi carent libri spiritu illo, propter quem maiora eadem illa cum aguntur quam cum leguntur videri solent.'; *Brut.* 93-4: 'quem [sc. Galbam] fortasse vis non ingeni solum sed etiam animi et naturalis quidam dolor dicentem incendebat efficiebatque ut et incitata et gravis et vehemens esset oratio; dein cum otiosus stilum prenderat motusque omnis animi tamquam ventus hominem defecerat, flaccescebat oratio. quod eis qui limatius dicendi consectantur genus accidere non solet, propterea quod prudentia numquam deficit oratorem, qua ille utens eodem modo possit et dicere et scribere; ardor animi non semper adest, isque cum consedit, omnis illa vis et quasi flamma oratoris exstinguitur. hanc igitur ob causam videtur Laeli mens spirare etiam in scriptis, Galbae autem vis occidisse.'; cf. also Quint. *Inst.* 12.10.50; Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 22).

against Mark Antony; the title was coined by Cicero himself.[4] Out of these fourteen speeches eleven were delivered before the senate, two (*Philippics Four* and *Six*) before the people and one (*Philippic Two*) purports to be a speech before the senate, but circulated as a pamphlet only and never was actually delivered (cf. *Att.* 15.13.1; 15.13.7; 16.11.1-2).

A few discussions of isolated passages apart, the relevant material from the *Philippics* seems to have never been collected under the guiding principle of 'performance', particularly with regard to its relevance to the argument of the orations.[5] Looking at the whole corpus from this perspective is a worthwhile attempt since this point of view may help to group a number of scattered phenomena together. Because of the coherence of these speeches and the great frequency of performative features, the *Philippics* are a good test case for the validity of this concept of performance. This case study may

[4]   All references to and quotations from Cicero's *Philippics* are based on P. Fedeli's edition (*M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia. Fasc. 28. In M. Antonium orationes Philippicae XIV* [Leipzig ¹1982, ²1986]); translations are taken from D.R. Shackleton Bailey's bilingual edition (*Cicero. Philippics. Ed. and transl.* [Chapel Hill / London 1986]), slightly adapted by the present author in cases. For a general introduction to the *Philippics* cf. J. Hall's overview ('The *Philippics*', in J.M. May [ed.], *Brill's Companion to Cicero. Oratory and Rhetoric* [Leiden / Boston / Cologne 2002] 273-304).

[5]   The importance of taking all aspects of an oration's delivery into account in order to appreciate its effect on the audience was generally recognised by V. Pöschl ('Zur Einbeziehung anwesender Personen und sichtbarer Objekte in Ciceros Reden', in A. Michel / R. Verdière [edd.], *Ciceroniana. Hommages à Kazimierz Kumaniecki* [Leiden 1975: Roma aeterna IX] 206-26; reprint in V. Pöschl, *Literatur und geschichtliche Wirklichkeit. Kleine Schriften II*, ed. by W.-L. Liebermann [Heidelberg 1983: Bibl. d. klass. Alt., N.F., 2. R., Bd. 74] 17-37), but not systematically investigated. Pöschl (225-6 = 36-7) thinks that the importance of an overall performance is specifically Roman. Besides, scholars have only recently begun to be interested in performative aspects of Roman orations and have looked at a few speeches and different aspects so far, asking, for instance, what roles the orator assigns to himself, his clients and his opponents, how he governs audience reactions or how he adapts the argument to a given performance situation (cf. e.g. A. Vasaly, 'The Masks of Rhetoric: Cicero's *Pro Roscio Amerino*', *Rhetorica* 3 [1985] 1-20; H. Gotoff, 'Oratory: The Art of Illusion', *HSPh* 95 [1993] 289-313; Chr.J. Burnand, *Roman Representations of the Orator during the Last Century of the Republic* [Diss. Oxford 2000]; Morstein-Marx [n. 2], esp. 136-43). Burnand's study is the only more extended discussion of the *Philippics* since he analyses a number of late-republican speeches, among them the *Philippics* (146-97), with respect to how the orator presents himself. Burnand acknowledges that the delivery of a speech is a two-sided performance, but he rather uses this idea to develop more general conclusions about oratory and does not look at the speeches in greater detail. R.L. Enos (*The Literate Mode of Cicero's Legal Rhetoric* [Carbondale / Edwardsville 1988]) looks at Cicero's court speeches and the relationship between the actually delivered version and the published form aimed at a larger and more distanced audience. He distinguishes between 'the oral arguments as *rhetoric* and the post-trial literary compositions as *rhetorical* inter-pretations' (92) and argues that the published speeches have been reworked in a literate mode. His focus is on the difference between rhetorical theory and practice and on the possibility to spread views on social and political issues by the published literary compositions. For some ideas about oral performances in ancient Greek political rhetoric cf. I. Worthington, 'Oral Performance in the Athenian Assembly and the Demosthenic *Prooemia*', in C.J. Mackie (ed.), *Oral Performance and its Context (Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece, Vol. 5)* (Leiden / Boston 2004: Mnemosyne Suppl. 248) 129-43 (with further references).

therefore point to general techniques used by Roman orators; however, similar features in other Ciceronian speeches and their relationship to the *Philippics* cannot be discussed here.

Analysing the notion of 'performance' (understood as just outlined) in the corpus of the *Philippics*, this paper will proceed by looking at various performative structures, starting from the smallest unit and gradually moving to more large-scale observations.[6] Thereby 'performance' in these speeches can be shown to consist of a number of different aspects and to involve both speaker and audience: for instance, the orator tries to create a favourable portrait of himself, orientated to the expectations of the audience, he has the audience participate actively in the performance, or he comments on actual or expected audience reactions as part of his argument. And the corpus as a whole may plausibly be regarded as an ongoing performance before the reader. In all these cases, the performance situation is skilfully exploited to make the orator's point and to influence the audience; in view of the political situation this technique might be considered more promising by the orator than an attempt at convincing the audience of the preferred way of action by a detailed argument.[7]

* * *

If one regards a speech as a personal performance of the orator who delivers it, one might consider the extent to which and the way in which his personality plays a part in influencing the audience. The orator's personality and its functions especially come to the fore when he talks about himself. In the *Philippics*, the first of several passages which have Cicero talk about himself before the senators is right at the beginning of the *First Philippic*; at his first attendance at a senate meeting after some time and in response to Antony's charges against him in a senate speech the day before, Cicero feels obliged to explain his reasons for having left Rome during the summer, for his return at precisely that point of time and for his absence from the senate

---

[6]   In the course of the *Philippics*, the orator also carries out various performative acts (on speech-act theory cf. e.g. M.H. Abrams, *A Glossary of Literary Terms.* Seventh Edition [Fort Worth et al. 1999] 291-4). For instance, *Philippic Nine* is a kind of funeral oration or a state funeral among his fellow senators for Servius Sulpicius Rufus, the envoy who died during the embassy to Antony; and in *Philippic Fourteen* those soldiers of the *legio Martia* who died in the battle at Mutina are honoured similarly (*Phil.* 14.29-35). *Philippic Twelve* is Cicero's refusal to participate in a second embassy. A large part of *Philippic Thirteen* is a (subjective and suggestive) commentary on a letter by Antony (*Phil.* 13.22-48). Most of the senate speeches end with a definite motion; they thus equal a proposal for a senatorial decree. These elements, however, are not particularly specific to Cicero's aim in these cases, but illustrate what functions senate speeches may fulfil or to what uses they can be put.

[7]   In this study, the expression 'audience' is used as a general and collective term denoting all people present at Cicero's respective speeches. Historical details, e.g. that the audience is a body of interest groups, of which Cicero is certainly aware, cannot be discussed here. Anyway, regarding the audience as one entity is in line with Cicero's explicit technique in the *Philippics* since he typically addresses himself either to individuals or to the audience as a whole.

meeting the day before (*Phil.* 1.1-15). He opens the speech as follows (*Phil.* 1.1):

> ante quam de republica, patres conscripti, dicam ea quae dicenda hoc tempore arbitror, exponam vobis breviter consilium et profectionis et reversionis meae. ego cum sperarem aliquando ad vestrum consilium auctoritatemque rem publicam esse revocatam, manendum mihi statuebam quasi in vigilia quadam consulari ac senatoria. nec vero usquam discedebam nec a re publica deiciebam oculos ex eo die quo in aedem Telluris convocati sumus.

> Members of the Senate, before I say what I think it right to say at this time on public affairs, let me briefly explain to you my reasons for leaving Rome and for returning. Hoping as I did that the Commonwealth had at last been restored to your guidance and authority, I took the view that as a consular and a senator I ought to stay on guard, so to speak. In fact, from the day we were summoned to the temple of Tellus I never left Rome or took my eyes off the political scene.

Cicero excuses the lengthy passage about himself by the circumstances, namely that the present situation and the possible irritation of the audience at his conduct force him to talk about this topic first before dealing with the main issue of the debate (*Phil.* 1.1; 1.7). In fact, this defence is caused by Antony's activities and the need for Cicero to react to them, but Cicero makes good use of the circumstances and turns them to his own advantage as they allow him to review his own conduct and the events in the recent past from his point of view and convey this interpretation to the audience. At the same time, this introduction is a self-stylization, by which Cicero demonstrates his political competence to the senators and also pays compliments to the senate.

Throughout this section Cicero uses typical formulae of modesty (e.g. *Phil.* 1.1; 1.10); the fact that he considers his presence in Rome and his beneficial actions to the state important becomes evident all the same. By referring his actions to what was going on in Rome and in the senate, he includes the audience in his exposition and suggests that he and the other senators share a common opinion about the state and are all eager to work for the welfare of the republic. Hence, by the performative dialogue Cicero makes his recapitulation appear not as an intrusive passage, but as a natural element; thereby the real purpose (to make a political statement) can be kept veiled and thus served even better. In other words, the role Cicero takes on in this introduction, organized as a performance, is designed to contribute to a wider-ranging political purpose.

Another telling passage is found in the *Seventh Philippic*, where Cicero explains that he, who has always been a supporter of peace, is now in favour of immediate war in the case of Antony (*Phil.* 7.7-8):

> itaque ego ille qui semper pacis auctor fui, cuique pax, praesertim civilis, quamquam omnibus bonis, tamen in primis fuit optabilis—

omne enim curriculum industriae nostrae in foro, in curia, in amicorum periculis propulsandis elaboratum est; hinc honores amplissimos, hinc mediocris opes, hinc dignitatem si quam habemus consecuti sumus—ego igitur pacis, ut ita dicam, alumnus qui quantuscumque sum—nihil enim mihi adrogo—sine pace civili certe non fuissem—periculose dico: quem ad modum accepturi, patres conscripti, sitis, horreo, sed pro mea perpetua cupiditate vestrae dignitatis retinendae et augendae quaeso oroque vos, patres conscripti, ut primo, etsi erit vel acerbum auditu vel incredibile a M. Cicerone esse dictum, accipiatis sine offensione quod dixero neve id prius quam quale sit explicaro repudietis—ego ille, dicam saepius, pacis semper laudator, semper auctor, pacem cum M. Antonio esse nolo. magna spe ingredior in reliquam orationem, patres conscripti, quoniam periculosissimum locum silentio sum praetervectus.

I have always been an advocate of peace. All good men desire peace, especially peace between fellow countrymen, but I have desired it more than most. My round of activity has always been worked out in the Forum, in the Senate-house, in protecting friends in danger. That is how I have won the highest honors, moderate wealth, and any prestige I may enjoy. Well, then: I, who might call peace my foster mother, who, whatever I am (I make no claims for myself), certainly should not have been what I am without peace in the community— these are dangerous words, Members of the Senate, and I tremble to think how you are going to receive them; but I beg and beseech you, Members of the Senate, bearing in mind my unflagging zeal for the maintenance and enhancement of your prestige, first of all to receive what I am about to say without offence and not to repudiate it until I have explained its meaning, even though the words grate upon your ears and you can scarcely believe they are Marcus Cicero's—I, the life-long encomiast and advocate of peace, I say it again, am against peace with Marcus Antonius. Members of the Senate, I enter upon the rest of my speech in good hope, now that I have passed the danger point without a sound of protest.

In a long-winded, complicated and disrupted sentence Cicero first sets out his general love for peace and reserves the striking remark 'pacem cum M. Antonio esse nolo' up to the end. One can well imagine how an orator would carefully launch into such a sentence, come to a halt several times and finally reach the climax. This sentence structure makes it clear that Cicero is about to voice an important point and that he takes great care over it, in order not to cause offence or unwelcome reactions. He obviously wants to make his position clear at this stage; in view of possible reactions he chooses a way by which he can prepare the audience, spell out their possible thoughts and comment on them in advance. The large number of addresses in this passage asks the audience to participate in Cicero's train of thought and to face the persona Cicero presents of himself. This effect is supported by Cicero's

alignment with the audience, when he calls himself by his own name (the only instance in the *Philippics* apart from a few quotations of remarks by others about him) as if he was looking at himself from the outside. Since Cicero takes the senators' silence as approval and explicitly voices this interpretation—though modestly phrased, the dialogue with the senators comes to a close just as he wishes.

Such a long-winded sentence, which seems to reflect the orator's thoughts and to be formed while being pronounced, need not have been preserved in the written version; as it is, it conveys the idea of a faithful transcript of the actual speech and at the same time all the feelings which are supposed to have produced such a sentence without naming them explicitly. This passage is essential to the argument since Cicero assigns himself a role different from that he had taken on so far and feels obliged to explain that change. At the same time, by giving an explanation and thereby showing that his behaviour is not contradictory, rather governed by a conscious change, he draws attention to the present extraordinary situation and the specific measures it requires. Thus Cicero can keep up the impression that he is working for the welfare of his fellow citizens as ever and that his activities are in agreement with the policy of the senate as the 'approval' of the senators shows (see below).

The *Fourteenth Philippic* too contains an extended passage in which Cicero discusses his own conduct before the senators and refutes rumours about his political plans (*Phil.* 14.12-17). In structure, namely that Cicero talks about himself, this passage is not different from those already mentioned; it is however somewhat different since Cicero's remarks are mainly designed to justify himself and to clarify his position in the senate and do not fulfil an immediate function in the fight against Antony. That is probably the reason why in this case Cicero assumes that the audience might reproach him for talking about himself and explains this procedure:

> [13] tu igitur ipse de te? dixerit quispiam. equidem invitus, sed iniuriae dolor facit me praeter consuetudinem gloriosum. nonne satis est ab hominibus virtutis ignaris gratiam bene merentibus non referri? etiam in eos, qui omnis suas curas in rei publicae salute defigunt, impetus, crimen, invidia quaeretur? . . . [15] . . . ; ex quo caedes esset vestrum omnium consecuta. quae res patefecit, patres conscripti, sed suo tempore totius huius sceleris fons aperietur . . . [17] haec interposui, patres conscripti, non tam ut pro me dixerim— male enim mecum ageretur, si parum vobis essem sine defensione purgatus—quam ut quosdam nimis ieiuno animo et angusto monerem, id quod semper ipse fecissem, uti excellentium civium virtutem imitatione dignam, non invidia putarent. magnus est in re publica campus, ut sapienter dicere Crassus solebat, multis apertus cursus ad laudem. utinam quidem illi principes viverent qui me post meum consulatum, cum eis ipse cederem, principem non inviti videbant!

[13] Self-applause? someone might object. It is against my will, to be sure, but a sense of injury makes me vainglorious, contrary to my habit. Is it not enough that persons ignorant of the meaning of true worth make no return to the deserving? Must those who devote all their care to the preservation of the Commonwealth be targets for backbiting and envy? . . . [15] . . . A massacre of the whole Senate would have been the next stage. These plans, Members of the Senate, were not revealed in operation, but when the time is ripe the source of all this villainy will be disclosed. . . . [17] I have put in these remarks, Members of the Senate, not so much in self-justification (I should be in a bad way if I needed any defence to clear myself with you) as by way of warning certain mean and petty-minded persons that they should regard the merit of outstanding citizens as deserving imitation, not envy, as I have always done. Public life is a broad field, in Marcus Crassus' wise words, and the path to glory is open to many. I only wish those leaders of the community were still alive who after my consulship saw me in a position of leadership not unwillingly, though I myself gave them prior place.

The objection of the fictitious *quispiam* is taken as a starting-point to encourage the senators to support Cicero further. Since Cicero refutes such criticism and claims that the need to justify himself makes him vainglorious contrary to his habit, he can present the situation from his point of view. The argument climactically leads up to the revelation that Cicero was to be murdered by conspirators, which would have led to the assassination of all senators. This arrangement renders it impossible that senators who do not agree with Cicero's policy distance themselves from him. On the contrary, by referring to the support of the people, Cicero puts even more psychological pressure on the senators. And before members of the audience might suspect that there is some need for Cicero to justify himself, he terms his remarks superfluous and designed to set up a political and moral example.

On the whole, Cicero exploits these problematic rumours to his advantage, since by referring to a potential danger he can align himself with the senators and equally present himself as a person who is morally and intellectually superior. Thus towards the end of the fight against Antony (at least as it seems at that point), on top of his role as a constant fighter for the welfare of the republic, Cicero offers the senators a community of interest (under his leadership), which is based on external threats and the expectations of the people.

Such strategies of presentation can be shown to be a general feature of the *Philippics*: several times Cicero claims that by the *Third Philippic* he has laid the groundwork for all further action against Antony and for reestablishing the republic (cf. *Phil.* 3.28; 4.1-2; 5.30; 6.2; 14.20; *Fam.* 10.28.2; 12.25.2). Although he certainly enjoys his glory, that claim is not only a personal statement, but predominantly a remark pursuing a political purpose, designed to suggest to the audience that foundations have been laid and that the only

possible way of proceeding now is to continue the policy then chosen. In addition to enhancing his personal glory Cicero thus takes on a specific role to further his cause; by pointing to previous successes he can induce the audience more easily to follow him again; he tries to move them by the impact of his persona rather than by a convincing argument.

Obviously, all roles Cicero takes on in the course of the performance are not directly related to or caused by the constraints of the delivery, but deliberately chosen to serve Cicero's ultimate political goal, namely to declare Antony a public enemy and reestablish the republic. That Cicero indeed plays a constructed role for the purposes of a convincing argument conducive to his cause is evident at the beginning of the *Third Philippic* (*Phil.* 3.1-2): in this passage Cicero says that finally the senate has been convened and swiftness is now imperative:

> serius omnino, patres conscripti, quam tempus rei publicae postulabat, aliquando tamen convocati sumus; quod flagitabam equidem cotidie, quippe cum bellum nefarium contra aras et focos, contra vitam fortunasque nostras ab homine profligato ac perdito non comparari, sed geri iam viderem. exspectantur Kalendae Ianuariae, quas non exspectat Antonius qui in provinciam D. Bruti, summi et singularis viri, cum exercitu impetum facere conatur; ex qua se instructum et paratum ad urbem venturum esse minitatur. quae est igitur exspectatio aut quae vel minimi dilatio temporis? ... mea autem festinatio non victoriae solum avida est sed etiam celeritatis.

> Members of the Senate, we have been called together later than the crisis of the Commonwealth demanded; but we meet at last. I have been pressing every day for a meeting, as I see a wicked war not in preparation but in actual conduct by a profligate and desperate man against our altars and hearths, against our lives and property. We are waiting for the Kalends of January, but Antonius does not wait for them. He is attempting to invade the province of our noble and distinguished fellow countryman Decimus Brutus with an army, and from that province he threatens, when equipped and ready, to march on Rome. Why then the waiting, why a moment's delay? . . . But I am in a hurry. I am eager, not merely for victory, but for quick victory.

The opening sentence immediately creates a feeling of disadvantage common to both orator and audience and also highlights Cicero's superior knowledge and leading role, since he had been calling for a senate meeting all the time. According to Cicero's letters, however, he was absent from Rome until 9 December 44 BCE and did not intend to attend a senate meeting before 1 January 43 BCE (cf. *Fam.* 11.5.1; 11.6a). He only decided to do so on the very day of the *Third Philippic* because of the political circumstances on that day. Of course, writing a letter is a kind of performance too, but, as it is a private and not a public one, information given in the letters deserves more credit when it concerns factual details. And, more importantly, the version

given in the speech contributes to Cicero's role and purpose in this context, namely to bring home the pressing urgency of the situation as he sees it since that view is thus corroborated by his persona.

In Cicero's view, the simple fact of the presence of a large audience is essential for the full effect of a speech (cf. e.g. *De or.* 2.338; *Deiot.* 5-7); and he acknowledges the importance of the orator's conforming to the audience's expectations, of working on their emotions and of winning their favour (cf. e.g. *De or.* 2.178). Therefore the audience is not to be regarded as a passive group receiving the orator's talk, rather as a more specific and more active entity. For the *Philippics* it can be shown how Cicero not only plays a role himself, but also makes use of alleged audience responses in the published versions of the speeches to drive home his point to potential readers; he probably used the basic structures in the actual speeches already.

For instance, when Cicero has voiced his position that he opposes peace with Antony in the quoted passage from the *Seventh Philippic*, he goes on to say that he can now continue his speech more reassuredly as he has managed to pass over this dangerous point without provoking any disapproving exclamations from the senators (*Phil.* 7.7-8). That comment on the reaction of the audience (which probably has some truth in it) demonstrates how Cicero includes an alleged audience reaction in the performance in order to stress that his point of view is accepted by the senators; that agreement is an essential step in the subsequent argument and an important element to the impact of the speech on both the actual audience in the senate and a more distanced reading public.

Generally, the feature that Cicero talks about reactions or behaviour of the audience as a whole and integrates them into his argument is more prominent in the *contio* speeches. Cicero's line of argument slightly varies too; that is caused by the different audiences he addresses (cf. *De or.* 3.211; *Orat.* 71; 123) and also by the different purposes of the speeches given before either body: in the senate, Cicero has to persuade his fellow senators of his point of view, to induce them to agree to his motion and therefore to present a proposal for a decree and a number of detailed and convincingly demonstrated facts. The people are then informed of the senatorial decrees, but cannot decide anything in this process; thus the orator tries to make them approve of the senate's decision or rather of his interpretation of it in order to gain support for his policy and to back his strategy thereby. Accordingly, in the *contio* speeches Cicero presents fewer facts; instead, he conveys a specific view of the situation and the senatorial decisions by way of emotionally appealing arguments, pointed statements and personal contact with the audience; in a speech to the people it is important to elicit audience reactions by leading questions or provocative remarks and thus establish an opinion shared between orator and audience.[8]

---

[8] For a comparison between speeches before the senate and before the people cf. e.g. D. Mack, *Senatsreden und Volksreden bei Cicero* (Würzburg 1937: Kieler Arbeiten zur klassischen

In both *contio* speeches, *Philippics Four* and *Six*, Cicero repeatedly refers to the audience's reactions to his remarks. A number of scholars right up to the present have taken these statements as true indicators of what the people really thought and of how Cicero's speeches were received.[9] In the *Fourth Philippic* particularly, Cicero has the audience emphatically agree to his denunciation of Antony as a public enemy several times. And thus scholars have thought that the people are more ready to accept this view that Cicero wants to spread than the senate. There is, however, no external evidence of how the people reacted to this speech, and these remarks may have been highlighted and adapted to serve the orator's argument in the published version. Nevertheless, one probably has to assume that what the published version says is not completely contrary to truth as contemporaries might have been able to check it; and the audience reactions are integral parts of Cicero's argument.

Further, the *contio* speeches not only show a higher degree of involvement of the audience, they also convey the impression of interaction between orator and audience. Cicero sometimes even seems to enter into a kind of dialogue with them, which establishes their shared opinion of Antony (cf. e.g. *Phil.* 6.12; cf. generally *Orat.* 138).[10] Besides, Cicero claims that the audience's reaction spurs him on, that is, that his policy is in some way dependent on the audience, and he also thanks the people for the *beneficia* conferred on him, that is for having him elected to political offices, and says that he therefore feels the duty to work for them as much as he can (cf. e.g. *Phil.* 4.1-2; 4.16; 6.18). At the time of the actual delivery such remarks could be designed to prevent the people from thinking that their opinion and actions are of no relevance and intended to have the people feel that they are appreciated as an important part of the Roman constitution and their decisions have actual repercussions on the policy of the state. However, it is the other senators and also equestrians who in addition to the people addressed will read the published versions of the speeches. In view of such an audience Cicero's alignment with the people shows that he acts out of support from and concern for the Roman people.

In this context, scholars have remarked that the only colloquial word found in *Philippic Six* did not come from Cicero himself, but from the people and was only taken up by him (*Phil.* 6.12):[11]

Philologie 2); J. Fogel, *Cicero and the "Ancestral Constitution": A Study of Cicero's* Contio *Speeches* (Diss. Columbia University, New York 1994).

9   Cf. e.g. Mack (n. 8), 50-1; 78-9; Shackleton Bailey (n. 4), 135; contrast Fogel (n. 8), 241 with n. 2.

10 M. Korenjak (*Publikum und Redner. Ihre Interaktion in der sophistischen Rhetorik der Kaiserzeit* [Munich 2000: Zetemata 104]) discusses the relationship between orator and audience with respect to the different circumstances of a later period; in this context he attributes an active and important role to the audience, also recognized in texts from this epoch.

11 Cf. e.g. L. Laurand, *Études sur le style des discours de Cicéron. Avec une esquisse de l'histoire du "cursus"*, 3 tom. (Paris [4] 1936-8; repr. Amsterdam 1965) 340; M. von Albrecht, 'M.

sed redeo ad amores deliciasque vestras, L. Antonium, qui vos omnis
in fidem suam recepit. negatis? num quisnam est vestrum qui tribum
non habeat? certe nemo. atqui illum quinque et triginta tribus
patronum adoptarunt. rursus reclamatis? aspicite illam a sinistra
equestrem statuam inauratam, in qua quid inscriptum est? 'quinque et
triginta tribus patrono.' populi Romani igitur est patronus L.
Antonius. malam quidem illi pestem! clamori enim vestro adsentior.

But I return to your favorite, your darling Lucius Antonius, who has
taken you all under his wing. Oh, you say not? Is there any of you
who doesn't have a tribe? Certainly not. Well, the thirty-five tribes
chose him as their patron. More protest? Look at that gilt equestrian
statue to the left. What does the inscription say? "The thirty-five
tribes to their patron." So: Lucius Antonius is patron of the Roman
People. To the devil with him! – I agree with your shouts.

Cicero certainly has it appear as if the insult 'malam quidem illi pestem!',
referring to Mark Antony's brother Lucius Antonius, was an expression taken
up from the people. This qualification of Lucius nicely fits Cicero's argument
at that point, and introducing the word as coming from the people enables
him to use it. It is in no way certain whether the people really voiced such an
exclamation; the passage is rather an instance of audience involvement
employed to make the use of a colloquial word less objectionable. Thus the
occurrence of a colloquial word is not so much a feature of Cicero's style, but
rather of his method and political target.[12]

Cicero is even so ingenious as to use different kinds of involvement of the
people. He either has them agree to what he has just said and expresses his
joy over the fact that their assessments coincide (cf. e.g. *Phil.* 4.1-2; 4.2-3), or
he has them voice something to which he immediately agrees (cf. e.g. *Phil.*
6.12). Thereby Cicero allocates to the audience an active role in the
performance and increases the persuasiveness of his case. The possibilities of
various and persuasive ways of bringing across one's point offered by a per-
formance situation suggest one reason why a performance situation is kept
even in a published text.

That brings the *Second Philippic* into play, as this 'speech' had never
been actually delivered (like the *actio secunda* against Verres[13]). That the
Second Philippic is cast in the form of a speech is primarily caused by the

Tullius Cicero, Sprache und Stil', *RE* Suppl. XIII (1973) 1237-1347, esp. 1252; *Cicero's
Style. A synopsis. Followed by selected analytic studies* (Leiden / Boston 2003: Mnemosyne
Suppl. 245) 26. Cicero comes back to a similar expression in *Philippic Thirteen* without that
having been provoked (cf. *Phil.* 13.48: 'quin tu abis in malam pestem malumque
cruciatum?'). Generally, most speeches exhibit some passages in colloquial phrasing,
especially when a dialogue with an individual member of the audience is being envisaged (cf.
e.g. *Phil.* 8.12: 'sed quaeso, Calene, quid tu?').

[12]   On that passage cf. also Pöschl (n. 5), 223-4 = 34-5.

[13]   On composition and circulation of the *Verrines* cf. Th.D. Frazel, 'The composition and
circulation of Cicero's *In Verrem*', *CQ* 54 (2004) 128-42.

fact that Antony's accusations of Cicero were made in a senate speech on 19 September 44 BCE and the *Second Philippic* purports to be Ciceros's reply to Antony's speech, delivered in the senate immediately afterwards; besides, speeches are the common tool for a political argument at Rome anyway. There may, however, be further reasons due to literary and political considerations as such a layout makes the harangue more effective. It is in line with the methods apparent in other speeches that a political performance is regarded as the most effective and direct means of bringing across one's views; hence Cicero imitates such a performance even if the statement of his political opinion is a written text right from the beginning.

One might think that such a text was labelled 'speech', but exhibited no signs of performance at all as they are not required. However, just the opposite is the case: this speech contains perhaps even more elements of performance than other senate speeches in the corpus. This feature is sometimes considered strange in a speech never actually delivered or thought to have been included only for the sake of verisimilitude.[14] Other scholars have taken indications of performance as signs of orality in a written text.[15] The term 'orality' certainly points the right way, but it does not cover all aspects of what is at issue. For that term does not include the audience's involvement and conveys the impression that such comments actually occurred or have to occur, whereas they are rather designed for a specific purpose both in delivered and in written speeches. That characteristic is more accurately described by the notion of 'performance', which takes account of both these points. Anyway, in the case of the *Second Philippic* one can be sure for once that all indications of performance are fictitious and are meant to contribute to the orator's aim; that might give a clue to their function in published speeches in general.

In *Philippic Two*, as well as in other *Philippics*, Cicero mentions a number of recent incidents and of examples from Roman history. In all these cases he rarely gives a sequential narration, but more often highlights several impressive features, mainly having recourse to details. That results in a vivid and more attractive way of telling, which is more adapted to moving an audience than a factual report. The opportunity for such a way of presentation might be another reason why the *Second Philippic*'s invective is cast in the form of a speech since that literary form allows a more graphic and sensational description of Antony's misdeeds, at which both the orator and the audience can look with disdain.

[14] Cf., e.g., J.D. Denniston, *M. Tulli Ciceronis in M. Antonium orationes Philippicae prima et secunda. Edited, with Introduction, Notes (mainly historical) and Appendices* (Oxford 1926) xvii.

[15] Cf. esp. M. Fuhrmann, 'Mündlichkeit und fiktive Mündlichkeit in den von Cicero veröffentlichten Reden', in G. Vogt-Spira (ed.), *Strukturen der Mündlichkeit in der römischen Literatur* (Tübingen 1990: ScriptOralia 19, Reihe A: Altertumswiss. Reihe, Bd. 4) 53-62.

Besides, in the *Second Philippic*, in addition to the usual addresses to the senators, Cicero refers to Antony's reactions to what he says. When Cicero is about to reveal the most horrible and embarrassing incident from Antony's career (according to Cicero), his behaviour at the Lupercalia of 44 BCE (*Phil.* 2.84-7), he describes what Antony is doing at this prospect (*Phil.* 2.84):

> sed ne forte ex multis rebus gestis M. Antoni rem unam pulcherrimam transiliat oratio, ad Lupercalia veniamus. non dissimulat, patres conscripti: apparet esse commotum; sudat, pallet. quidlibet, modo ne [nausiet] faciat quod in porticu Minucia fecit. quae potest esse turpitudinis tantae defensio? cupio audire, ut videam ubi rhetoris sit tanta merces [id est ubi campus Leontinus appareat].

> My review must not pass over the most brilliant of all Marcus Antonius' exploits. Let us come to the Feast of Lupercal. He doesn't disguise it, Members of the Senate, his agitation is evident, he sweats, turns pale. Anything, as long as he doesn't do what he did in the Gallery of Minucius! What possible excuse can there be for such outrageous conduct? I am anxious to hear it, so that I see where the huge reward of the rhetorician is.

Cicero claims that Antony is turning pale, nervous and agitated when he is about to discuss the Lupercalia. That such a remark is possible and probable at all, is due to the fact that *Philippic Two* is the only *Philippic* given while Antony is supposed to be present, since he does not attend the senate meeting during which Cicero gives the *First Philippic*, and all other speeches are delivered after Antony left Rome. More importantly, these remarks about Antony's envisaged behaviour serve the obvious purpose to give Cicero's accusations greater force when even Antony himself is moved by the revelations; at the same time Cicero aligns himself with the audience against Antony (cf. also *Phil.* 8.18).

Constant changes between addresses to Antony in the second person and talking about him in the third person, combined with addresses to the senators, and repeated references to Antony's reproaches in his speech make the *Second Philippic* a shifting and multi-sided dialogue that includes both people and texts. In other *Philippics*, too, Cicero sometimes addresses Antony although he obviously is not present (cf. e.g. *Phil.* 1.31; 4.6; 13.39; 13.45; 13.48) and even points to this feature in *Philippic One* (*Phil.* 1.31).[16] Thereby an absent audience is integrated into the performance.[17] This technique serves to highlight the extent to which Antony is opposed by the

---

[16] Cf. *Phil.* 1.31: 'tu autem, M. Antoni, – absentem enim appello – unum illum diem quo in aede Telluris senatus fuit non omnibus his mensibus quibus te quidam multum a me dissentientes beatum putant anteponis?'

[17] For instance, in *Philippic Thirteen* Lepidus is addressed several times (*Phil.* 13.10; 13.14-15; 13.21). In *Philippic Fourteen* Cicero even addresses the soldiers who died while fighting against Antony (*Phil.* 14.33). That gives Cicero's plea to honour them on account of their services for the Roman state a more emotional appeal and allows him to express his appreciation of their deeds in a more personal manner.

Roman people as it gives the impression that in addressing Antony Cicero speaks as a representative of all those present, who all confront Antony.

On a more general level, addresses to Antony can be grouped under a further heading, namely the involvement not of the audience as a body, but of its individual members. This feature makes its appearance in two different ways as addresses can be directed either to actual members or to fictitious or generic members. That means, on the one hand, Cicero sometimes addresses other senators attending the meeting, when he wishes to praise them or to agree with them or when he wants to oppose them. That transforms part of the oration's performance into a conversation between two people, of which only one half is recorded. But reactions of the persons addressed are not expected and not part of the argument; Cicero's remarks on their own constitute a coherent train of thought; questions are rhetorical or immediately answered by himself.

Singling out individual members of the audience for participation in the performance is intended to make Cicero's statements more personal and thus more effective; it applies to individuals who are leading figures and can be directed both against Cicero's opponents and to persons whose support he wishes to enlist. For example, Cicero is constantly fighting Q. Fufius Calenus as Calenus is the most important one of Antony's followers in the senate, advocating a policy of reconciliation with Antony (cf. e.g. *Phil.* 5.25; 7.5; 8.11-13). Or, on the other hand, Cicero reminds the consul Pansa, chairman of the session and by virtue of his position an exemplary figure, to fulfil the duties of his office and to pursue a responsible policy (e.g. *Phil.* 7.5-7; 7.27).

A variant of this feature can be observed when texts written by others are being talked about. Most notably, that occurs in the *Thirteenth Philippic*; there Cicero reads out a letter by Antony sentence by sentence and comments on it (*Phil.* 13.22-48). To a smaller extent, this method can also be found in other speeches when, for instance, Cicero quotes phrases from dispatches or inscriptions on statues and discusses them, sometimes combined with a dialogue with the actual audience (e.g. *Phil.* 3.15-22; 6.12-15). By these references to written phrases Cicero has other 'speakers' participate in the performance although they are not present and do not say anything at that point of time. But a literal quotation of a statement set down in writing gives the interlocutor a kind of authentic voice. And when Cicero argues against the content of the written text or ridicules its wording, his criticism seems well-founded and provable. Thus, this way of extending the performance situation helps to make Cicero's argument more persuasive.

On the other hand, Cicero sometimes has generic interlocutors speak or refers to them, for instance in order to voice possible objections against what he is saying or to introduce contrary views so that he can refute them conveniently while he is still speaking (e.g. *Phil.* 5.5-7; 10.15; 11.20; 11.36). This method makes Cicero's speech more vivid and presents the orator as being concerned for his audience; at the same time his own position becomes less vulnerable as it can be defended more convincingly. Or Cicero talks about unnamed people spreading rumours (e.g. *Phil.* 7.2-4). Thus he does not

attack anybody personally, but the need to discuss the rumours seems greater when people are actually holding these views. Besides, Cicero can ridicule the views as well as the people spreading them. The involvement of persons gives him a further point to argue against, which may be dealt with more easily and more persuasively on the basis of general observations.

The most basic means of participation of the audience is addressing them, that means inserting *patres conscripti* and *Quirites* respectively.[18] This is not only a conventional and polite feature, but it is clear for the *Philippics*, where addresses are particularly numerous, that they are not inserted at random: nearly each instance as well as the degree of frequency in individual passages can be explained as rhetorical features conducive to Cicero's strategy. An overview of all relevant examples suggests that in the senate speeches Cicero inserts addresses when he has something to say which is important, should involve the audience personally, or is a delicate point either for him or for the audience, and that in the *contio* speeches he mainly uses addresses to claim common ground.

<p style="text-align:center">* * *</p>

References to what other people have done or might do or what they have said or might say could also be regarded as instances of performance on a larger scale. For referring to speeches and motions other people have made within the same senate meeting transforms the senate meeting as a whole into one coherent performance. References to previous senate meetings or senatorial decrees or to events and activities having occurred between several meetings have the whole course of events connected with Antony appear as one extended and consecutive performance. This kind of performance does not just involve one speaker and his audience, but a wider range of people not all of them present at all stages (apart from Cicero who participates in each phase).

Positioning one individual speech as an instance within one long performance places the individual text in a larger context. This feature probably is the reason why the whole corpus of the *Philippics* has been termed 'a drama in five acts consisting of fourteen scenes'.[19] Such a label

---

[18]   On the use of *Quirites* cf. V. Léovant-Cirefice, 'Le rôle de l'apostrophe aux *Quirites* dans les discours de Cicéron adressés au peuple', in G. Achard / M. Ledentu (edd.), *Orateur, auditeurs, lecteurs: à propos de l'éloquence romaine à la fin de la République et au début du Principat. Actes de la table-ronde du 31 janvier 2000* (Lyon / Paris 2000: Collection du Centre d'Études et de Recherches sur l'Occident Romain, Nouvelle série n° 21) 43-55 (56: discussion).

[19]   Cf. M. Fuhrmann, *Marcus Tullius Cicero. Sämtliche Reden. Eingel., übers. u. erl. Band VII* (Zurich / Munich 1982: Bibliothek der Alten Welt. Römische Reihe) 103-7; *Marcus Tullius Cicero. Die politischen Reden. Band III. Lateinisch – deutsch. Hg., übers. u. erl.* (Munich – Darmstadt 1993) 609-13; *Cicero und die römische Republik. Eine Biographie* (Munich / Zurich 1989, 2. durchges. Aufl. 1990, 3. durchges. u. erw. Aufl. 1991, 4. durchges. und bibliogr. erw. Aufl. 1997) 287-9; English translation of ²1990: *Cicero and the Roman Republic.* Translated by W.E. Yuill (Oxford / Cambridge [Mass.] 1992) 205-6; contrast Stroh (n. 20).

certainly describes the dramatic impact of each speech and the activities they represent, and is a possible characterization in this respect. However, one should not push the resemblance to drama too far and view it as a structural analogy as well, since the cycle is not built along the same lines as one self-contained drama, but is rather made up of individual instances which are variations on the same theme and complements to each other. These present a coherent picture because it is the orator Cicero throughout who directs the performance; he adapts it to ongoing changes in the political situation, but remains the leading and successful figure.

On the other hand, it can be demonstrated that the combination of several performance situations within the group is used to further Cicero's political goal to declare Antony a public enemy. This method becomes especially probable when one looks at the *Fourth Philippic* as part of the corpus of the *Philippics*. For in the *Third Philippic*, delivered earlier on the same day in the senate, Cicero does not propose to declare Antony a public enemy because that would be too rash a procedure at that moment of time, but he only calls for the bestowal of honours on those fighting against Antony and for the annulment of Antony's allotment of the provinces. In the *Fourth Philippic*, given before the people shortly afterwards, Cicero purports to inform them of what has been going on in the senate; but he does not simply state the facts, he rather interprets the senate's decree and thereby makes it conform to his own policy. Cicero summarizes the decree by saying that not in word, but in fact Antony has been declared a public enemy (cf. *Phil.* 4.1-2). And that is what the *Fourth Philippic* is needed for in the framework of the whole corpus. Only by that speech can it become clear that the senate's decree triggered by the *Third Philippic* is an important step towards declaring Antony a public enemy and conducive to Cicero's policy. And it is proved to be the right policy thereby as it is supported by a large number of Roman citizens, demonstrated by their supposed approval of it.[20]

* * *

---

[20] Generally, *Philippics* 3-14 exhibit a thematic coherence and close connections among each other, in contrast to other Ciceronian speeches against Antony not found in the corpus and not preserved. Accordingly, a good case has been made that *Philippics* 3-14 only constitute the *Philippics* proper, intended to be read as a corpus, and that the first two speeches were later added. On this issue cf. W. Stroh, 'Ciceros demosthenische Redezyklen', *MH* 40 (1983) 35-50; 'Ciceros Philippische Reden. Politischer Kampf und literarische Imitation', in M. Hose (ed.), *Meisterwerke der antiken Literatur. Von Homer bis Boethius* (Munich 2000) 76-102; Chr. Schäublin, 'Ciceros demosthenische Redezyklen: ein Nachtrag', *MH* 45 (1988) 60-1 [taken up by J. Leonhardt, 'Cicero. II. Cicero als Redner und Schriftsteller', *Der Neue Pauly* 2 (Stuttgart / Weimar 1997) 1196-1202, esp. 1197; English translation: 'Cicero. II. Cicero as orator and writer', *Brill's New Pauly. Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World* (Leiden / Boston 2003) 321-7, esp. 322]; G. Manuwald, 'Cicero versus Antonius. On Structure and Construction of the Philippic Collection', in T. Stevenson / M. Wilson (edd.), *Cicero's* Philippics: *History, Rhetoric and Ideology*, *Prudentia* (2006) (forthcoming); contrast Fuhrmann (n. 19).

To conclude: looking at Cicero's *Philippics* from the point of view of performance may lead to a clearer idea of what ways of presenting one's ideas and influencing the audience become available by the (real or fictitious) performance situation of delivering a speech before an audience and how Cicero uses these possibilities in order to achieve his political goal according to the reflections in the transmitted texts.

Even in the published versions or in orations never actually delivered Cicero keeps up the idea of a performance situation, which holds true for the actual delivery of a speech. That is not only due to the simple fact that even if these speeches have been reworked they are meant to appear as transcripts of actual speeches and as authentic as possible, but these signs of performance also serve a crucial function in achieving the orator's target. Thus publishing the speeches in the supposed form of an oration provides the orator with the opportunity to use a greater variety of methods to highlight and interpret aspects according to his wishes, to include suitable audience reactions and to render the text more vivid.

On the formal level, a supposed performance situation offers a wider range of ways in which the orator may organize his speech: he can take on various roles, make the audience participate and even enter into some sort of dialogue with them. As regards contents, Cicero can construct a persona or even different personae of himself as it suits his argument. On the whole, he thereby appears to be a wise, superior and successful fighter for the freedom of the Roman people, for the Republican cause and for the welfare of the state. Even actual facts are made to play a part in the performance in order to further Cicero's argument as they are presented in Cicero's interpretation.

Since even in the published version Cicero retains the position of an orator and its characteristic features in order to influence the audience as persuasively as possible and deliberately assumes a number of further roles so that his statement is made from the most authoritative perspective, he uses his constructed persona to make his point. The persona who suggests a way of action sometimes seems to be more important than a convincing argument that proves its advantages. A clever use of the performance situation makes the orator's remarks more persuasive without him having to adduce further or more convincing arguments.

Since Cicero is confronted with a tense political situation and argues for a policy that goes against his beliefs followed so far, is juridically illegal and is opposed by parts of the audience, it is important to use all rhetorical means available; a skilful performance may induce the audience to follow Cicero in regarding the (ex-)consul Antony as a public enemy although that is simply his interpretation of the situation. That is why Cicero may have been induced to employ such a great number of performative features in the *Philippics*.

The orator who directs and dominates the performance as well as the interaction with the audience in support of the argument are constituent elements in rendering a (delivered or read) speech persuasive. In the case of the *Philippics*, each speech contributes to producing the desired image of Cicero and his policy, namely that fighting Antony as proposed by Cicero

will reestablish the republic. The selection of those speeches assembled in the corpus highlights that image further as they all serve to show that Cicero and his strategy are successful, in contrast to other speeches against Antony not included in the corpus.[21]

Thus, even in the form of silent texts as they have come down to us, Cicero's *Philippics* still bear signs of performance. If one becomes attentive to them, they show Cicero to be a skilful politician, orator and writer, who knows to employ all kinds of means offered by the performance situation chosen to achieve his political target in difficult circumstances.

Albert-Ludwigs-Universität   GESINE MANUWALD

---

[21]   On the selection of speeches for the corpus and its possible original structure see above n. 20.