



How to Make (and Break) a Cicero: *Epideixis*, Textuality, and Self-fashioning in the *Pro Archia* and *In Pisonem*

Cicero's deployment of cultural texts—philosophical, rhetorical, and oratorical—for political purposes is a vital contribution to Roman cultural and literary history. Both broad ideological goals and personal political ambitions spurred Cicero's projection of the literary into the political domain. His cultural interventions sought not only to shape the general political and intellectual landscape of the late republic, but also to construct and position a particular version of his self within that landscape. In Cicero's cultural projects, ideology is wedded to self-fashioning,¹ and the tenor of the message is inextricably bound up with the persona of the messenger. Cicero's mixing of the cultural and the political domains not only plays a formative role within the late republic, but presages the full-scale exploitation of literary and artistic programs for political ends in the Augustan age.²

I would like to thank Thomas Habinek, Rebecca Krawiec, Martha Malamud, and *Classical Antiquity's* two anonymous readers for their many insightful criticisms, suggestions, and encouragement. I delivered an earlier version of this paper at the University of Pennsylvania in April of 1998. My thanks are due to Ralph Rosen for inviting me to speak, and to the faculty and students in attendance for their helpful responses. Of course, I alone am responsible for this essay's shortcomings.

1. Greenblatt 1980 introduced "self-fashioning" as a field of inquiry. For valuable investigations of self-fashioning in Roman contexts, see Leach 1990, Riggsby 1995 and 1998, as well as the special issue of *ClAnt* (vol. 16, 1997) devoted to self-fashioning, in which I have found particularly useful Bloomer 1997.

2. Habinek 1994 and Narducci 1997 are important contributions to our understanding of Cicero's use of cultural texts to shape political discourse. On the *Pro Archia's* place in this cultural program, see Narducci 3–18. On Cicero's project as an anticipation of Augustus', see Habinek 65 and Narducci 17.

This essay explores one aspect of Cicero's use of cultural writing for political ends: his employment of the epideictic rhetorical mode in two of his speeches, *Pro Archia* and *In Pisonem*. The epideictic is the form of oratory that is most closely associated with self-consciously literary expression and least connected to the "real world" of the senate and forum. It is a ludic rhetorical domain that embraces paradoxes: it encompasses both praise and blame, is both markedly Greek and proximate to the Romans' *laudatio funebris*, and is simultaneously associated with both textual fixity and *viva voce* improvisation. This fluidity and malleability makes epideictic an ideal vehicle for Cicero's political designs, allowing him not only to mold a political agenda but also a self as part of a cultural program that supersedes the purely political. Cicero's use of the epideictic mode stands as an exemplary case of how a literary form could interact with Roman political reality to reveal the potentialities and limitations of attempts to shape politics through cultural means.

Although the *Pro Archia* and *In Pisonem* are speeches that appear to be utterly dissimilar in tone, circumstances, and agenda, their shared use of epideictic provides generically determined coordinates that facilitate their comparison. This epideictic framework shows that Cicero's encomiastic defense of the Roman citizenship of the poet Licinius Archias and his invective against his aristocratic nemesis L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus are polar and complementary opposites. Each text is composed of three different main characters: a Greek poet, his prominent Roman patron, and an accuser who seeks to throw suspicion on their relationship. In the *Pro Archia* Cicero presents himself as a distinguished ex-consul who has an ideal relationship with his client and former teacher Archias in order to deflect the malevolent insinuations of Archias' prosecutor Grattius. In the *In Pisonem* Cicero takes on the prosecutor's role and, using arguments and tropes that are inversions of those of the *Pro Archia*, depicts Piso's relationship with the poet Philodemus as a model of depravity. This shuffling of roles allows each speech to articulate, from its opposite perspective, the general mechanics of literary self-presentation, in both oratory and poetry, within the cultural landscape of the late republic. Moreover, each speech is intended to fix a flattering version of Cicero's self in ornamented prose that will achieve canonical longevity.

A brief overview of my argument may prove useful to the reader. I begin by investigating the archaeology of epideictic from its formulation in Greek rhetorical theory to its uneasy reception within the Roman rhetorical tradition, especially as is evident in Cicero's own theoretical works. This background shows the aspects of the genre that Cicero sought to exploit in the *Pro Archia* and *In Pisonem*: its valorization of aesthetic concerns over logical proof, its proximity to the aristocratic Roman funeral oration, its association with both improvisatory speech and textual fixity. By transforming the legal case of the *Pro Archia* into an epideictic speech that seeks to use the cultural value of poets and poetry to naturalize Archias as a Roman citizen, Cicero shapes the speech into a text that carries out several simultaneous cultural transactions: it argues that literary texts

are a legitimate technology of self-presentation within Roman culture; it becomes an item of exchange in a negotiation with Archias that seeks to obligate the poet to write a laudatory poem on Cicero's behalf whose content and tone the speech subtly prescribes; and it becomes Cicero's own proleptic funeral oration, thus enabling the *novus homo* to co-opt an aristocratic representational mode. And yet, the legal arguments that the *Pro Archia* suppresses prefigure the ways that Cicero's self-fashioning strategies would eventually fail. Cicero argues that in law textual authority is predicated upon personal *auctoritas*. It is precisely the failure of Cicero's own *auctoritas* that leads to his ignominious exile and the refusal of Archias to write the poem Cicero requests.

A letter written in 55, Cicero's private solicitation for an ornate laudatory historical monograph from Lucceius (*Fam.* 5.12), parallels his negotiations with Archias and makes clear what literary "polish" should provide, namely, a version of events that smoothes away traces of unflattering incidents from the author's narrative. Cicero makes this request, moreover, after the disgrace of his exile, and so this letter manifests the *Pro Archia*'s tactics within the very different political circumstances that Cicero confronts in the *In Pisonem*. In that speech, invective inverts the self-fashioning strategies used in the *Pro Archia* in order to debunk Piso's image, and to recuperate Cicero's own prestige at the expense of Piso's. The *In Pisonem* has the same long-range cultural ambitions as the *Pro Archia*, but without the previous speech's hopes for tangible short-term success. Faced with his inability to cause Piso real political damage commensurate to that which he claims to have suffered at Piso's hands, Cicero crafts an ornately polished caricature of Piso designed to achieve canonical durability. My study concludes by examining how Cicero's reception by the orators of Seneca's *Suasoriae* and *Controversiae* gives evidence of the success, and limitations, of these long-term cultural ambitions.

THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF EPIDEICTIC AND ROMAN CULTURAL ANXIETIES

Cicero's introduction of epideictic oratory into the center of Roman public life, and his exploitation of this self-consciously literary rhetorical type for forensic and political purposes, was a bold innovation that can best be understood in the context of Roman rhetoric's problematic reception of this Greek rhetorical type. Within the Roman rhetorical tradition, epideictic had the role of the exceptional rhetorical genus that eluded stable classification. The alterity that marked the epideictic mode can be ascribed to two historical factors. First, Aristotle's original formulation of the forensic, deliberative, and epideictic triad is inherently unstable: Aristotle uses a balanced dyad to formulate the deliberative and forensic modes, in which the listener in each case is a judge (*κριτής*) either of matters that have happened (in the case of forensic) or will come to pass (deliberative). In contrast, the listener of epideictic (*Rh.* 1358b2–6) is a spectator of artistic force

or ability (περὶ τῆς δυνάμεως ὁ θεωρός). Epideictic's proper time coordinate is the present, although this point is presented almost as an afterthought (1358b17–18).³ Aristotle is the authority that Roman rhetoricians regularly invoke in their own discussions of the *tria genera*, and it is on his unbalanced foundation that they base their understanding of this essential division within rhetoric.⁴ Second, Rome lacked a long-standing tradition of ceremonial oratory like Greece's, thus rendering much of Greek theory on epideictic inappropriate to a Roman cultural context.⁵ Consequently, the oldest surviving Roman rhetorical works either pay epideictic scant attention or subordinate the discussion of the genus to its use within forensic or deliberative speeches.⁶

The rhetorical theory of Cicero's maturity, however, does not simply omit or gloss over epideictic in a neutral fashion, dismissing it as not fulfilling a practical function. Rather, these texts give evidence that this rhetorical type provoked deep-seated cultural anxieties which may have contributed to late-republican Roman rhetoricians' general reticence about the genus. The *De Oratore*, Cicero's first and most comprehensive major rhetorical treatise, presents rhetorical theory as arising spontaneously from a conversation among Roman aristocrats familiar to Cicero in his youth. He structures this dialogue along the trajectory of a real discussion, with the changes of opinion, digressions, and resumptions of earlier issues that are characteristic of an actual conversation.⁷ Cicero's text therefore reveals the naturalizing process that Greek rhetorical thought underwent within a traditional Roman context. His aristocratic interlocutors talk about epideictic in the categories made available to them by their culture and thus render it in terms that appear "natural" according to these cultural criteria.⁸ Since it articulates the dynamics of this naturalization process in the polyphony of staged dialogue,

3. Hinks 1936 discusses Aristotle's anomalous division of the three rhetorical types. Beale 1978: 223 notes that this has seemed "an overly schematic contrivance." On epideictic in general see Buchheit 1960, Burgess 1902, and Lausberg 1998: 102–11. Menander Rhetor's late third-century treatises on epideictic give an indication of the theoretical elaboration the genus received in later antiquity. See Russell and Wilson 1981 for an edition with commentary, and an introduction that provides a general overview of "Epideictic Practice and Theory" (xi–xxxiv).

4. Roman rhetoricians are unanimous in crediting Aristotle with the invention of the threefold division (Cicero *Inv. rhet.* 1.7, *De Or.* 2.43; Quintilian *Inst.* 2.21.23, 3.7.1 [on epideictic in particular]).

5. On epideictic in Rome, see Kennedy 1972: 21–23.

6. Cicero devotes only the last two sections of his youthful *De Inventione* to a cursory discussion of the rhetorical type. The *Ad Herennium* (3.15) advises against the neglect of epideictic since, even though the type is seldom employed on its own, judicial and deliberative speeches often contain large sections devoted to praise and blame. This exhortation suggests that other contemporary Roman rhetoricians regularly omitted epideictic from their programs. In contrast, Quintilian *Inst.* 3.7 provides a more elaborate theoretical formulation of the genre. Although Quintilian bases his discussion on Cicero, he writes in an era when ceremonial oratory (such as the oratorical contest in honor of Jupiter Capitolinus that Domitian inaugurated in 86: see *Inst.* 3.7.4 and Butler 1921 ad loc.) played a larger role than in Cicero's time.

7. For this point I am indebted to Narducci 1997: 32. Cf. Hall 1996.

8. On naturalization, in the structuralist sense, see Culler 1975: 137: to naturalize something is "to bring it within the modes of order which culture makes available, and this is usually done by talking about it in a mode of discourse which a culture takes as natural."

the *De Oratore* provides invaluable evidence for the various forces that shaped the Roman reception of Greek rhetoric in general and for the source of cultural anxieties about epideictic oratory.

In the first book, Cicero's interlocutor Antonius provides an overview of the basic elements of rhetoric. The scheme that Antonius presents does not accommodate epideictic, which he introduces as an afterthought, seemingly more from a desire to render a complete account of standard rhetorical thought than from the conviction that epideictic has a vital role to play in oratory.⁹ The second book resumes the discussion of the *genera dicendi* in the form of a more critical reevaluation of the rhetorical tradition.¹⁰ Antonius limits legitimate oratory to the forensic and deliberative branches and dismisses "that third type" (without mentioning its name or purpose) as possibly useful but less necessary than the others.¹¹ This conversation takes a significant turn, however, when Q. Lutatius Catulus interrupts with the point that this third genus deals with *laudationes*. Immediately the discussion focuses upon the *laudatio funebris* that Catulus recently delivered on behalf of his mother.¹² However, no sooner does Antonius associate this native Roman speech with the Greek category of display oratory than he attempts to distance the *laudatio* from rhetorical regulation of any sort. He claims that there are certain types of oratorical expression that do not lend themselves to theoretical formulation. The *laudatio* does not require theory's guidance since there is no one who does not know those qualities which are worthy of praise.¹³ Antonius groups praise and blame with other examples of non-regulated uses of language, all of which call for "the highest ornaments of speech," but have no need for artificial rules.¹⁴ Cicero's text casts the *laudatio funebris* in a crucial role within the drama of Roman self-definition in relation to Greek rhetorical thought. The *laudatio funebris*, although it presents an obvious

9. *De Or.* 1.141: *causarum, quae sint a communi quaestione seiunctae, partim in iudiciis versari, partim in deliberationibus; esse etiam genus tertium, quod in laudandis aut vituperandis hominibus poneretur.* Note Cicero's description of this passage as presenting well-known basic elements of rhetoric (*De Or.* 1.137): *communia et contrita praecepta.*

10. Antonius' recapitulation is supposed to inform new arrivals of the previous day's discussion (*De Or.* 2.41): *nam Crassus heri, cum vos, Catule et Caesar, non adessetis, posuit breviter in artis distributione idem, quod Graeci plerique posuerunt, neque sane quid ipse sentiret, sed quid ab illis diceretur, ostendit.*

11. *De Or.* 2.43: *ea mihi videntur aut in lite oranda, aut in consilio dando esse posita, nam illud tertium, quod a Crasso tactum est et, ut audio, ille ipse Aristoteles, qui haec maxime illustravit, adiunxit, etiam si opus est, minus est tamen necessarium.*

12. *De Or.* 2.44: "ita," inquit Antonius "et in eo quidem genere scio et me et omnis, qui adfuerunt, delectatos esse vehementer, cum a te est Popilia, mater vestra, laudata, cui primum mulieri hunc honorem in nostra civitate tributum puto."

13. *De Or.* 2.44–45: *sed non omnia, quaecumque loquimur, mihi videntur ad artem et ad praecepta esse revocanda: ex eis enim fontibus unde praecepta dicendi sumuntur, licebit etiam laudationem ornare neque illa elementa desiderare, quae ut nemo tradat, quis est qui nesciat, quae sint in homine laudanda?*

14. They are testimony (*testimonium*, 2.48), official dispatches (*mandata*, 2.49), rebuke, encouragement, consolation (*obiurgatio, cohortatio, consolatio*, 2.50) and history (2.51). Cf. *De Or.* 2.50: *quod non summa dicendi ornamenta desideret; sed ex artificio res istae praecepta non quaerunt.*

Roman analogue to the Greek category of epideictic, nevertheless becomes a stumbling block that halts the advance of Antonius' inquiry into epideictic.

Arguments that appeal to what is "natural" often attest to deep-rooted cultural unease. Such is the case in Antonius' claim that praise and blame are "natural" forms of speech with no need for classification and regulation. This strategy allows Antonius to avoid categorizing the *laudatio funebris* as merely a variety of ornate Greek speech reducible to a set of generic prescriptions. The *laudatio funebris*, which the Romans considered an authentically Roman indigenous form of speech of great antiquity, was the centerpiece of the aristocratic funeral ceremony. As such, this distinctly Roman form of utterance held a privileged position both in the structures of Roman national identity and as part of the signs and narratives that justified the nobility's political domination. The funeral oration, together with its material complement, the wax masks of the deceased ancestors that were carried in funeral processions, were basic components of the aristocracy's self-presentation technologies.¹⁵ A *nobilis* like Antonius would have reason to resist any assault on the integrity of this mainstay of aristocratic image-production.¹⁶ But a *novus homo* like Cicero, who did not have access to this image technology, will, in the *Pro Archia*, exploit epideictic's proximity to the *laudatio funebris* for his own self-fashioning designs.

Later in the *De Oratore*, Cicero employs a series of stark antitheses to distance the Roman *laudatio* from Greek *epideixis*: while the Greek epideictic oration is meant for reading, pleasure, and individual glorification, Roman *laudationes*, when in the form of court depositions, provide a useful public service and are brief and stylistically restrained; moreover, ostentatious oratory is inappropriate for funeral.¹⁷ Cicero's cultural arguments naturalize the Roman *laudatio* by placing it within the domain of traditional values (public, useful, unadorned) while they mark out the alterity of Greek *epideixis* by relegating it to the realm of the questionable (private, pleasurable, ornate). By drawing this distinction along such fundamental cultural polarities, Cicero shows how the separation between *epideixis* and *laudatio* is embedded within the *De Oratore's* program of cultural self-definition.

15. Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* 5.17.3) attests to the Romans' belief that the *laudatio funebris* was indigenous and ancient. See Flower 1996, esp. ch. 5, "Praising the Ancestors: *Laudationes* and other Orations," 128–58.

16. These *laudationes*, moreover, were notorious for the unreliability of their self-serving fictions (as Cicero attests in *Brutus* 62), a factor which may have contributed to Antonius' zealous defense of the genre.

17. *De Or.* 2.341: *ipsi enim Graeci magis legendi et delectationis aut hominis alicuius ornandi quam utilitatis huius forensis causa laudationes scriptitaverunt; quorum sunt libri, quibus Themistocles, Aristides, Agesilaus, Epaminondas, Philippus, Alexander alique laudantur; nostrae laudationes, quibus in foro utimur, aut testimoni brevitatem habent nudam atque inornatam aut scribuntur ad funebrem contionem, quae ad orationis laudem minime accommodata est.* Quintilian *Inst.* 3.7.1f. similarly insists that Roman custom has integrated epideictic into the realm of *negotium*, although Greek theorists had relegated it to *otium*.

The *Orator*, written some ten years later, links the cultural anxieties about epideictic to its position within the dubious realm of *otium*.¹⁸ While the *Orator* (unlike the *De Oratore*) treats epideictic as an independent species of rhetoric, it places it outside the domain of serious oratory. Epideictic stands in the same relationship to forensic speech as a parade does to actual warfare: the epideictic orator may ostentatiously employ all of the stylistic ornaments at his disposal without concern for practical application. It occupies the ludic space of the gymnasium and palaestra, and is driven from the forum; the distinction that divides *otium* from *negotium* separates epideictic from forensic oratory.¹⁹ Although epideictic can afford the young orator valuable preparation for real oratorical combat, its goal is delight and not conflict.²⁰ The absence of a point at issue allows the listener to be fully open to the aural pleasures that the genre affords.²¹ Elsewhere Cicero presents epideictic as an autonomous entity freed from the necessities that constrain forensic and deliberative speeches: it does not affirm dubious issues, but ones that are certain or are at least treated as such (*certa aut pro certis*).²² In an epideictic oration, style and its ability to give pleasure are the dominant considerations. Cicero suggests that the periodic sentence is particularly appropriate for epideictic, in that it represents epideictic's self-containment in microcosm, is oriented towards pleasure, and is apart from the strife of the courts.²³ The emphasis in epideictic upon ornament, rhythm, and pleasure places it in proximity to poetry, a fact that will be of particular consequence for Cicero's deployment of this mode in the *Pro Archia*.²⁴

18. On the importance of the concept of *otium* in Roman culture see André 1966.

19. *Orator* 42: dulce igitur orationis genus et solutum et fluens, sententiis argutum, verbis sonans est in illo epideictico genere, quod diximus proprium sophistarum, pompae quam pugnae aptius, gymnasiis et palaestrae dicatum, spreum et pulsum foro. sed quod educata huius nutrimentis eloquentia [est] ipsa se postea colorat et roborat, non alienum fuit de oratoris quasi incunabulis dicere. verum haec ludorum atque pompae; nos autem iam in aciem dimicationemque veniamus.

20. *Orator* 37: est enim illa quasi nutrix eius oratoris quem informare volumus; *Orator* 38: non enim ad iudiciorum certamen sed ad voluptatem aurium. Cf. *Orator* 37: quae absunt a forensi contentione, eiusque totius generis quod Graece ἐπιδεικτικὸν nominatur, quia quasi ad inspiciendum delectationis causa comparatum est.

21. *Orator* 208: nam cum is est auditor qui non vereatur ne compositae orationis insidiis sua fides attemptetur, gratiam quoque habet oratori voluptati aurium servienti.

22. *Part. or.* 71: non enim dubia firmantur sed ea quae certa aut pro certis posita sunt augmentur.

23. *Orator* 207–208: ergo in aliis, id est in historia et in eo quod appellamus ἐπιδεικτικὸν, placet omnia dici Isocrateo Theopompeoque more illa circumscriptione ambituque, ut tanquam in orbe inclusa currat oratio, quoad insistat in singulis perfectis absolutisque sententiis. itaque posteaquam est nata haec vel circumscriptio vel comprehensio vel continuatio vel ambitus, si ita licet dicere, nemo, qui aliquo esset in numero, scripsit orationem generis eius quod esset ad delectationem comparatum remotumque a iudiciis forensique certamine, quin redigeret omnis fere in quadrum numerumque sententias.

24. As part of his discussion of prose rhythm in *Orator* 201–203, Cicero presents the differences between rhythmical prose and poetry as consisting more in degree than in kind: poets enjoy greater freedom in their use of figures, but are more constrained by meter. He specifies that they both share an orientation towards aural pleasure (*Orator* 203): si ad quam rem adhibeatur, ad delectationem: . . . si quae res efficiat voluptatem. eadem quae in versibus, quorum modum notat ars. sed aures ipsae

Despite the anxieties caused by epideictic's association with *otium*, its ludic quality renders it an ideal vehicle for Cicero's self-fashioning. Epideictic, since it is not grounded in the reality of a court case or political meeting, is a genre that stands apart from questions of truth and falsity. Its presence within the ludic domain of *otium*, the realm of the free-play of signification, suggests that its orientation may be reversed, from praise to blame and vice versa.²⁵ *Otium*, the area in the Roman consciousness where paradox is most at home, allows epideictic to be both itself and its opposite.²⁶ Rhetorical theory prescribed that invective use the same general topics as praise, but that it exchange those characteristics deemed worthy of praise for their converse.²⁷ Thus, invective may be seen as a carnivalesque inversion of praise, an inversion, moreover, as we will see in the case of the *Pro Archia* and *In Pisonem*, that follows a trajectory from high to low style in both the form and content of these orations.²⁸

Inherent in epideictic's paradoxical status is its ambivalent attitude towards textuality: epideictic is the rhetorical genre most associated both with *ex tempore*, *viva voce* performance and with the textual fixity of written form. Epideictic's writerliness reflects both its status as the most self-consciously literary and artistic rhetorical type and the fact that epideictic was thought particularly suited to publication.²⁹ The periodic style's architectural refinements almost require the

tacito eum sensu sine arte definiunt. The Gorgianic genealogy of epideictic seems to be a factor in its association with poetry: in the *Encomium of Helen*, only meter distinguishes poetry from prose (*Helen* 9): τὴν ποιῆσιν ἅπασαν καὶ νομίζω καὶ ὀνομάζω λόγον ἔχοντα μέτρον. See Kennedy 1963: 63: "[Gorgias] regarded an orator as a *psychagogos*, like a poet, a leader of souls through a kind of incantation."

25. Note the insistence that the one rhetorical genus of epideictic comprises both praise and blame: Aristotle *Rh.* 1358b12–13: ἐπιδεικτικὸς δὲ τὸ μὲν ἔπαινος τὸ δὲ ψόγος. *Rhet. Her.* 1.2: demonstrativum est quod tribuitur in alicuius certae personae laudem vel vituperationem (cf. Cicero *Inv. rhet.* 1.7). Quintilian *Inst.* 3.4.12: est igitur, ut dixi, unum genus, quo laus ac vituperatio continetur.

26. See Bloomer 1997: 70 n. 26 (discussing the rhetorical exercises of the Empire) "ludic genres [are] texts that present interpretative schemes contrary to common sense, e.g., by presenting paradoxes of framing: 'Ludic genres present a critique not only of conceptual classifications, but on the level of the nonsense of classification itself.' Declamation occurs in a play context, where roles and categories are suspended, created, and reversed." He here quotes Stewart 1979: 39. See also Dupont 1997: 50–52, who discusses recitation as a "ludic performance," and, on "ludism" in general, *eadem* 1985: 48–51.

27. For *vituperatio* as the inversion of *laudatio*, cf. *Rhet. Her.* 3.12, where the subject matter of blame is the opposite of that of praise: quibus sententiis contraria sumuntur a vituperatione. Cf. 3.13–3.15 for the application of this general principle. Cf. Cicero *Inv. rhet.* 2.177 (after listing those qualities that are worthy of praise, Cicero suggests that their contraries are apparent): contraria quoque, quae et qualia sint, intellegentur. See also *De Or.* 2.349: iam vituperandi praecepta contrariis ex vitiiis sumenda esse perspicuum est.

28. On the idea of the carnivalesque, see Bakhtin 1984.

29. See Aristotle *Rh.* 1414a18f.: ἐπιδεικτικὴ λέξις γραφικωτάτη: τὸ γὰρ ἔργον αὐτῆς ἀνάγνωσις. Cf. Quintilian *Inst.* 3.8.63: namque Aristoteles idoneam maxime ad scribendum demonstrativam proximamque ab ea iudicalem putavit. Cf. *De Or.* 2.341: ipsi enim Graeci magis legendi et delectationis aut hominis alicuius ornandi quam utilitatis huius forensis causa laudationes scriptitaverunt.

pen.³⁰ Countering this writerliness is the genre's Gorgianic genealogy: Gorgias' myth of the all-powerful *logos*, unencumbered by written form, presents epideictic as the voice in performance.³¹ Indeed, the resistance that the *De Oratore* shows to bringing epideictic under theoretical regulation can be seen as a manifestation of the inherent tension in epideictic between scripted textuality and *ex tempore*, "natural," performance. We shall see that self-conscious artistry and ambitions beyond the mere moment of delivery are integral elements of the speeches that I am investigating, and that the dynamic of textual fixity versus *viva voce* evanescence animate each of these speeches. While all speeches share in the tension between voice and text, the *Pro Archia* and *In Pisonem* do so to an exceptional and significant degree. Both present themselves as virtuoso vocal performances even as they display a marked ambition to arrest their performances in textual form.

THE *PRO ARCHIA* AS EPIDEICTIC ORATION: THE CONSTRUCTION OF A SELF

Nearly every sentence of Cicero's defense of the Roman citizenship rights of the Syrian-born Greek-speaking poet Licinius Archias bears the unmistakable hallmarks of the epideictic style: complex subordination, extravagant ornament, and lavish figuration.³² Far from disguising his innovation, Cicero calls direct attention to it with repeated apologies that use the rhetorical terminology that describes the epideictic style.³³ Although rhetorical theory sanctioned the introduction of epideictic elements into forensic speeches (something that Cicero does in other speeches), the extent of the transformation in the *Pro Archia* is exceptional and involves both stylistic and procedural transgression.³⁴ Cicero's apologies conspicuously flout standard judicial practice. He quickly dispenses

30. See Narducci 1997: 162f.

31. Cf. Gorgias *Hel.* 8: λόγος δυνάστης μέγας ἐστὶν ὃς μικροτάτῳ σώματι καὶ ἀφανιστατῶ θεϊότατα ἔργα ἀποτελεῖ.

32. For a detailed stylistic commentary on the speech, see Gotoff 1979. On the *Pro Archia* as an epideictic speech, see Narducci 1997: 3–18, esp. 6f.

33. *Arch.* 3: hoc uti genere dicendi, quod non modo a consuetudine iudiciorum, verum etiam a forensi sermone abhorreat; 18: utar enim vestra benignitate, quoniam me in hoc novo genere dicendi tam diligenter attenditis; and 32: quae fere a mea iudicialique consuetudine et de hominis ingenio et communiter de ipsius studio locutus sum, ea, iudices, a vobis spero esse in bonam partem accepta, ab eo qui iudicium exercet certo scio. Cf. *Orator* 208 (on epideictic): orationem generis eius quod esset ad delectationem comparatum remotumque a iudiciis forensique certamine.

34. See *Rhet. Her.* 3.15: et si separatim haec causa minus saepe tractatur, at in iudicialibus et in deliberativis causis saepe magnae partes versantur laudis aut vituperationis. Cf. Cicero *Orator* 209: genus autem hoc orationis neque totum adsumendum est ad causas forensis neque omnino repudiandum. Four years earlier, in 66 BCE, Cicero delivered the *Pro lege Manilia*, a deliberative oration framed as a *laudatio* addressed to Pompey. See Cicero *Orator* 102: fuit ornandus in Manilia lege Pompeius; temperata oratione orandi copiam persecuti sumus. Cf. Narducci 1997: 7. Cicero emphasizes both the stylistic and procedural aspects of his innovations (*Arch.* 3): hoc uti genere dicendi, quod non modo a consuetudine iudiciorum, verum etiam a forensi sermone abhorreat.

with the legal technicalities and pronounces that case closed.³⁵ Cicero's considerable consular *auctoritas* enabled him to make so unconventional a speech: it was delivered in the year following his consulate and his triumphant foiling of Catiline's conspiracy.³⁶ Likewise, in the *Pro Sulla*, the only other speech to survive in the post-consular year, Cicero based his defense specifically in terms of his own consular *auctoritas*.³⁷

By transforming the *Pro Archia* into an epideictic oration whose praise of poets and poetry defended Archias' claim to Roman citizenship, Cicero allows himself to subordinate the legal case to the cultural arguments that are the essence of his oration. The boundaries between various realms of human activity are permeable and interrelated in this speech.³⁸ The obscuring of established limits, which becomes a *leitmotif* of the *Pro Archia*'s cultural arguments, sets the stage for the two parallel and interrelated rhetorical strategies that the speech performs. It allows Cicero first to dissolve the cultural polarities that stood in the way of Archias' naturalization (Greek and Roman; poetry and rhetoric; *otium* and *negotium*; private and public; *delectatio* and *utilitas*), and then to breach the distinction between Archias and Cicero himself, and so transform the *Pro Archia* into a full-blown instance of Ciceronian self-fashioning.

Blurring the distinction between advocate and client was an essential aspect of Roman legal practice, wherein patron stood as proxy for client and used his prestige as the guarantee of his assertions.³⁹ The *Pro Archia*, however, extends the manner and degree of this practice. Cicero's reasons for using his defense of Archias to defend himself arise from the consular's circumstances in 62. Cicero had come under increasing attack for his execution of Roman citizens without trial on the Nones of December, and, as the *Pro Sulla* also shows, he used the defense of others in the post-consular year to vindicate his actions as consul.⁴⁰ Sulla's

35. *Arch.* 8: si nihil aliud nisi de civitate ac lege dicimus, nihil dico amplius; causa dicta est. The *Pro Balbo*, another case of citizenship rights, uses much the same tactic (sect. 15): atque, ut ego sentio, iudices, causa dicta est. See Damon 1997: 271. Riggsby 1999 persuasively argues that the public (i.e., criminal) courts (*iudicia publica*) routinely downplayed legal formalities and instead emphasized the question of the general public welfare. "Crime" as a category of thought was primarily defined in terms of "[harm] done to the community as a whole" (Riggsby 151). Cicero's arguments for Archias' naturalization employ an analogous criterion: the merits of the poet's case are based on his contributions to the general public good.

36. See May 1988: 6f. and 11f. (on the general importance of *auctoritas* in Roman advocacy) and 69–79 (on Cicero's use of his *auctoritas* specifically in the *Pro Sulla*).

37. In *Pro Sulla* 33 Cicero invokes his consular *auctoritas* while taking a self-deprecatory stance: itaque attende, Torquate, quam ego defugiam auctoritatem consulatus mei.

38. On the link between rhetoric and poetry, see *Arch.* 2: ctenim omnes artes quae ad humanitatem pertinent habent quoddam commune vinclum et quasi cognatione quadam inter se continentur. The prominent position of this statement near the beginning of the oration establishes this interconnection as a continuous theme of the speech.

39. See May 1988, esp. 1–12.

40. On the last day of the year, and of Cicero's term in office, the tribune Caecilius Metellus Nepos attempted to prevent him from giving the traditional outgoing oath for a consul on the grounds that it was improper for one who had summarily executed Roman citizens. See *Fam.* 5.2.7 for Cicero's

prosecutor Torquatus accused Cicero of treating his consulate as a *regnum*, of being the third foreign king of Rome.⁴¹ The claim that Cicero's municipal origins made him a non-Roman, though without legal substance, was a favorite motif of his detractors: Catiline himself, according to Sallust, sneered at the consul as a "resident alien" (*inquilinus civis urbis Romae*) in a speech to the senate in which he vaunted his own ancestral glory.⁴² The terms of the attacks against Cicero make the *Pro Archia* an especially appropriate medium for his apologies. The case of Archias' citizenship rights would have had obvious resonances with these rhetorical attacks against Cicero's Roman status.⁴³ In defending Archias' citizenship in a way that blended himself with his client, Cicero could justify his own claim to be authentically Roman and, by extension, to have conducted himself as consul in accordance with the *mos maiorum*.

The merging of Cicero's self with that of Archias is intimately connected with the orator's transformation of the speech from a forensic to an epideictic oration. He defends his decision to adopt an epideictic mode by arguing that it is the appropriate style to use when speaking on a poet's behalf (*Arch.* 3):

patiamini de studiis humanitatis ac litterarum paulo loqui liberius et in eius modi persona, quae propter otium ac studium minime in iudiciiis periculisque tractata est, uti prope novo quodam et inusitato genere dicendi.

... that I be permitted both to speak about the humanities and literature with a bit more license, and, in the case of a person of this sort who has been very little involved in legal peril because of his leisure and study, to use a certain nearly unprecedented and unusual type of speaking.

Cicero wants to defend the poet, whose domain of activity is that of *otium*, in the oratorical style that is associated with that realm. He justifies his choice

account of how he improvised an oath in which he claimed not only to have discharged his duties properly but to have saved the republic.

41. *Pro Sulla* 22: Tarquinius et Numam et me tertium peregrinum regem esse dixisti. Cf. Mitchell 1991: 67 and n. 8.

42. Sallust *Cat.* 31.7. Cf. Appian *B. Civ.* 2.2. A notable example of such attack is the Pseudo-Sallustian *In Ciceronem* (sect. 1): quasi unus reliquus e familia viri clarissimi, Scipionis Africani, ac non repeticus, accitus ac paulo ante insitus huic urbi civis. Asconius (72 Stangl) claims that Cicero's colleague in the consulate Antonius similarly disparaged his origins. Cf. Berry 1996: 182. The extent to which *peregrinitas* became part of Cicero's public persona is attested by Juvenal's portrait of the orator (8.237f.): hic novus Arpinas, ignobilis et modo Romae / municipalis eques. Cf. the entire passage (8.236–44). The *Commentariolum Petitionis* (sect. 2) summarizes Cicero's identity, objective, and city succinctly: "civitas quae sit cogita, quid petas, qui sis, prope cottidie tibi hoc ad forum descendenti meditandum est: 'novus sum, consulatum peto, Roma est.'" If authentic, the *Comment. pet.* shows that Quintus thought that Marcus' essential identity was that of *novus homo*; if spurious, it is further testimony of the importance of this identity to Cicero's public persona. On this text see now Morstein-Marx 1998 (especially 260f. on the question of the work's authenticity).

43. This liminality was not legal but entirely rhetorical, however, since Arpinum had enjoyed full Roman citizenship status since 188 BCE. Cf. Berry 1996: 183f. with refs.

not by legal precedent, but according to the canon of aesthetic propriety: the style of a speech should fit the subject matter.⁴⁴ The semantic ambiguity of *persona* (meaning both a person involved in a legal dispute and a literary character)⁴⁵ smoothes Cicero's transition from the role of legal advocate conducting a court case to that of a literary artist who crafts self-consciously poetic prose in honor of his client. In this splendid example of the performative power of epideictic, Cicero simultaneously justifies his use of this mode and employs it.

Cicero then takes a further step in assuming the poet's role when he grants Archias an especially prominent place in his personal history. He claims that, for as long as his memory can recall, Archias was integral to his intellectual development and specifies that Archias helped to mold his voice (*Arch.* 1):

quod si haec vox huius hortatu praeceptisque conformata non nullis aliquando salutis fuit, a quo id accepimus, quo ceteris opitulari et alios servare possumus, huic profecto ipsi, quantum est situm in nobis, et opem et salutem ferre debemus.

But if this voice, which has been molded by Archias' encouragement and instruction, has at any time been a deliverance to some people, I assuredly ought to give help and deliverance to that man from whom I received the means through which I am able to help and deliver others.

Cicero's densely packed words outline a complicated persuasive agenda constructed within the *Pro Archia*'s epideictic framework. This passage engages three closely related themes that are important to the work as a whole: the molding of a voice (which, for an orator like Cicero, is tantamount to the construction of a self), the speech as performance, and the issue of debt and reciprocity.

Cicero first focuses his audience's attention, or his readers' imagination, upon his voice itself. The deictic use of the demonstrative adjective in *haec vox* captures the voice at the moment of actual (or imagined) utterance. The artistry of Cicero's performance is an immediate sensory demonstration of Archias' practical importance to the state. How could Archias not be a valuable member of the community if he molded the voice that saved Rome from Catiline? Cicero's polished performance itself becomes proof of the arguments that he proposes.

Cicero returns to the theme of the voice in a notably high-style and poetic expression (*Arch.* 19): *saxa et solitudines voci respondent, bestiae saepe immanes cantu flectuntur atque consistunt*. While the immediate context is a discussion of the divine gift of poets, specifically the power of the poetic voice, Cicero's

44. For discussions of *decorum*, see Cicero *Orator* 70–74; *Off.* 1.94–99 (for a discussion of moral propriety in light of artistic propriety).

45. See *OLD* s.v., 5 on the use of *persona* in legal contexts. Reid 1877 ad loc. notes that *tractata est* is an expression drawn from drama and is well suited to Cicero's reference to Archias as a *persona*.

language could equally refer to his own *vox* so prominently foregrounded at the beginning of the speech.⁴⁶ Cicero's epideictic performance enacts the convergence of oratory and poetry by becoming poetic to defend Archias. The reception of this passage shows how marked the performative aspects of this text are. Quintilian uses this passage as a paradigmatic example of both vocal tonality and gesture, thus testifying that Cicero's performance of the *Pro Archia* lingered in the imagination of one of his greatest readers in antiquity.⁴⁷

Cicero's finely crafted performance repays his debt to Archias for fashioning his *vox* and signals his expectation of a favor in return. In the *Pro Archia* the theme of mutual benefaction between poets and patrons appears repeatedly and draws attention to the speech's own status as a *quid pro quo*. Cicero relates a darkly comic anecdote of a mercenary *ex tempore* poetic performance: Sulla's use of proceeds from the sale of the goods of the *proscripti* to pay a bad poet for his unmetrical, *ex tempore*, verses, with the stipulation that he never write again.⁴⁸ This story has an apotropaic goal. Cicero presents a particularly grimy exchange between a patron and poet to ward off suspicions from his own more discrete negotiations with Archias.⁴⁹

The *Pro Archia* does not, however, present the relationship between *laudator* and *laudandus* as merely an exchange of services. As Cicero blurs the distinction between himself and Archias, so too he presents his exemplary couplings of poet and patron in such a way that the two blend with each other. Such is the case with Cicero's presentation of Archias' relationship with Lucius Lucullus, where it is not clear whether his description of the war's magnitude, difficulty, and variety of terrain and sea praises the general for his military accomplishment or the poet for his artistic prowess in representing such challenging subject matter.⁵⁰

The coin of these transactions between poet and patron in the *Pro Archia* is sometimes mutual representation. Ennius, who holds a special paradigmatic role in the *Pro Archia*, is rewarded by Scipio Africanus by being represented in a

46. The allusion is to Amphion and Orpheus. See Reid 1877 ad loc.

47. Quintilian *Inst.* 11.3.167: iam cantici quiddam habent sensimque resupina sunt: saxa atque solitudines voci respondent; 11.3.84: at cum speciosius quid uberiusque dicendum est, ut illud saxa atque solitudines voci respondent, expatiatur in latus et ipsa quodam modo se cum gestu fundit oratio.

48. *Arch.* 25: quem (sc. Sullam) nos in contione vidimus, cum ei libellum malus poeta de populo subiecisset, quod epigramma in eum fecisset tantummodo alternis versibus longiusculis, statim ex iis rebus quas tum vendebat iubere ei praemium tribui sub ea condicione, ne quid postea scriberet. This odd scene is particularly striking since Cicero elsewhere describes the Sullan proscriptions as a milestone in Roman political decline and draws special attention to the ignominy of Sulla's selling off the goods of his victims as "booty" (*Off.* 2.27). It is as if the ludic atmosphere of the epideictic mode overrides his sense of *decorum*.

49. Cf. Habinek 1998: 104f. for a discussion, in another context, of the apotropaic gestures of authors who "[b]y talking about a problem . . . hope to make it go away."

50. *Arch.* 21: Mithridaticum vero bellum, magnum atque difficile et in multa varietate terrarumque versatum, totum ab hoc expressum est.

marble statue placed on the family's tomb on the via Appia.⁵¹ Another of Ennius' patrons, Fulvius Nobilior, performed a similar honorific gesture by founding the temple of Hercules and the Muses with spoils from his Ambracian campaign.⁵² These paradigmatic instances of exchange are exemplary of the transaction that the *Pro Archia* as a whole performs. This speech constructs an honorific memorial for Archias in exchange for the poet's past service, while it looks ahead to Archias' creation of a poem celebrating Cicero's consulate (*Arch.* 28):

nam quas res nos in consulatu nostro vobiscum simul pro salute huius
atque imperii et pro vita civium proque universa re publica gessimus,
attigit hic versibus atque inchoavit; quibus auditis, quod mihi magna res
et iucunda visa est, hunc ad perficiendum adhortatus sum.⁵³

Those things which I, along with you, accomplished in my consulate, both for the safety of the empire, the lives of our citizens, and for the republic as a whole, Archias has taken up and begun to celebrate in verses. After I heard them, because it seemed to be a great and pleasing affair, I encouraged him to complete it.

Cicero discreetly veils the terms of this transaction by presenting the poem as Archias' spontaneous creation. And yet Cicero deliberately mentions both that he encouraged Archias to complete the poem and that Archias promised to do so.⁵⁴ The *Pro Archia* thus becomes a token of exchange which both specifies and publicizes the terms of that transaction. Moreover, the speech does not simply anticipate Archias' poem, it also suggests what sort of poem Cicero would like to have from the poet's pen. The premise that underlies much of the *Pro Archia*'s argumentation, the blurring of the boundary between Cicero and Archias, sets in motion a series of reciprocal expectations between poet and patron. The stylistic finish and laudatory exuberance with which Cicero honors Archias sets a standard for the poet to emulate. As Cicero's poetically charged epideictic style represents Archias' formative influence on the voice of the orator, so should Archias' poem mirror the mode of Cicero's speech for the poet.⁵⁵

51. *Arch.* 22: carus fuit Africano superiori noster Ennius, itaque etiam in sepulcro Scipionum putatur is esse constitutus ex marmore. On the importance of Ennius to Cicero, see Shackleton Bailey 1983.

52. *Arch.* 27: iam vero ille, qui cum Aetolis Ennio comite bellavit, Fulvius non dubitavit Martis manubias Musis consecrare. Cicero's "Martis . . . consecrare" may be a quotation from Ennius' *Ambracia* (as Timpanaro 1949: 198–200 suggests). If so, Cicero's choice to use a quotation from the poet's monumental poem to refer to the general's physical monument would emphasize the reciprocal nature of their relationship.

53. I retain E's reading of *adhortatus sum* instead of *adhortavi* G : *adoravi* Schol. : *adornavi* Klotz. In this I follow Reid 1877: 79.

54. *Arch.* 31: . . . eum qui vos, qui vestros imperatores, qui populi Romani res gestas semper ornavit, qui etiam his recentibus nostris vestrisque domesticis periculis aeternum se testimonium laudis daturum esse profitetur.

55. For an example of Cicero's setting his own level of stylistic finish in an oration to match that of gifts received from a client, see *Fam.* 9.12 (to Dolabella) where Cicero claims that his inornate *Pro Deiotaro* matches Deiotarus' own "coarse, homespun" gifts to him.

Archias' compositional techniques, and the unfinished state of his poem in praise of Cicero, provided a natural motivation for the speech's implicit stylistic prescriptions (*Arch.* 18):

quotiens ego hunc Archiam vidi, iudices—utar enim vestra benignitate, quoniam me in hoc novo genere dicendi tam diligenter attenditis—quotiens ego hunc vidi, cum litteram scripsisset nullam, magnum numerum optimorum versuum de eis ipsis rebus quae tum agerentur dicere ex tempore, quotiens revocatum eandem rem dicere commutatis verbis atque sentiis! quae vero accurate cogitateque scripsisset, ea sic vidi probari ut ad veterum scriptorum laudem perveniret.

How many times did I see this fellow Archias, judges—for I shall use your indulgence, since you are so attentively listening to me speaking in this strange genre of speech—how many times did I see this fellow, though he had written not a letter, improvise a great number of excellent verses about the very things that were going on at the time, how many times did I see him, when called for an encore, deliver the same content in different words and expressions! And in fact what he has written carefully and thoughtfully I have seen meet with such approval that he achieved the distinction of great writers of old.

Archias' forte seems to have been the composition of improvised verse. If such was the case, we may construct a plausible scenario for the scene of Archias' composition of his poem on Cicero's consulate. He may have extemporized verses *viva voce* to which Cicero encouraged him to give finished written form. Cicero's contrast between fleeting verbal utterance and careful composition that is fixed in writing, and will stand the test of time, corresponds with his description of the unfinished state of Archias' poem, which Cicero urges him to complete.⁵⁶ The *Pro Archia*'s implicit prescriptions set standards of laudatory exuberance, textual fixity, and stylistic finish for Archias to emulate. The epideictic mode serves Cicero well in this agenda not only because it is the rhetorical register that is closest to poetry, but also because it is a genre that had associations with the textual fixity of a writerly mode intended for distribution to a reading public. Cicero's comparison of Archias with Ennius is meant to inspire Archias to shed the persona of a composer of light impromptu verse and become a monumental epicist.⁵⁷

56. Cicero makes no mention of writing or reading in his description of Archias' composition on his consulate, and instead presents the poem as a performance that he heard (*Arch.* 28). Moreover, Cicero's choice of the word *attigit* to describe Archias' composition suggests an *ex tempore* composition. Williams 1978: 115 (cited by Wiseman 1982: 31) suggests that the poem may have been an epigram. Wiseman 1982: 31f. and 44 n. 35 notes the difference between how Cicero describes Archias' epic on the Mithridatic war (*Arch.* 21: bellum . . . totum . . . expressum est) and the poem for Marius (*Arch.* 19: attigit). See also Hardie 1983: 24. Cf. Quintilian *Inst.* 10.7.19, where Archias and Antipater of Sidon are mentioned as examples of poetic improvisers.

57. On the phenomenon of monumental writing in general see Woolf 1996.

THE *PRO ARCHIA* AS PRE-MORTEM
LAUDATIO FUNEBRIS

Cicero's desire to have his consular self fixed in textual form stemmed from the fact that his social position circumscribed the avenues for self-representation that were available to him. In a gesture that co-opts the mainstay of the *nobiles'* repertoire of self-presentation, Cicero employs *imagines* as the dominant metaphor to express his own cultural self-fashioning (*Arch.* 14):

quam multas nobis imagines non solum ad intuendum, verum etiam ad imitandum fortissimorum virorum expressas scriptores et Graeci et Latini relinquerunt! quas ego mihi semper in administranda re publica proponens, animum et mentem meam ipsa cogitatione hominum excellentium conformabam.

How many *imagines* fashioned of the bravest men have both Greek and Latin writers left for us, not only for us to gaze upon but also to imitate! By continually holding these in my mind while administering the state I used to fashion my heart and mind by the very thought of extraordinary people.

The word *imago* has a broad semantic range and the comparison between literary works and plastic art was a rhetorical topos at least since Isocrates.⁵⁸ Nevertheless, Cicero's claim that he used literary *imagines* in the molding of his heart and mind has clear parallels with passages that refer both to the wax ancestral portraits that the Roman nobility used in their funerary ritual and to their transformative effect on the *nobiles* who gazed upon them.⁵⁹ Near the end of the speech Cicero turns from this more passive use of *imagines* to a comparison between self-representation in literature and memorialization in statues and *imagines* (*Arch.* 30):

an statuas et imagines, non animorum simulacra, sed corporum, studiose multi summi homines relinquerunt; consiliorum relinquere ac virtutum nostrarum effigiem nonne multo malle debemus summis ingeniis expressam et politam?

58. Murphy 1958: 103f. sees in *Arch.* 30 an echo of Isocrates *To Nicocles* 36: βούλου τὰς εἰκόνας τῆς ἀρετῆς ὑπόμνημα μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦ σώματος καταλιπεῖν and also compares *Evagoras* 73 where Isocrates asserts (idem, 104): "that such likenesses of accomplishments can be found only in τοῖς λόγοις τεχνικῶς ἔχουσι ('artistically composed descriptions')." See also Ogilvie and Richmond 1967: 315 on Tacitus *Agricola* 46.3.

59. Sallust *Jugurtha* 4.5: nam saepe audiui Q. Maximum, P. Scipionem, <alios> praeterea civitatis nostrae praeclaros viros solitos ita dicere, quom maiorum imagines intuerentur, vehementissime sibi animum ad virtutem adcendi (see also *Jugurtha* 4.7 for Sallust's contrast between the *nobiles'* use of *imagines* and the *novi homines* who must resort to other tactics for political advancement). Cf. Valerius Maximus' description of the goal of the *tituli* that accompanied these *imagines* (5.8.3): videbat enim se in eo atrio consedis, in quo imperiosi illius Torquati severitate conspicua imago posita erat, prudentissimoque viro succurrebat effigies maiorum cum titulis suis idcirco in prima parte aedium poni solere, ut eorum virtutes posteris non solum legerent, sed etiam imitarentur. See Flower 1996: 185–222, esp. 220f., and Habinek 1998: 51–55.

Many distinguished men have zealously left behind statues and *imagines*, likenesses not of their souls but of their bodies; ought we not much rather prefer to leave behind a likeness of our policies and acts of bravery that has been fashioned and polished by the greatest geniuses?

By metaphorically co-opting a representational mode within the *nobiles*' exclusive domain,⁶⁰ Cicero employs a subversive strategy that makes a liability into an asset.⁶¹ In Sallust's account, Marius, the other Arpinate *novus homo*, questions the integrity of the *imagines* as a sign system that reflects true nobility and claims that his "*imagines*" are the war trophies and the scars that he received in battle.⁶² Likewise, Cicero claims that his self-presentation through literary *imagines* exploits a mimetic capacity that is greater than that of the aristocrats' *imagines*, while he also emphasizes the formative role played by artistic "polish" in literary representation.⁶³ Cicero's program is more innovative and culturally ambitious than Marius', whose critique of the *nobiles*' image-system is based on his prowess in the traditionally valued realm of warfare.⁶⁴ Cicero, in contrast, implicitly critiques the standard Roman notion of *virtus* by extending it beyond soldiering and even politics and into the realms of rhetoric, literature, and the aesthetic. The *Pro Archia* develops and broadens the persona of *imperator togatus* that Cicero had introduced in the Catilinarians, and seeks to negotiate what was, in traditional Roman thought, a contradiction in terms.⁶⁵ Cicero's speech seeks

60. While it has been long thought that there existed a formal *ius imaginum* that was conferred upon those who reached the curule aedileship (based on Cicero, *In Verrem* 5.36: [a list of the honors enjoyed by a curule aedile:] *togam praetextam, sellam curulem, ius imaginis memoriam posteritatemque prodendae*). Flower 1996: 53–59 convincingly argues, using evidence from the newly discovered *S.C. de Cn. Pisone patre*, that Cicero refers here to a custom and not a formal statute. On Cicero's transforming the nobility's *imagines* into his own form of self-representation in the *Pro Archia*, see Narducci 1997: 16f.

61. For Cicero's boast to have reached the consulate without the help of *imagines* and the noble ancestry they represent, see *De lege agraria* 2.100: *nulli populo Romano pro me maiores mei sponponderunt: mihi creditum est; a me petere quod debeo, me ipsum appellare debetis. quem ad modum, cum petebam, nulli me vobis auctores generis mei commendarunt, sic, si quid deliquero, nullae sunt imagines quae me a vobis deprecentur.*

62. Sallust *Jugurtha* 85.29: *non possum fidei causa imagines neque triumphos aut consulatus maiorum meorum ostendere, at, si res postulet, hastas, vexillum, phaleras, alia militaria dona, praeterea cicatrices advorso corpore. hae sunt meae imagines, haec nobilitas, non hereditate relicta, ut illa illis, sed quae ego meis plurimis laboribus et periculis quaesivi.*

63. Cicero's attention to the formative effects of literature's representational medium contrasts with Sallust's insistence that it is *not* the *imagines*' wax or molding that produces their effects on the *nobiles*. See *Jugurtha* 4.6: *scilicet non ceram illam neque figuram tantam vim in sese habere, sed memoria rerum gestarum eam flammam egregiis viris in pectore crescere neque prius sedari, quam virtus eorum famam atque gloriam adaequaverit.*

64. Cicero presents Marius in *Arch.* 5 as an incomplete consul. While Marius performs deeds worthy of Archias' pen, his colleague Catulus combines such accomplishments with an appreciation for literature: *alter [sc. Marius] res ad scribendum maximas, alter [sc. Catulus] cum res gestas tum etiam studium atque aures adhibere posset.* Cf. *Arch.* 19.

65. *Cat.* 2.28: *me uno togato duce et imperatore sedetur;* 3.15: *quod (sc. supplicatio) mihi primum post hanc urbem conditam togato contigit;* 3.23: *togati me uno togato duce et imperatore*

to confound this distinction by presenting *imperatores*, fresh out of their armor, cultivating poets and the Muses, thus setting a standard for Archias' toga-wearing judges to follow.⁶⁶

Cicero's inclusion of these literary *imagines* signals another of his self-fashioning strategies in the *Pro Archia*. In his defense of Archias, Cicero creates a hybrid of Greek *epideixis* and the Roman *laudatio funebris* by importing into his text the *imagines* which are the material complement of the funeral oration, thus transforming the speech into a text that fulfills the function of a funeral oration to himself. Besides the *imagines*, the *Pro Archia* contains several themes and motifs associated with the *laudatio funebris*: catalogues of exemplary individuals who shaped Cicero's self; a preoccupation with the power of representations both to spur on an individual towards greatness and to overcome the oblivion of the grave (14, 23, 30); a short obituary for the recently-deceased actor Roscius (17); and a meditation on the soul's ability after death to perceive events (30).⁶⁷ Much that Cicero says in the speech, if changed from a first- to a third-person narrative, would fit the generic expectations of the funeral oration. The *laudatio funebris* form allows Cicero's self-presentation in the *Pro Archia* to assume the perspective of ultimate monumentality and the authority of a narrative that has reached its final conclusion, while avoiding death's demand for silence.⁶⁸

THE CORRUPTIBILITY OF THE WRITTEN WORD AND THE FAILURE OF THE *PRO ARCHIA*

While it is not known for certain whether the *Pro Archia* won Archias his citizenship, Cicero himself attests to its inability to coax a poem from Archias' pen.⁶⁹ The terms in which Cicero presents his failure show how far he fell short of achieving the outcome he desired. In a letter to Atticus written in early July of 61, Cicero grudgingly accepts the fact that he will have to be satisfied with the celebratory epigrams that Atticus has placed in his private shrine to the Nereid

vicistis. Cf. *Pis.* 6: mihi togato senatus, non ut multis bene gesta, sed ut nemini conservata re publica singulari genere supplicationis deorum immortalium templa patefecit. Habinek 1998 summarizes the goal of Cicero's togate rhetoric nicely, saying that it constituted (87) "a new myth, one rooted in the potential of a civilian government to parry weapons with the toga and to defeat military might through the power of language." Cf. Habinek 1994: 62f. and see Nicolet 1960, Narducci 1997: 15. For an illuminating study of Cicero's fashioning of his consular *persona* in the *First Catilinarian*, see Batstone 1994.

66. *Arch.* 27: quare, in qua urbe imperatores prope armati poetarum nomen et Musarum delubra coluerunt, in ea non debent togati iudices a Musarum honore et a poetarum salute abhorreere.

67. For a collection of the extant fragments see Vollmer 1891. Cf. Flower 1996: 128–58.

68. On Cicero's delight at the thought of self-memorialization that one usually receives after death, see *Arch.* 30: nunc quidem certe cogitatione quadam speque delector. On how death, or likeness, can confer meaning to a narrative, see Brooks 1984: 90–112 (ch. 4: "Freud's Masterplot: Model for Narrative"), esp. 95.

69. It is generally assumed that Cicero defended Archias successfully. See Alexander 1991: 115.

Amalthea, since Thyillus has abandoned him and Archias has written nothing about him. Cicero suspects that, after finishing a poem for the Luculli (probably the work referred to in *Arch.* 21), Archias has turned his attention to composing a play in honor of one of the Metelli.⁷⁰ He is forced to confront the fact that his experience has undone the valorization of literary over material monuments that is a central trope in the *Pro Archia*, and that Archias has spurned his petition for poetic *imagines* in favor of commissions from powerful aristocratic patrons who assisted Archias in acquiring his Roman citizenship.⁷¹

Archias' failure to write the promised poem, far from being an anomaly, is but one of many instances in the years following his consulate when Cicero did not receive honorific memorialization from other writers. Moreover, the pathology of Cicero's failure to persuade, or compel, others to celebrate his accomplishments is anticipated within the text of the *Pro Archia* itself. Cicero claims that Archias is a properly naturalized Roman citizen, and yet he argues that the value of the poet's cultural contribution to the state alone would justify his citizenship.⁷² His legal arguments—which the *Pro Archia*'s cultural arguments suppress—privilege the living voice over textual evidence, and thus conflict with the speech's goal of persuading Archias to publish his poem on Cicero's consulate. These legal points also designate personal *auctoritas* as the factor that determines textual authority, thus unwittingly diagnosing the failure of the *Pro Archia* itself in its negotiations with Archias. The poet's refusal to produce the promised poem highlights Cicero's own declining *auctoritas* in the years following his consulate. Thus the legal digression articulates social and political realities that the *Pro Archia*'s cultural program sought to transcend, and it encodes the very ways that Cicero's program of self-fashioning, both in this speech and globally, would later fail.

In place of the citizenship documents from Heraclea which were destroyed in the Social War, Cicero presents Archias' patron Marcus Lucullus and an embassy

70. *Att.* 1.16.15: epigrammatis tuis, quae in Amaltheo posuisti, contenti erimus, praesertim cum et Thyillus nos reliquerit et Archias nihil de me scripserit; ac vereor ne, Lucullis quoniam Graecum poema condidit, nunc ad Caecilianam fabulam spectet. On Atticus' shrine to Amalthea and Cicero's desire to build one of his own, see Moore 1906. Nepos *Att.* 18 refers to Atticus' composition of epigrams in honor of distinguished Romans. On Cicero's punning reference to this play for the Metelli see Shackleton Bailey 1965: 325. Thyillus, who may have been a freedman of Cicero (*Att.* 1.9.2 attests that he was in Cicero's household in 67), is the author of three poems in the *Anthology* (*Anth. Pal.* 6.170; 7.223; 10.5). See Williams 1978: 115.

71. For Archias' close relationship with the M. and L. Lucullus, see *Arch.* 8 (Marcus' appearance in court to testify that Archias was a citizen of the federated state of Heraclea), 11 (Archias' traveling on military campaigns with Lucius), and 21 (the poem in honor of Lucius' conduct of the Mithridatic war); for his friendship with Q. Metellus Pius (cos. 80) see *Arch.* 7 (Archias' reporting his residential status in Rome to his friend Metellus who was serving as praetor, in accordance with the citizenship requirements of the lex Plautia Papiria), 9 (the appearance of Archias' name in Metellus' citizenship rolls), 26, and 31.

72. *Arch.* 4: perficiam profecto ut hunc A. Licinium non modo non segregandum, cum sit civis, a numero civium, verum etiam, si non esset, putetis asciscendum fuisse.

from that city to attest orally to Archias' naturalization. Lucullus' prestige, scrupulousness, and credibility guarantee the reliability of his words.⁷³ Cicero offers a general principle that valorizes authoritative speech over the corruptible written word (*Arch.* 8):⁷⁴

est ridiculum ... de hominum memoria tacere, litterarum memoriam flagitare; et cum habeas amplissimi viri religionem, integerrimi municipii iusiurandum fidemque, ea, quae depravari nullo modo possunt, repudiare, tabulas, quas idem dicis solere corrumpi, desiderare.

It is ridiculous ... to keep quiet about human memory, but to demand the memory of letters; and though you have the scrupulousness of a most distinguished man, and the pledge and trust of a community of the highest integrity, to reject those things which can in no way be corrupted, but to clamor after documents, which at the same time you say are liable to be falsified.

Cicero then must deal with the question of what determines the validity of different sources of textual evidence when he confronts the awkwardness that Archias' name appears in the citizenship rolls of one of the Roman praetors from 89, Q. Metellus Pius, but is absent from the rolls of two others, A. Claudius Pulcher (the father of Cicero's enemy P. Clodius) and P. Gabinius Capito. Cicero extricates himself from this difficulty by asserting that it is personal *auctoritas* that determines the validity of written texts (*Arch.* 9):

nam cum Appi tabulae neglegentius adservatae dicerentur, Gabinii, quamdiu incolumis fuit, levitas, post damnationem, calamitas omnem tabularum fidem resignasset, Metellus, homo sanctissimus modestissimusque omnium, tanta diligentia fuit, ut ad Lentulum praetorem et ad iudices venerit et unius nominis litura se commotum esse dixerit. his igitur tabulis nullam lituram in nomen A. Licinii videtis.

For whereas it is alleged that the documents of Appius were rather carelessly maintained, and as for those of Gabinius, so long as he was not convicted, his frivolousness, and after he was convicted, his downfall completely undermined the credibility of his documents, Metellus, the most conscientious and most loyal of all men, was a man of such scrupulousness that he came to the praetor Lentulus and to a trial and said that he was disturbed by the erasure of a single name. In these documents, then, you see no erasure over the name of Aulus Licinius Archias.

Here Cicero's use of the metaphor of breaking the seal of a document (*omnium tabularum fidem resignasset*) to express the impairment of textual authority provides a vivid image of the physical vulnerability of texts in the absence of personal

73. *Arch.* 8: adest vir summa auctoritate et religione et fide. M. Lucullus, qui se non opinari, sed scire, non audivisse, sed vidisse, non interfuisse, sed egisse dicit.

74. See Habinek 1998: 103 on the dynamic of textuality and aristocratic presence.

auctoritas.⁷⁵ P. Gabinius Capito was praetor in 89 and afterwards propraetor in Achaia. The *post damnationem calamitas* to which Cicero alludes is Gabinius' conviction on charges of extortion during his propraetorate.⁷⁶ The combination of an inherent insubstantiality (*levitas*) with political disaster, therefore, destroyed the validity of the texts under his supervision. In contrast, Metellus' scrupulous trustworthiness led him to extraordinary measures to authenticate his documents by going to his colleague Lentulus for his appraisal of a suspect entry.⁷⁷

The rhetoric of this legal digression, in keeping with Cicero's privileging of the spoken over the written word, accords with what could be termed the "foundational myth" of the *Pro Archia*: that Cicero's living voice vested with consular *auctoritas*, in and of itself, validates Archias' claim to Roman citizenship. However, this valorization of voice over text runs diametrically opposite to Cicero's goal of having Archias give textual fixity to his *ex tempore* composition in honor of Cicero's consulate. According to the *Pro Archia*'s own logic, its inability to obligate Archias to write a poem on Cicero's behalf suggests a deficit of *auctoritas*. The speech's failure is all the more precipitous since it dramatizes the decay of that very quality that enabled the composition of the *Pro Archia* in the first place, namely, Cicero's consular prestige. That Archias does not reciprocate Cicero's artfully crafted speech with a poem in the consular's honor, but instead offers his services to the Luculli and Metelli (those figures responsible for the legal basis of his case for naturalization), underscores both the collapse of the *Pro Archia*'s self-fashioning strategies and Cicero's misplaced confidence in the power of literary polish to compete on the same level as long-standing political alliances.

In its failed entreaty that Archias "finish off" the poem on Cicero's consulate (*Arch.* 28: *perficiendum*), the *Pro Archia* provides an idealizing depiction of textual polish (*Arch.* 30: *effigiem . . . summis ingeniis expressam et politam*).⁷⁸ This mystification of textual polish seeks to obscure the compromising similarity that it shares with erasure, that quality whose presence (as the legal arguments of the *Pro Archia* claim) undermines the integrity of a document. Both processes, polish and erasure, involve the removal of material and traces that one does not wish to remain visible. In the years following his consulate, Cicero's compromised *auctoritas*, especially after the *calamitas* of his exile, will allow others to assert that his own and others' texts that celebrate his consulate are as tampered with, corrupted, and subjected to erasure as Gabinius' suspect citizenship rolls. Moreover, Cicero's deficit of *auctoritas* will compel him to make increasingly explicit requests for "polish" that will erase events Cicero wants obliterated from the record.

75. *OLD* s.v. *resigno* 1.

76. See *PW* VII col. 430 (Gabinius 13).

77. For a discussion of oral versus written testimony see Quintilian *Inst.* 5.7.32–34.

78. *Arch.* 18 (on the quality of Archias' polished written compositions and the linkage between textual polish and longevity): *quae vero accurate cogitateque scripsisset, ea sic vidi probari, ut ad veterum scriptorum laudem pervenerit.*

THE LETTER TO LUCCEIUS,
ORNATUS, AND THE FIGHT FOR TEXTUAL FIXITY

The legacy of Cicero's consulate, which immediately won him both glory and vilification, never rested on anything but an unstable foundation. Cicero's execution of Roman citizens without trial on the Nones of December was an event of such moral and legal ambiguity that Cicero was compelled to go to extraordinary lengths to defend his actions, both while still in office and in the years following. Subsequent outcomes showed that Cicero's energetic attempts to shield his consulate from attack were as necessary as they were futile: the exile that Clodius engineered for Cicero in 58 brought home to him the inherent instability, ambiguity, and danger posed by his consulate, and led him to the horrifying realization that his greatest claim to glory directly precipitated his greatest personal and political disaster. The irony of the situation tormented Cicero, who, in a letter to his brother from exile in Thessalonica in June of 57, wrote: "that acclaimed consulate of mine has stolen from me you, my children, my country, and my fortunes."⁷⁹

After the humiliation of his exile, Cicero had both to legitimize his consulate and rationalize the subsequent collapse of his prestige. While the *Pro Archia* resists a suspicious reading of what precisely is involved in the literary fiction Cicero hopes that Archias will provide, Cicero's letter of April 55 to his friend and historian Luceius glosses the meaning of this *ornatus*.⁸⁰ This letter shows Cicero transacting a negotiation similar to that which he attempted in the *Pro Archia*, but in very different post-exilic circumstances.⁸¹ In the private writing of a personal letter, however, Cicero is free to voice themes that the public venue of the *Archia* did not allow him to express openly, since the epistolary medium, according to Cicero, encourages a greater level of candor than a face-to-face discussion. This letter is roughly contemporary with the invective against Piso and presents a positive example of Cicero's post-exilic self-presentation, while the *In Pisonem* shows its negative analogue. As the Luceius letter seeks to rehabilitate Cicero's political self through an ornamented laudation, so the *In Pisonem* strikes out those Cicero held responsible for his exile, namely L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus.

79. *Q. Fr.* 1.3.1: *meus ille laudatus consulatus mihi te, liberos, patriam, fortunas, tibi vix ne quid eripuerit praeter unum me.*

80. I should note that I use the word *ornatus* not as a term limited to the domain of stylistics but to denote a broader cultural phenomenon of textual embellishment and "polish."

81. Cicero's correspondence preserves examples of others seeking out Cicero's praise in the same way that Cicero does with Luceius: see the letters from Lentulus (*Fam.* 12.14.6f., which includes a list of his accomplishments; cf. Allen 1954: 125) and Trebonius (*Fam.* 12.16). On the general state of affairs, see Allen 1954: 135: "It was a political necessity that there should be an interchange of praise among statesmen, and also that there should be gratitude when one heard he had been praised (*Att.* 2.25.1)."

82. *Fam.* 5.12.1: *coram me tecum eadem haec agere saepe conantem deterruit pudor qui paene subrusticus. quae nunc expromam absens audacius: epistula non erubescit.*

and Aulus Gabinius, the consuls under whom Clodius' laws exiling Cicero had passed.⁸³ One could say, then, that the letter uses the *Pro Archia*'s strategies within the *In Pisonem*'s historical circumstances.

Similarities in both the form and the content of their rhetorical tactics show that the *Pro Archia* and the letter to Luceius perform similar negotiations. In this letter Cicero appears either to allude to passages from the *Pro Archia* or to draw upon the same store of common-places,⁸⁴ thus attesting, certainly, to the fact that these two texts are engaged in similar persuasive programs, and, perhaps, to the canonicity that the *Pro Archia* has achieved in the intervening years.⁸⁵ Moreover, each text makes stylistic prescriptions in the same way. As Cicero gives the *Pro Archia*, as an epideictic oration, a high degree of stylistic polish that anticipates a similarly polished text in exchange, so too the letter to Luceius engages codes of highly polished, carefully wrought praise that signal expectations of a similar text from Luceius: Cicero presents this letter to Atticus as so finely crafted a piece of writing (*valde bella est*) that Atticus should acquire a copy from Luceius.⁸⁶ And what sort of textual polish does this polished composition ask in return? To Luceius Cicero makes explicit what we may well suspect was implicit in the negotiation transacted in his defense of Archias (*Ad fam.* 5.12.2–3):

neque tamen ignoro quam impudenter faciam qui primum tibi tantum oneris imponam—potest enim mihi denegare occupatio tua—deinde etiam ut ornas me postulem. quid, si illa tibi non tanto opere videntur ornanda? sed tamen, qui semel verecundiae finis transierit, eum bene et naviter oportet esse impudentem. itaque te plane etiam atque etiam rogo, ut et ornas ea vehementius etiam quam fortasse sentis, et in eo leges historiae neglegas gratiamque illam . . . si me tibi vehementius commendabit,

83. In addition to the *In Pisonem*, Piso and Gabinius also come under attack in *Red. sen.* 13–16 and *Sest.* 19–24.

84. Cf. *Fam.* 5.12.7: unus enim Xenophontis libellus in eo rege laudando facile omnis imagines omnium statuasque superavit, with *Arch.* 30: an statuas et imagines, non animorum simulacra, sed corporum, studiose multi summi homines reliquerunt, consiliorum relinquere ac virtutum nostrarum effigiem non multo malle debemus. summis ingeniis expressam et politam? (cf. *Rep.* 6.8); and *Fam.* 5.12.7: ut mihi non solum praeconium, quod, cum in Sigeum venisset, Alexander ab Homero Achilli tributum esse dixit, with *Arch.* 24: atque is tamen, cum in Sigeo ad Achillis tumulum adstitisset, "o fortunate, inquit, adolescens, qui tuae virtutis Homerum praeconem inveneris!" Each also expresses Cicero's desire for fame (*Arch.* 28 and *Fam.* 5.12.1, 5.12.9).

85. Further evidence for the *Pro Archia*'s canonicity is to be found in a letter dating from 45 in which Cicero reports Luceius' consolatory advice to him that contains this phrase (*Fam.* 5.13.5): ad ea, quibus secundae res ornantur, adversae adiuvantur (cf. *Arch.* 16: at haec studia adolescentiam agunt, senectutem oblectant, secundas res ornant, adversis perfrugium ac solacium praebent). Has the *Pro Archia* achieved such a level of canonicity that, so many years after its publication, Cicero finds Luceius quoting the speech back to him? For another echo of this passage see Quintilian *Inst.* 1.4.5.

86. *Att.* 4.6.4: epistolam Luceio quam misi, qua meas res ut scribat rogo, fac ut ab eo sumas (*valde bella est*) eumque ut adproperet adhorteris, et quod mihi se ita facturum rescripsit agas gratias. Hall 1998 suggests that Cicero's pride in the letter is as much because of the subtlety of the delicate request it makes as it is on account of its stylistic finish.

ne aspernere amorique nostro plusculum etiam quam concedet veritas, largiare.

Not that I am unconscious of the effrontery of what I am about, first in laying such a burden upon you (pressure of work may refuse me), and secondly in asking you to write about me eulogistically. What if the record does not appear to you so eminently deserving of eulogy? But still, once one has passed the bounds of modesty, he ought to be well and heartily shameless. And so I ask you again, and openly, that you glorify these events even more strongly than you perhaps feel, and that you in this case waive the laws of history and do not neglect that personal bias if it urges you more strongly on my behalf, and yield to our affection a bit more than even the truth will allow.⁸⁷

Cicero's radically different circumstances in 55 would have made him all the more anxious for flattering textual representation than he was in 62. He makes explicit what was left implicit in the *Pro Archia*, that *ornatus* is a supplementary process beyond, and in addition to, mere textual representation.⁸⁸ Cicero then makes a further request beyond that which he voiced in the *Pro Archia*. His careful delineation of the bonds of *amicitia* between himself and Archias implicitly required that Archias produce a text in honor of Cicero as ornamented as the *Pro Archia*. Yet Cicero explicitly asks Luceius to allow his personal attachment to Cicero (*amor, gratia*), rather than the events themselves or whatever the historian might feel about them, to determine the degree of *ornatus* he lends to Cicero's story.

Cicero's recommendation that Luceius treat his story from the Catilinarian plot to the return from exile suggests that the textual polish which Cicero requests from both Luceius and Archias involves a degree of erasure, the selective obliteration of unflattering incidents from their texts. Luceius' specialty, the theory of political insurrections, would provide a venue for the historian to praise and blame deserving parties. As if to stave off the possibility that his own policies might be unfavorably evaluated, Cicero immediately stipulates that

87. In rendering *Fam.* 5.12 I borrow from the translation by Shackleton Bailey 1978 since it aptly captures the stylistic finish of Cicero's prose.

88. *Att.* 2.1 (June of 60) catalogues several of Cicero's attempts to encourage others to celebrate his consulate. Cicero makes clear that the role of his *laudatores* is to provide *ornatus* to his accomplishments, a task for which Cicero has circulated a Greek prose narrative as a template. See (of Posidonius) *Att.* 2.1.2: *quamquam ad me rescripsit iam Rhodo Posidonius se, nostrum illi ὑπόμνημα <cum> legeret, quod ego ad eum ut ornatius de isdem rebus scriberet miseram, non modo non excitatum esse ad scribendum sed etiam plane deterritum, quid quaeris? conturbavi Graecarum nationem, ita vulgo qui instabant ut darem sibi quod ornarent, iam exhibere mihi molestiarum destiterunt; and Att. 2.1.1 (Cicero's comparison between Atticus' austere, and his own lavish ornamented, praise): *quamquam tua illa (legi enim libenter) horridula mihi atque incompta vis sunt, sed tamen erant ornata hoc ipso quod ornamenta neglexerant . . . meus autem liber totum Isocrati myrothecium atque omnis eius discipulorum arculas ac non nihil etiam Aristoteliae pigmentum consumpsit.**

should Luceius employ his customary frankness (*liberius*), he would mark out for censure the untrustworthiness, plots, and betrayal that many people showed towards him. In the guise of celebrating Luceius' freedom of speech, Cicero carefully places any unflattering reference to himself out of the bounds of Luceius' work.⁸⁹ The written account that Cicero promises to provide Luceius, should he take up this commission, would doubtless provide a more detailed narrative prescription than Cicero hints at here.⁹⁰

Cicero's negotiations with Archias and Luceius also show the vital role that *ornatus* plays within the economy of praise and prestige. The polish that Cicero gives to both the letter to Luceius and the speech for Archias makes these texts suitably valuable items of exchange.⁹¹ *Ornatus* transforms each text into an object of tangible value for its recipient: the *Pro Archia*'s textual polish demonstrates the speech's central argument (the practical utility of poets like Archias) and so contributes to the successful resolution of Archias' legal problems; for Luceius the value would be the less immediate benefit of flattery from a consular who, in 55, had considerable literary, if not much political, prestige. For Cicero, *ornatus* gives his text the value necessary to oblige its recipient to craft a text of reciprocal praise of similar value, marked with a proportional degree of *ornatus*.

Moreover, polish authorizes a text as the work of a particular artist. *Ornatus* leaves the stamp of an esteemed writer's *ingenium*, which thus adds value to the work.⁹² The fate of Cicero's speech against Curio and Clodius provides an illuminating negative example of the linkage between stylistic polish and textual authority. In exile Cicero was anxious that this text, which had gotten into circulation without his approval, not alienate the elder Curio and become an obstacle to his recall. Cicero expresses his hope that the *In Curionem*'s lack of textual finish will allow him to claim that the work is a forgery.⁹³ As Cicero wants the *In Curionem*'s careless composition to cast doubt on its legitimacy, so he lends the *Pro Archia* a level of stylistic finish to mark it as the work of the genius who

89. *Fam.* 5.12.4: *illa poteris uti civiliū commutationum scientia vel in explicandis causis rerum novarum vel in remediis incommodorum. cum et reprehendes ea quae vituperanda duces et quae placebunt exponendis rationibus comprobabis et, si liberius, ut consuesti, agendum putabis, multorum in nos perfidiam, insidias, proditionem notabis.* Rudd 1992: 24 astutely notes that Cicero leaves room for "no mention of any possible hesitations or misjudgments on the consul's part."

90. *Fam.* 5.12.10: *si enim suscipis causam, conficiam commentarios rerum omnium.*

91. See Habinek 1998: 112 on how the polish in Catullus 1 marks the book as a fitting item of exchange for Nepos: "The verb *dono* performs the dedication, while the description of the *libellus* as 'having been given a smooth finish' (*expolitum*) characterizes it as the sort of prestige object appropriate for such an action: both high-quality books and marble statues receive this treatment." Cf. Batstone 1998.

92. Note Cicero's linkage of *ingenium* and polish (*Arch.* 30): *effigiem ... summis ingeniis expressam et politam*; and his desire to reap the benefit of Luceius' *auctoritas* and *ingenium* (*Fam.* 5.12.1): *illa cupiditas ut vel auctoritate testimoni tui vel iudicio benevolentiae vel suavitate ingeni vivi perfruarur.*

93. *Att.* 3.12.2: *quia scripta mihi videtur neglegentius quam ceterae puto ex se <posse> probari non esse meam.*

crafted the Catilinarians.⁹⁴ Cicero hopes that the *In Curionem*'s compromised authenticity will have the opposite effect of the deeply marked authorial stamp which the *Pro Archia* bears: polish renders a text long-lived, while neglect makes it ephemeral.⁹⁵ The problem that the *In Curionem* posed to Cicero shows the unintended perils of textual fixity. The fixity of Cicero's poem on his consulate, the *Consulatus Suus*, would later pose similar problems, as we shall see in the *In Pisonem*.⁹⁶

The conspicuous failures of writers to deliver Cicero texts, either ornamented to his satisfaction or at all, should not obscure the fact that Cicero did, on occasion, succeed in setting a stylistic keynote that others emulated. Such was the case in 61 when Crassus, to Cicero's surprise, delivered a speech in the senate praising Cicero's consulate that parroted back Cicero's own heavily ornamented themes. The fact that Crassus delivered this speech largely in an effort to embarrass Pompey does not negate the fact that Cicero here succeeds in ventriloquizing his ideas through a leading member of the senate. Cicero's self-praise and his attempts to win praise from others were purposeful activities well adapted to the realities of late republican politics.⁹⁷ *Ornatus* was not simply empty adornment, but a substantial presence in Roman public life of real political consequence.

THE *IN PISONEM* AND *PRO ARCHIA*

The ludic realm that the epideictic mode summons is as much a formative influence in the *In Pisonem* as in the *Pro Archia*.⁹⁸ As the *Pro Archia* substitutes an oratorical performance for legal argumentation, so the *In Pisonem* is a staged verbal assault on an enemy that takes the place of real criminal prosecution (a

94. In addition to Cicero's direct statement that Archias deserves a share of the credit for Cicero's success in defending the republic, and his repeated allusions to his recent successes, we find Cicero's language echoing that of the Catilinarians. Compare (*Arch.* 21) urbem . . . totius belli ore ac faucibus ereptam esse atque servatam (in reference to Lucullus' saving the city of Cyzicus) and (*Cat.* 3.1) urbem . . . paene e faucibus fati ereptam et vobis conservatam.

95. Cf. how Catullus 1 implicitly links polish with longevity. See Habinek 1998: 112f.

96. See Courtney 1993: 156, who argues that Cicero called his poem *Consulatus Suus* and not, as is generally supposed, *De Consulatu Suo*.

97. *Att.* 1.14.3: Crassus . . . surrexit ornatissimeque de meo consulatu locutus est, ut ita diceret, se quod esset senator, quod civis, quod liber, quod viveret, mihi acceptum referre; quotiens coniugem, quotiens domum, quotiens patriam videret, totiens se beneficium meum videre. quid multa? totum hunc locum quem ego varie meis orationibus, quarum tu Aristarchus es, soleo pingere de flamma, de ferro (nosti illas ληκῦθουζ), valde graviter pertexuit. Cicero's presentation of these prescriptions in textual terms shows the importance of textual fixity to his program of self-promotion. On Cicero's setting a discourse of praise in the *Catilinarians* that Pompey later follows, see Allen 1954: 135; *Cat.* 4.21 is echoed in what Pompey is reported to have said in *Att.* 2.1.6. Cf. *Phil.* 2.12 and *Off.* 1.77f.

98. Cicero marks the epideictic genus of the *In Pisonem* in ways that correspond to those in the *Pro Archia*: *Pis.* 71: hoc opus genus orationis quo nunc utor ab huius loci more abhorreret; cf. *Arch.* 3: uti genere dicendi quod non modo a consuetudine iudiciorum verum etiam a forensi sermone abhorreat. For the ancient reception of the *In Pisonem* as an example of epideictic, see Quintilian *Inst.* 3.7.2.

prosecution that never took place because of Cicero's political weakness and the protection Piso enjoyed as Caesar's father-in-law).⁹⁹ Each speech is a ludic text that stands as a proxy for a "real" text that Cicero chose not to write, and, as such, functions with a similar generic license to play by rules of its own construction.

The epideictic mode, by embracing both praise and invective, links the speeches' rhetorical strategies in such a way that *personae*, themes, and metaphors for representation that appeared in the *Pro Archia* reappear in the *In Pisonem*, but in burlesque, inverted forms. The *Pro Archia* had three basic players who propel the drama: Cicero appears in the role of the heroic, brilliant consular seeking just glory for his service; Archias, the consular's client and former teacher, is the Greek-speaking poet whose poetry is presented as having a public, exemplary role; and Grattius is the malevolent and shadowy accuser. The *In Pisonem* recasts these roles in their opposite form: Cicero takes the role of "accuser"; Piso plays a depraved, stupid, and inglorious consul whose wickedness is concealed beneath a veneer of respectability; and Philodemus takes the role of the consular's exasperated tutor, whose frivolous verse memorializes his patron's private depravity.

A change of tone and texture accompanies the transformation of players. The *Pro Archia* offers a unified view of human experience wherein all activities (poetic, rhetorical, and political) are woven together into the unbroken fabric of Cicero's seamless prose.¹⁰⁰ In the *In Pisonem* this world disintegrates into a landscape littered with lurid fragments and failed intentions. The *Pro Archia*'s realm is one in which sign and referent, and praiser and praised, are bound closely together; that of the *In Pisonem* is marked by profound semiotic uncertainty. The failure of signs to coincide with referents is a repeated theme in the speech, including Cicero's claim that Piso's name, but not Piso himself, was made consul (*Pis. 2: Piso est a populo Romano factus, non iste Piso*); Piso refuses to allow senators to wear clothing of mourning to protest Cicero's exile (*Pis. 18: maerorem relinquis, maeroris aufers insignia*); Piso's belief that the consulate consists in its trappings (*Pis. 23: tu in lictoribus, in toga praetexta esse consulatum putas*); and that shame and opprobrium are only words to Piso (*Pis. 65: existimatio, dedecus, infamia, turpitudine, verba atque ineptiae*). To move from *Pro Archia* to *In Pisonem* is to move from lofty idealism to withering pessimism, from public glory to private vice. While epic grandeur is the dominant mode of the *Pro Archia*, in the *In Pisonem* the satiric and the bitterly comic prevail.

99. *Pis.* 50 and 90 detail specific laws that Piso has broken. *Pis.* 82 announces Cicero's intention not to prosecute Piso now, while sections 83–94 provide a list of Piso's transgressions that concludes with Cicero's threat to prosecute at a more suitable time. See Nisbet 1961: 175–80 for a discussion of Cicero's allegations. It should be noted, however, that it is very unlikely that Cicero, as a member of the senatorial class, would have prosecuted Piso under any circumstances. While an orator might use an accusation to advance his career in its early stages (as Cicero did with the *Verrines*), established speakers seldom undertook prosecutions. See Narducci 1997: 146f.

100. Cf. *Arch.* 2: etenim omnes artes, quae ad humanitatem pertinent, habent quoddam commune vinculum et quasi cognatione quadam inter se continentur.

The *In Pisonem*'s world of discontinuity and instability thus presented Cicero with an entirely different framework for his self-fashioning designs than the *Pro Archia*. While Cicero used Archias as a vehicle for his self-presentation by blurring the boundary between his self and that of his client, Piso, in contrast, functions as a foil who is the opposite of Cicero.¹⁰¹ The *In Pisonem*'s attack on Piso performs two simultaneous tasks: it exacts retribution against that figure whom Cicero treated as largely responsible for his exile and his consequent loss of prestige, and it seeks to recuperate that lost prestige by presenting Piso's vices as the mirrored opposite of Cicero's own virtues. By so radically configuring Piso as Other, and by casting suspicion on all of those qualities that Cicero presents as absolutely Other than his own qualities, by implication Cicero validates his own self.

Comparison between the deployment of *imagines* in each text provides a focal point for the comparison of their different discourses of self-presentation. The *Pro Archia* co-opts the prestige and presumed semiotic stability of these wax masks and thus uses this aristocratic sign-system for Cicero's own, more egalitarian, form of cultural self-fashioning. Within this speech, the *imagines* are signifiers that are not only reliable conveyers of meaning, but of meaning that is transformative: it is by contemplation of these *imagines* that Cicero constructed his self according to their example.¹⁰² The *In Pisonem*, in contrast, presents Piso as a fallen aristocrat whose *imagines* are a false credential (*Pis.* 1):¹⁰³

oculi supercilia frons voltus denique totus qui sermo quidam tacitus mentis est, hic in fraudem homines impulit, hic eos quibus eras ignotus decepit fefellit induxit. pauci ista tua lutulenta vitia noramus, pauci tarditatem ingeni, stuporem debilitatemque linguae. numquam erat audita vox in foro, numquam periculum factum consili, nullum non modo inlustre sed ne notum quidem factum aut militiae aut domi. obstrepisti ad honores errore hominum commendatione fumosarum imaginum, quorum simile habes nihil praeter colorem.

Your eyes, eyebrows, forehead, in short, your whole face, which is a kind of silent language of the mind, drove people into deception; it was this that deceived, tricked, and persuaded those who did not know you. Few of us knew those dirty vices of yours, few knew the slowness of your mind and the dullness and weakness of your tongue. Your voice was not so much as heard in the forum, nor has your advice ever been put to the test. In the field or at home you've accomplished nothing that

101. For passages of explicit comparison between the careers of the two, see *Pis.* 15 (their consulates); 33 (their departures from the city); 37 (Cicero's exile and Piso's proconsulate); 51 (their returns).

102. *Arch.* 14: *imagines* . . . quas ego mihi semper in administranda re publica proponens, animum et mentem meam ipsa cogitatione hominum excellentium conformabam.

103. On Cicero's repeated references to "the electoral advantage of those who could boast noble descent and atria full of *imagines*" see Morstein-Marx 1998: 273f. and note 81.

is distinguished—or even known. You sneaked into office by tricking everyone with the commendation of your smoky *imagines* with which you have no likeness except color.

Cicero portrays Piso as a point-for-point inversion of his own self-presentation in the *Pro Archia*: Cicero's Orphic *vox*, oratorical *ingenium*, consular *consilium*, and *novitas* in the *Pro Archia* find the absolute converse in Piso. When Cicero calls Piso's body a deceptive "language" or "text" (*sermo . . . mentis*), he situates his attack in implicitly textual terms: to combat the text of Piso's lying physiognomics Cicero deploys his *In Pisonem*, an authentic textual representation of its author's *ingenium*. Moreover, Piso's fraudulent *imagines* set a leitmotif of semiotic suspicion that is sustained throughout the speech and becomes a framework for Piso's configuration as the mirrored double of Cicero: simultaneously his polar opposite and his *Doppelgänger*.

PISO AS FALSE CONSUL, AN ANTI-CICERO

The *In Pisonem* is overall a text that reflects on the process of constructing a self, in which Piso appears as a paradigm of sham self-fashioning, a "little man made of mud and muck."¹⁰⁴ As Cicero sought to shape his image through praise of Archias in the *Pro Archia*, so too in the inverted mode of the *In Pisonem* the invective against Piso serves Cicero's ambitions for his self-presentation. In response to his marginalization in the Rome of the triumvirate, Cicero molded this speech into a text of rhetorical indirection. By dismantling Piso's image-making tactics, Cicero simultaneously exacts retribution against his enemy and seeks to rehabilitate his own compromised prestige. By representing Piso as a point-for-point mirrored opposite of himself, and, in particular, by casting Piso's consulate as a disastrous version of his own, Cicero seeks to reconstruct a political legacy that had gone out of control.

Cicero presents Piso as a man who, owing to his deficiencies of *ingenium* and *gravitas*—cardinal elements of Cicero's own self-presentation—is incapable of even conceiving of the magnificence of the consulate.¹⁰⁵ When Cicero describes his experience of seeking help from the consul Piso, he presents Piso not only as a fraudulent self and as a false consul, but as himself a false sign (*Pis.* 19):

ab hoc eiecto cadavere quicquam mihi aut opis aut ornamenti expetebam?
consulem ego tum quaerebam. consulem, inquam, non illum quidem,
quem in hoc maiali invenire non possem. qui tantam rei publicae causam
gravitate et consilio suo tueretur, sed qui tamquam truncus atque stipes, si
stetisset modo, posset sustinere tamen titulum consulatus.

104. *Pis.* 59: hic homullus ex argilla et luto fictus.

105. *Pis.* 24: magna nomen est, magna species, magna dignitas, magna maiestas consulis; non capiunt angustiae pectoris tui, non recipit levitas ista; non egestas animi, non infirmitas ingeni sustinet, non insolentia rerum secundarum tantam personam, tam gravem, tam severam.

And what help or ornament was I expecting from this abandoned corpse? I was then looking for a consul, a consul, I say, and that is not what I could hope to find in this gelded pig, namely a man who, by his seriousness and advice, could look after such an important case for the commonwealth, but one who like a trunk or a sign-post, if he could only stand straight, would be able at least to hold up the label of the consulate.

Here the *In Pisonem*'s themes of Piso as illegitimate consul and of semiotic instability converge in Piso's representation as the ultimate failed signifier: a fallen sign-post incapable of even holding up the title "consul."

The capstone to Cicero's semiotic dismantling of Piso is the *In Pisonem*'s depiction of Piso's soldiers smashing into pieces a statue of Piso that he erected in Macedonia anticipating, so Cicero claims, disgrace upon his return to Rome (*Pis.* 92). The soldiers thus project their anger for Piso onto his likeness (*Pis.* 93):

illi autem statuam istius persimilem, quam stare celeberrimo in loco voluerat ne suavissimi hominis memoria moreretur, deturbant adfligunt comminuunt dissipant. sic odium quod in ipsum attulerant, id in eius imaginem ac simulacrum profuderunt.

Then those soldiers cast down, shattered, broke to small pieces, and completely destroyed a very good likeness of that fellow, which he had wished to stand in a very busy place, lest the memory of this delightful man perish. So what hate they had borne against the man himself they vented on his image and likeness.

This scene can stand as a metaphor for what Cicero does in the *In Pisonem* as a whole: the speech presents a fictional representation of Piso from which Cicero exacts his vengeance. This destruction of a statue which Piso had intended as a memorial to his greatness as proconsul performs a *damnatio memoriae* in retribution for Piso's assaults on Cicero's *auctoritas*.¹⁰⁶

In this invective against Piso and his consulate Cicero does not avoid unintended self-revelation. The extent to which Cicero's "Piso" is a construction based on Cicero's own suffering and anxieties is most clearly seen in his depiction of Piso's experiences when he was superseded in his proconsulate in Macedonia (Piso's prize, so Cicero claims, for betraying him [*Pis.* 28]) and returned to Rome in disgrace (*Pis.* 99):

abiectum, contemptum, despectum a ceteris, a te ipso desperatum et relictum, circumspectantem omnia, quicquid increpuiisset pertimescentem, diffidentem tuis rebus, sine voce, sine libertate, sine auctoritate, sine ulla specie consulari horrentem tremulentem adulantem omnis videre te volui: vidi.

106. On the erasure of Piso's memory from the state, see *Pis.* 96: omnes memoriam consulatus tui, facta, mores, faciem denique ac nomen a re publica detestantur.

You downcast, scorned, despised by others, despairing of yourself and abandoned, looking around at everything, terrified at every sound, mistrustful of your circumstances, voiceless, without freedom, without prestige, and without the slightest appearance of being a consular, trembling, shivering, and flattering everyone, this I have desired to see, and this I have seen.

Cicero's hyperbolic portrayal of Piso's dismay as a result of this serious, but not catastrophic, political setback, raises suspicions that Cicero's depiction exceeds the bounds of probability. The penultimate word *volui* places the entire passage in context: we are here within the realm of Cicero's wishful imaginings. The resemblance of this depiction to Cicero's own circumstance when facing the disgrace of exile—"without a voice, without freedom, without prestige, and without any appearance of being a consular"—is striking, and is echoed in Cicero's letters written when he went into exile and was forced to confront his reversal of fortune. What Cicero says to Atticus about the impression left by his letters is equally applicable to us later readers (*Ad Att.* 3.8.4):

ex epistularum mearum inconstantia puto te mentis meae motum videre qui, etsi incredibili et singulari calamitate afflictus sum, tamen non tam est ex miseria quam ex culpae nostrae recordatione commotus.

From the confusions in my letters I think that you can see the disturbance of my mind which, although it is afflicted by an unbelievable and unparalleled disaster, nevertheless is not so disturbed by its misery as it is by reflecting on my own blame.

By ascribing his own experiences to Piso, Cicero both exacts retribution proportional to that which he suffered from Piso's inaction and seeks to distance himself from his own past by assigning its suffering to another.¹⁰⁷

The neatness of the correspondence between Cicero's own misfortunes and those he imputes to Piso is an index of how much the *In Pisonem* is a work of fiction, a literary intervention into the political realm. The epideictic status of the oration facilitates the speech's persuasive agenda, which is predicated on a dynamic of deferral and substitution. Not only does "Piso" take the role of Cicero's double and serve as a vehicle through which Cicero seeks to master his past, but the invective delivered in the senate replaces a courtroom accusation: the fear of prosecution substitutes for real legal jeopardy; and Piso is attacked instead of Pompey or Caesar. Moreover, Piso's role as a proxy for those persons who were more directly responsible for Cicero's exile gives Cicero's "Piso" a symbolic value

107. Cicero's attempts to erase his past extends to his claim (*Pis.* 95) that punishments inflicted upon the innocent, including exile, are not true punishments, while the guilty, even if unpunished, are tormented by their consciences.

far beyond Cicero's vendetta against the consular.¹⁰⁸ While Cicero has legitimate anger against Piso for his failure to act on his behalf, Piso also serves as a substitute for other targets against whom Cicero dared not raise his voice. Cicero could ill afford falling afoul of the triumvirs, especially after they again consolidated their pact at Luca.

The speech's convergence of politics and literary representation crystallizes in its response to Piso's attack on Cicero's poem on his consulate. In accord with the trajectory from high to low style that defines the *Pro Archia's* relationship to the *In Pisonem*, poetry appears in the *In Pisonem* not as the all-powerful voice of Orpheus in its pastoral landscape, but in the *locus inamoenus* of an elementary school lesson. The authoritative utterance becomes replaced by text-bound fragments of verse dissected and counter-dissected by Piso and Cicero, who square off as battling *grammatici*. Cicero, in the manner of a school master instructing a slow student about the working of metaphor, defends a line of his *Consulatus suus* of particular political and textual vulnerability against Piso's hostile interpretation (*Pis.* 73):

... scire cupio quid tandem in isto versu reprehendas, "cedant arma togae." "tuae dicis" inquit "togae summum imperatorem esse cessurum." quid nunc te, asine, litteras doceam? non opus est verbis sed fustibus. non dixi hanc togam qua sum amictus, nec arma scutum et gladium unius imperatoris, sed quia pacis est insigne et otii toga, contra autem arma tumultus atque belli, poetarum more locutus hoc intellegi volui, bellum ac tumultum paci atque otio concessurum. quaere ex familiari tuo Graeco illo poeta: probabit genus ipsum et agnoscat, neque te nihil sapere mirabitur.

I want to know finally what it is that you find fault with in this verse, "let arms yield to the toga." "You are saying," he says, "that the greatest general is going to yield to your toga." What! Must I teach you your letters, you ass! You don't need words but a good thrashing! I did not mean this toga which I am wearing, nor the arms, shield, and sword of one particular general, but because the toga is a symbol of peace and quiet, and, in contrast, arms are a symbol of disturbance and warfare, I spoke in the manner of poets and meant for this to be understood, namely, that warfare and disturbance will yield to peace. Go ask your friend the Greek poet: he will give a passing grade to my figure and will recognize it for what it is, and won't be a bit surprised by your ignorance.

108. *Pis.* 75: nam paulo ante dixisti me cum eis conflagere quos despicerem, non attingere eos qui plus possent, quibus iratus esse deberem. Cf. Nisbet 1961: xvi: "Cicero felt dutiful gratitude to Pompey for bringing him back, but in his more candid moments recognized that he had previously betrayed him." See his note 2 for references, and xvi-xvii: "[T]he uncontrolled onslaught on Piso is in part a calculated thrust at Caesar. But Cicero went too far, and in 54 was called to order; in the *Pro Vatinius* and the *Pro Gabinio* he was forced to atone for his imprudence." Cicero's return from exile was predicated upon a disgraceful "palinode" (*Att.* 4.5). Cf. *De provinciis consularibus*, which both argues for the extension of Caesar's term in Gaul and attacks Piso and Gabinius.

As we have seen in the *Pro Archia*, Cicero's togate discourse was a central aspect of his consular self-fashioning, and was the trope that Cicero attempted to use as a link between himself and Pompey by presenting himself as the *imperator togatus* corresponding to Pompey's *imperator armatus*. The trope of linking *toga* and *arma* was essential for the political alliance he sought to forge with Pompey, and one can trace its fragility from Pompey's failure to respond to Cicero's overtures inviting his praise for and ratification of his consulate down to the general's failure to block his exile.¹⁰⁹ Cicero continued to need Pompey's good will, and Piso, and others, sought to jeopardize it by misreading *cedant arma togae*.¹¹⁰ In the hands of a monstrous Aristarchus (*Pis.* 73) like Piso, the text of *Consulatus* faced a destruction similar to that which Gabinius' citizenship rolls encountered under Cicero's scrutiny in the *Pro Archia*. With Cicero stripped of his *auctoritas*, his "Consulate" (both the poem and the event) could not hope to achieve the fixity that Cicero so energetically sought to give it.

Besides having the general fragility of a monumental text written by an author with compromised prestige, Cicero's *cedant arma togae* has the particular vulnerability of the incautious use of figuration. In Cicero's defense of the line he tries to fix the meanings of *arma* and *toga* at points on their chains of signification where he could defuse Piso's dangerous reading: *arma* is not Pompey, nor is *toga* Cicero. Instead, the line has the more general meaning, via metonymy, that war should yield to peace.¹¹¹ And yet, Cicero's "speaking in the manner of poets" with a trope that was so open to Piso's unflattering interpretation reveals Cicero's too-firm faith, either in the power of his *auctoritas* to sustain such a comparison with Pompey's accomplishments, or in his ability to control the meaning of figurative language, regardless of its semantic instability. Cicero's verse overplays his political hand and, with its clumsy deployment of figuration, lacks the polished indirection that could have deflected Piso's hostile interpretation. By singling out this particular line, Piso exploits Cicero's misplaced confidence in the process of substitution, both in the figurative realm of his trope, *cedant arma togae*, and in the realm of Cicero's self-fashioning in relation to Pompey. By writing *cedant*

109. In late 63 Cicero had sent a long letter to Pompey boasting of his accomplishments (*Schol. Bob.* 167 Stangl; *Planc.* 85; *Sulla* 67) to which Pompey sent a cool public reply. *Fam.* 5.7 is Cicero's response to Pompey. See Nisbet 1961: 141f. and Stockton 1971: 146f. On Pompey's failure to help Cicero when he faced exile see Plutarch *Cicero* 31 and cf. *Pis.* 77.

110. Within invective the dynamics of textual appropriation could move from the misreading of Cicero's poetry to the actual rewriting of lines: see Goldberg 1995: 167 (and cf. Courtney 1993: 172) on the changing of *laudi* to *linguae* by the author of the *Invectiva in Ciceronem*.

111. Nisbet 1961 ad loc. compares *De Or.* 3.167 (*togam pro pace, arma ac tela pro bello*) and notes that this work, written in the same year as *In Pisonem*, seems a further attempt to defend his poem. He also compares Servius ad *Aen.* 1.1: *ut Cicero cedant arma togae, id est bellum paci*, which attests to the eventual success of Cicero's explanation of this as the verse's meaning. Nisbet (141) notes too that the conclusion of the line, *concedat laurea laudi*, where the mention of laurel could refer only to a general's victory, undermines Cicero's explanation.

arma togae Cicero unwittingly provided his enemies an emblem for their attack on his hubris.¹¹²

Cicero repays Piso's iconoclasm towards his *Consulatus*, and turns Piso's weapons against him, when he claims that Philodemus' poetry incriminates Piso.¹¹³ As Piso says that Cicero's *Consulatus* records his veiled feelings of superiority over Pompey, so Cicero interprets Philodemus' light verse as uncovering the real self behind the deceptive signs that Piso uses to conceal it. Here Cicero takes on the guise of the prosecutor Grattius, who had made suspicious insinuations about Cicero's devotion to poetry and Archias.¹¹⁴ Cicero's appropriation of Philodemus' occasional verse for his attack on Piso follows the same path from high style to low that marks the shared coordinates in the *In Pisonem* and *Pro Archia*. Whereas in the latter, epic poetry is configured as *imagines* to represent public virtue, in the former, light verse reflects private vice. Philodemus' poems peel off the veneer of Piso's specious austerity and reveal his private life to be a perversely literal interpretation of Epicurean doctrine: the sordid and unsophisticated pursuit of sensory pleasures.¹¹⁵

Cicero also claims that Philodemus' poems reflect Piso's life like a mirror (*Pis.* 71): *in quibus [sc. versibus], si qui velit, possit istius tamquam in speculo vitam intueri*. The mirror itself is a generically suitable metaphor for Cicero's invective mode since it is a trope associated with both comedy and realism.¹¹⁶ Regardless of its stylistic appropriateness, however, Cicero's choice of this particular trope brings with it implications that Cicero would have been eager to deny but which nonetheless accord with the particular symbolic role that Cicero's "Piso" has within the speech. A mirror has inevitable associations with self-seeing:¹¹⁷ Cicero's *speculum* has the clear heuristic value of introducing those ways in which Piso functions as Cicero's double, his mirrored opposite, and, as such, a vital vehicle for Cicero's self-presentation. Cicero portrays Piso's political career as a nightmarish double of his own, calling Piso a "reverse general" (*Pis.* 92: *praeosterus imperator*) who erects monuments to his military catastrophes.¹¹⁸

112. The verse continued to cause Cicero problems: see *Phil.* 2.20.

113. Piso simply alludes to Philodemus' incriminating verses and does not quote from them (*Pis.* 71): *ex quibus multa a multis et lecta et audita recitarem, ni vereretur ne hoc ipsum genus orationis quo nunc utor ab huius loci more abhorreret*. Similarly, Cicero refuses to quote from his *De Temporibus Suis* in *Pro Plancio* 74: *nolo cetera, quae a me mandata sunt litteris, recitare: praetermitto, ne aut proferre videar ad tempus, aut eo genere uti litterarum, quod meis studiis aptius quam consuetudini iudiciorum esse videatur*; cf. Courtney 1993: 173.

114. See *Arch.* 12: *quaeres a nobis, Gratti, cur tanto opere hoc homine delectemur*.

115. *Pis.* 65–67. This mistakenly literal interpretation of Epicurean teachings recalls Cicero's claim that Piso was unable to understand the figural language in Cicero's poetry.

116. Cf. Cicero in Donatus *De Com.* 5.1: *comediam esse imitationem vitae, speculum consuetudinis, imaginem veritatis*. See Nisbet 1961 ad loc.

117. Varro interprets self-seeing as a *speculum's* defining quality (*Ling.* 5.129): *speculum a speciendo, quod ibi se spectant*.

118. His status as a reversal of a standard Roman aristocrat crystallizes in his Epicureanism: see his shunning fame in *Pis.* 57–64.

Finally, as in the *Pro Archia*, Cicero signals the epideictic generic status of the *In Pisonem* through its polished verbal expression. In the peroration Cicero faces the difficulty of closure within this fictive text and confronts the problem of its proxy status as a substitute for a law suit, and its inability to cause Piso direct and immediate harm (*Pis.* 99):

qua re si tibi euenit quod metuis ne accidat, equidem non moleste feram; sin id tardius forte fiet, fruar tamen tua et indignitate et timiditate, nec te minus libenter metuentem videbo ne reus fias quam reum, nec minus laetabor cum te semper sordidum, quam si paulisper sordidatum viderem.

So if the thing that you fear happens, indeed I will not be annoyed; but if perhaps this happens at a later date, I will still take pleasure in your dishonor and fear, nor will I be less happy when I see you being afraid of becoming a defendant than to see you actually a defendant. And I will not be less joyful when I see you in a state of constant disgrace than if I see you wearing the mourning garb of a defendant for only a short while.

As David Kubiak has argued, here in the concluding sentence of the work, where we would expect to find the speech's most forceful expression of feeling, Cicero instead emphatically engages the stylistic codes of the epideictic mode.¹¹⁹ Particularly striking amid the passage's extravagant *ornatus* is the way that Cicero uses the pun on *sordidum* . . . *sordidatum* as the finishing touch of his justification not to criminally prosecute Piso. The ludic realm of the *epideixis*, where the free play of the structures of signification may dominate logical argumentation, allows Cicero to avoid acknowledging that it is his political marginalization that stood in the way of his seeking legal retribution from Piso: Cicero glides away along the tracks of the arbitrary similarity of these phonemes. Far from trying to conceal his rhetorical manipulations, Cicero ostentatiously displays his literary *ornatus*, and makes his invective a celebration of his enduring claim to distinction, literary *ingenium*, a quality that his "Piso" so conspicuously lacked.

CONCLUSION: THE POWER AND LIMITATIONS OF LITERARY *INGENIUM*

The *Pro Archia* and the *In Pisonem*, as well as the letter to Luceius, are texts that sought to fix Cicero's self within an authoritative triumphal narrative. In this regard, they all can be considered failures: Archias never wrote the hoped-for

119. Kubiak 1989: 237f.: "Here, precisely where one expects the most vigorous feeling, comes an elaborate conceit based on the punning of *sordidum* and *sordidatum*, an effect reinforced in the almost Gorgianic quality produced by the exaggerated and unsolemn alliteration of *forte fiet, fruar tamen tua* combined with the jingly *libenter metuentem and reus . . . reum*. This and similar places suggest the Asiatic style, and show that Cicero is anxious for his assault against Piso to be placed in a context of ostentatious art."

poem; Luceius seems never to have represented Cicero in his histories;¹²⁰ and the *In Pisonem*, already a text characterized by ineffectual indirection, did not lead to any substantial political damage against its target, but was perhaps only a source of temporary embarrassment and chagrin for Piso.

If the *In Pisonem* could not hope to achieve actual mastery over Cicero's foes or his own past, the text does nevertheless provide a representation of such an achievement. This act of mimesis appears to have given Cicero the immediate personal satisfaction of causing Piso a slight diminution of prestige while also serving longer-term political ambitions. Cicero's poem *De Temporibus Suis*, the successor to the *Consulatus*, provides evidence for the dynamics of textual gratification involved in the *In Pisonem* and also shows the lessons about the dangers of textual fragility that Cicero learned from the publication of the *Consulatus*. In a letter to Quintus in the year following the publication of the *In Pisonem*, Cicero, after mentioning Gabinius' arrival into Rome to face charges of treason, tells (perhaps facetiously) of his plan to include Piso and Gabinius in the text of his *De Suis Temporibus* (*Q. Fr.* 3.1.24):

proximus est tamen Piso. itaque mirificum ἐμβόλιον cogito in secundum librorum meorum includere dicentem Apollinem in concilio deorum qualis reditus duorum imperatorum futurus esset; quorum alter exercitum perdidisset, alter vendidisset.

Next is Piso. So I am thinking of including in the second of my books a wonderful episode: Apollo giving a speech in the council of the gods that describes what sort of homecoming two generals would have, of whom one lost his army, while the other sold his.

In a continuation of the textual assault on Piso and Gabinius from the *In Pisonem*, Cicero contemplates fixing them within the epic that he designed as the mirrored complement and continuation of his *Consulatus*, with the same number of books and a matched council of the gods scene.¹²¹ Here we find a clear-cut instance of Cicero's tactic for achieving textual control: he contemplates encasing Piso's and Gabinius' disgrace within Apollo's oracular utterance, and thus links their downfall to his redemptive return from exile within the same divinely-ordained narrative. In this way, Cicero writes a poetic account that follows the template that he set out for Luceius' history.¹²² For Cicero, the imprisonment of Piso in

120. See Shackleton Bailey 1977: 318.

121. On the *De Temporibus Suis* as a sequel to the *Consulatus*, see Courtney 1993: 174, Goldberg 1995: 166, and Harrison 1990: 459, who sees the similarities between the poems as being motivated by a desire "to establish some kind of parallelism between his two autobiographical epics, as well as the apologetic purpose of asserting continued divine support for his actions and political career." Or the question of whether Cicero's quip states a real intention to compose such a scene, see Harrison 1990: 457, who cautions that the reference does not guarantee that Cicero actually wrote the ἐμβόλιον and Goldberg 1995: 166, who doubts that Cicero was being serious.

122. Cf. Cicero's prescription that the history, in addition to praises of himself, should contain attacks on his enemies (*Fam.* 5.12.4): multorum in nos perfidiam, insidias, proditorem notabis. On

the sequel to the *Consulatus* would be a fitting retribution for his attack on that earlier poem: Cicero's poetic text itself takes vengeance upon its critic. Curiously, although he finished a draft of the *De Temporibus Suis*, and sent a copy to Quintus for him to show to Caesar in Britain, Cicero seems never to have published the poem. In the *Pro Plancio* Cicero pointedly refuses to quote from the poem, saying that to do so was not in accordance with the practice of the courts. It is as if Cicero had learned from the fate of the *Consulatus* the lesson of the inherent vulnerability of a literary text once published, and chose instead to reserve the poem as a source of private satisfaction that would remain un-assailed by his enemies.¹²³

The *In Pisonem*, in contrast to a poetic text, engaged Cicero's strengths, and so he had nothing to fear from its publication. Experience had taught him that the strength of his reputation as the supreme orator of his day insulated the texts of his orations from the sort of assaults to which his autobiographical poems were liable. The triumphal narrative of the *In Pisonem* provides a suitable subject matter for the display of his unparalleled oratorical mastery. His reputation for oratorical *ingenium* remained intact and was a source of prestige undiminished by his political marginalization in 55. He so deeply marked the text of the speech against Piso with his *ingenium* that it immediately became part of the classroom canon. In the very same letter to Quintus in which he described his notional addition to the *De Temporibus Suis*, Cicero responds to the news that Piso has published a pamphlet in response to the *In Pisonem* (*Q. Fr.* 3.1.11):

alterum est de Calventi Mari oratione: quod scribis tibi placere me ad eam rescribere, miror, praesertim cum illam nemo lecturus sit si ego nihil rescripsero, meam in illum pueri omnes tamquam dictata perdiscant.

Your other point is about Calventius Marius (i.e. Piso): I am amazed that you write that it would gratify you if I wrote a speech in answer to his, especially since no one is going to read his if I do not write in response, while all the school boys learn my speech against him as a rote lesson.

Cicero's surprise at Quintus' suggestion that he return Piso's oratorical salvo suggests the value the *In Pisonem* had for Cicero. R. G. M. Nisbet's memorable characterization of the speech as a "masterpiece of misrepresentation" cuts to the essence of the speech's power and limitations.¹²⁴ The speech is at once

may also compare this poetic rendering of the story to the presentation of Piso's life as a tragic narrative complete with Furies (*Pis.* 46–47).

123. *Q. Fr.* 2.14.2 reports that Caesar likes the poem, while *Q. Fr.* 2.16.5 tells Quintus that Caesar praised the first book but found fault with the second, and asks whether Caesar took exception to its subject matter or its treatment (num aut res eum aut $\chi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\tau\eta\rho$ non delectat). For the non-quotation of the poem, see *Planc.* 74 (early 54) (quoted at note 113). In a letter to Lentulus (*Fam.* 1.9.23) Cicero rationalizes his non-publication of the poem on account of his not wanting to cause harm to past benefactors. To Quintus he writes that the poem had a special significance for himself (2.8.1: illa omnia mihi magis scripsi quam ceteris). See Courtney 1993: 173f.

124. Nisbet 1961: xvi. On the fictionality of Cicero's presentation of Piso, see Nisbet 1961: 192–97 (Appendix VI: "The *In Pisonem* as an Invective").

an inaccurate caricature of Piso and an exemplar of invective whose stylistic distinction marked the speech as a work of *ingenium* that gave it immediate canonicity. Cicero wrote the *In Pisonem* as a part of a dialogue with Piso: he delivered the speech in response to Piso's attack on him in the senate, and took care to present the published version as a rebuttal of his enemy's accusations. The *In Pisonem* in turn led to Piso's publication of a counter-invective.¹²⁵ Nevertheless, the *In Pisonem*'s canonicity allowed it, in essence, to have the last word even before Piso's counterattack. Were Cicero to respond to Piso's pamphlet, such a supplement to the *In Pisonem* would detract from the monumentality that Cicero's textual polish sought to achieve for the speech. The *In Pisonem* is the product of a calculated program of textual *ornatus* whose goal was to achieve the status of a masterpiece, an exemplary text whose univocal canonicity would, in effect, obliterate his enemy's attacks, such that their only survival would be as fragments within his own text's matrix, and thus subject to Cicero's own depiction of events.

The textual triumph Cicero achieved in the *In Pisonem*, written within a period of his forced withdrawal from forensic activity, of turning to the "gentler Muses" of intellectual inquiry,¹²⁶ was the only sort of recompense available to him in the absence of real political *auctoritas*. The *In Pisonem* and *Pro Archia* are texts that seek to bridge the gap between the literary essay and forensic speech, and to project the rhetoric of display into the political domain. They therefore mark an intermediate step between texts of private reflection and ones of direct political engagement. The failure of each to translate cultural authority into political power attests to the insurmountable political barriers Cicero faced. In 55/4, *ingenium* alone was of little avail to the consular stripped of his prestige, forced to defend the triumvirs' henchmen, including, in a humiliating volte-face, Gabinius himself.¹²⁷

Despite these immediate political shortcomings, Cicero accomplished a cultural triumph that has left traces of a genealogy from the boys learning the *In Pisonem* by heart to the *rhetoires* of the Senecan *controversiae* and *suasoriae*. These orators, whose speeches under the principate were consigned to the un-

125. On Piso's original attack against Cicero in the senate see Asconius (11 Stangl) and cf. Nisbet xiv, who catalogues specific instances in the *In Pisonem* where Cicero responds to Piso's accusations. On the unlikely identification of the pseudo-Sallustian *Invectiva in Ciceronem* as Piso's pamphlet, see Nisbet 1961: 197f. (Appendix VII).

126. Cf. Cicero's reference to the composition of the *De Oratore* in *Fam.* 1.9.23 (Dec. 54 BCE): scripsi etiam—nam me iam ab orationibus diiungo fere referoque ad mansuetiores Musas, quae me maxime sicut iam a prima adulescentia delectarunt. On the *De Oratore*'s strategy of positioning itself away from the realm of practical politics in order to realize its cultural and ideological ambitions, see Habinek 1994: 56f.

127. On these speeches, which would include *Pro Messio*, *Pro Druso*, *Pro L. Caninio Gallo*, and *Pro Vatino*, as well as *Pro Gabinio*, see Crawford 1984: 173f., 180–83, 188–97. Although some have called the *Pro Gabinio* a "red herring" (e.g., Gruen 1974: 527), Crawford (188–97) convincingly argues that Cicero defended Gabinius. Including the *Pro Vatino* (on the spuriousness of fragments that purport to be from this speech, see Crawford 1994: 301–308), Cicero never published the texts of these speeches, doubtless to avoid the embarrassment of publicizing his role as legal lackey for the triumvirs.

remitting *lusus* of which the *Pro Archia* and *In Pisonem* were foretastes, continually replayed the drama of the fragility of Cicero's *ingenium* in the face of blunt political force. They debated the issue of whether Cicero's self was to be found in his person or in his texts.¹²⁸ Cicero's symbolic importance for these orators, as the father of their art, is almost explicitly presented in *Controversia* 7.2, where his killer, a certain Popillius, is presented as a parricide whom Cicero once defended on this charge.¹²⁹ With the melancholy of those seeking to capture the moment of the collapse of the political consequence of their art, their *suasoriae* return to the scene of Cicero's assassination at the behest of Antony, and fictionally counsel him about, first (*Suas.* 6), whether he should beg Antony for his life and, second (*Suas.* 7), whether he should accept Antony's offer to spare his life in exchange for burning his writings. The *suasoriae* re-stage Cicero's death and, by extension, the freedom of speech that disappeared with him, with a compulsiveness that indicates the trauma of this event, as they seek to achieve mastery over this ordinary loss.¹³⁰

In *Controversia* 6 the series of speeches about Cicero's willing acceptance of death (first several that advised against, then a few for, begging for his life) yield to a mixture of prose-historical and poetic accounts. Here we find the self-fashioning seeds that Cicero sowed in life come to flower in death. Cornelius Severus' poem, in a haunting echo of the *Pro Archia*, presents Cicero's severed head on the rostra as an *imago* whose sight leads those gathered in the forum to recall his accomplishments. Severus thus expresses Cicero's togate political discourse in the sort of laudatory poem that he was cheated of in life.¹³¹ The historical account of Bruttidius Niger presents the crowd, upon seeing Cicero's head on the *rostra* (the locus of his forensic activity), as spontaneously recounting Cicero's accomplishments, explicitly in the terms of a funeral *contio* in which the audience does not listen to, but delivers, the *laudatio funebris*.¹³² In death, Cicero's head becomes the *imago* that symbolizes and memorializes his legacy. This grisly scene is far removed from the *Pro Archia*'s idealizing vision of literary

128. In *Suasoriae* 6 and 7, as well as *Controversia* 7.2. Richlin 1999: 203 quotes Mayor [1877] 1979 ad Juvenal 10.120 that "no theme was more popular for school declamations." On Cicero's death-scene in these declamations see Roller 1997 and Narducci 1997: 172f. On the general role of these exercises in training Roman males for positions of authority, see Bloomer 1997. For an ancient critique of the unreality of these exercises, see Tacitus *Dialogus* 35.

129. See Richlin 1999: 203. Seneca himself doubts the historicity of this event, saying (*Controv.* 7.2.8) that few historians assign the assassination to a Popillius, and that he was a parricide is entirely the invention of the declaimers.

130. In the Preface to *Controversiae* 1 (sect. 11) Seneca laments his own belatedness in terms of his being cheated of hearing Cicero's "living voice" by the turmoil of the civil wars.

131. Sen. *Suas.* 6.26.1–4: 13–15: oraque magnanimum spirantia paene virorum / in rostris iacere suis; sed enim abstulit omnis / tamquam sola foret, rapti Ciceronis imago. / tunc redeunt animis ingentia consulis acta; . . . egregium semper patriae caput, ille senatus / vindex, ille fori, legum ritusque togaeque, / publica vox saevius aeternum obmutuit armis. Cf. Richlin 1999: 203f.

132. Sen. *Suas.* 6.21: datae gemitu et fletu maximo viro inferiae, nec, ut solet, vitam depositi in rostris corporis contio audivit sed ipsa narravit. Not coincidentally, Seneca proceeds to give accounts of various historians' *laudationes funebres* in Cicero's honor (*Suas.* 6.21–27).

representations as Cicero's *imagines*, and yet the origination of the *laudatio* on the lips of the crowd attests to the ultimate success of Cicero's strategies of self-presentation.

Further, *Suasoria* 7, in its debate over whether Cicero should burn his books in exchange for his life, directly grapples with the issue of the relationship between Cicero's self and his texts. The speeches, all of which opposed the bargain, repeatedly fasten upon the point that Cicero's writings were equivalent to his *ingenium*: Antony hated Cicero's *ingenium* more than Cicero himself loved it; against his *ingenium* the triumvirs' arms had no power; his *ingenium*, preserved in his writings, was eternal, while the body was mortal.¹³³

By agreeing to the bargain, Cicero would himself proscribe what Antony could not (his *ingenium*), while his refusal would allow his *scripta* to be an eternal *proscriptio* of Antony.¹³⁴ The discourse of Cicero's self and his writings extends even to the point where his texts are considered to constitute a more authentic self than his body: "the most worthless part of you is that which can be either stolen from or given to you: that true Cicero is that which Antony does not think can be proscribed except by Cicero himself."¹³⁵ The primacy of Cicero's works over his body led no declaimer known to Seneca to speak on behalf of Cicero's accepting the bargain: they all were concerned for his books and not his person.¹³⁶ The speech that Seneca credits as the best on this theme, that of Pompeius Silo, bursts the fictional premise of the scenario: Cicero's destruction of his writings would be of no consequence since they had already spread all over the earth. Antony wanted only to shame Cicero by forcing him to compromise his principles.¹³⁷ Silo's ironical reformulation of the exercise gives evidence for

133. *Suas.* 7.1: ne propter hoc quidem ingenium tuum amas, quod illud Antonius plus odit quam te. . . ingenium erat in quod nihil iuris haberent triumviralia arma; 7.5: misericordiam tu istam vocas, supplicium sumptum <de> Ciceronis ingenio? 7.7: ignoscere tu illum tibi putas qui ingenio tuo irascitur? ab hoc tu speras vitam cui nondum verba tua exciderunt? ut corpus, quod fragile et caducum est, servetur, pereat ingenium, quod aeternum est? . . . (7.8) mortem tibi remittit ut id pereat quod in te solum immortale est. qualis est pactio? Aufertur Ciceroni ingenium sine vita; promittuntur <pro> oblivione nominis tui pauci servitutis anni. non ille te vivere vult, sed facere ingenii tui superstitem; 7.10: <Nihil tam intolerabile> esse quam monumenta ingenii sui ipsum exurere.

The trope of Cicero's writings as being equivalent to his *ingenium* reappears in the discussion of the first book burning in Rome in *Controv.* 10 pref. 6, where Seneca says that it is fortunate that this punishment was not invented in Cicero's time: bono hercules publico ista in poenas ingeniorum versa crudelitas post Ciceronem inventa est; quid enim futurum fuit si triumviris libuisset et ingenium Ciceronis proscribere? Cf. Richlin 1999: 200f.

134. *Suas.* 7.1: commentus est Antonius quemadmodum, quod non poterat cum Cicerone <proscribi, a Cicerone> prosciberetur. 7.8: sine durare post te ingenium tuum, perpetuam Antonii proscriptionem. . . admirabile posteris vigebit ingenium <tuum>, et uno proscriptus saeculo proscribes Antonium omnibus. 7.9: non ille tibi remittit proscriptionem, sed tolli desiderat suam. See Richlin 1999: 205 on Pollio's punning on *scribere/proscribere* (Macrobius *Saturnalia* 2.4.21).

135. *Suas.* 7.8: crede mihi, vilissima pars tui est quae tibi vel eripi vel donari potest: ille verus est Cicero quem proscribi Antonius non putat nisi a Cicerone posse.

136. *Suas.* 7.10: omnes pro libris Ciceronis solliciti fuerunt, nemo pro ipso.

137. *Suas.* 7.11: non esse tam stultum Antonium ut putaret ad rem pertinere libros a Cicerone comburi, cuius scripta per totum orbem terrarum celebrarentur. . . quaeri nihil aliud quam ut ille

the success of Cicero's self-fashioning program when he attests to the worldwide diffusion of his texts. Moreover, these orators' fascination with the question of the self as body or as text suggests that Cicero was successful both in establishing a textual *corpus* that would outlive his body¹³⁸ and in setting an ideological keynote for his reception. The terms of this debate echo an idea that animates many of the self-fashioning strategies in both the *Pro Archia* and *In Pisonem*: the valorization of textually expressed verbal *ingenium* over illusory, mute, material signifiers, be they the statues and *imagines* of the *nobiles* or the deceptive silent text of Piso's physiognomics.¹³⁹

These rhetoricians' repeated playings-out of the drama of the true location of Cicero's self, which resides in texts marked by his *ingenium* rather than in his body, and of the tangible threat that his *scripta* posed to triumvirs and which their proscriptions were unable to avert, suggest the degree to which, even in the absence of blunt political power, literary *ingenium* had a vitality and materiality that made it a matter of tangible political consequence. The exercises of these post-lapsarian, imperial orators attest to the cultural importance of Cicero's program of textual self-fashioning, even as it failed to establish a political discourse that would arrest Cicero's and the Republic's fall. It would take an Augustus for Rome to see a fuller integration of literary and political *auctoritas*.¹⁴⁰

State University of New York at Buffalo
jdugan@acsu.buffalo.edu

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, M. C. 1990. *Trials in the Late Roman Republic, 149 BC to 50 BC*. Toronto.
 Allen, W. 1954. "Cicero's Conceit." *TAPA* 85: 121-44.
 André, J.-M. 1966. *L'otium dans la vie morale et intellectuelle romaine*. Paris.
 Bakhtin, M. M. 1984. *Rabelais and his World*. Bloomington.
 Batstone, W. 1994. "Cicero's Construction of Consular *Ethos* in the *First Catilinarian*." *TAPA* 124: 211-66.
 ———. 1998. "Dry pumice and the programmatic language of Catullus 1." *CP* 93: 125-35.

Cicero multa fortiter de mortis contemptu locutus ad turpes condiciones perductus occideretur. Antonium illi non vitam cum condicione promittere, sed mortem sub infamia quaerere.

138. See *Fam.* 5.12.4: a principio enim coniuurationis usque ad reditum nostrum videtur mihi modicum quoddam corpus confici posse. Shackleton Bailey 1977 ad loc. suggests that the meaning of *corpus* is not "a book" but that Cicero "is probably thinking of the various episodes in the drama which Luceius would cast into an artistic whole." Cf. *Att.* 2.1.3 for Cicero's description of his collection of consular orations as constituting a *σῶμα*.

139. Cf. esp. *Arch.* 30: statuas et imagines, non animorum simulacra, sed corporum, and *Pis.* 1: voltus denique totus qui sermo quidam tacitus mentis est, hic in fraudem homines impulit.

140. I am here indebted to Narducci's discussion (1997: 17) of how the *Pro Archia* anticipates the Augustan dovetailing of literary culture and politics. For an analysis of Augustus' attempts in the *Res Gestae* to fix an authoritative narrative of his political legacy that he desired, see Yavetz 1984.

- Beale, W. H. 1978. "Rhetorical Performative Discourse: A New Theory of Epideictic." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 11: 221–47.
- Berry, D. H. 1996. *Cicero: pro P. Sulla oratio*. Cambridge and New York.
- Bloomer, W. M. 1997. "Schooling in Persona: Imagination and Subordination in Roman Education." *ClAnt* 16: 57–78.
- Brooks, P. 1984. *Reading for the Plot*. New York.
- Buchheit, V. 1960. *Untersuchungen zur Theorie des Genos Epideiktikon*. Munich.
- Burgess, T. C. 1902. *Epideictic Literature*. Chicago.
- Butler, H. E., trans. 1920. *The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian*. Vol. 1. Cambridge, Mass., and London.
- Courtney, E., ed. 1993. *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*. Oxford.
- Crawford, J. W. 1984. *M. Tullius Cicero: The Lost and Unpublished Orations*. Göttingen.
- . 1994. Second edition. *M. Tullius Cicero: The Fragmentary Speeches*. Atlanta.
- Culler, J. 1975. *Structuralist Poetics*. Ithaca.
- Damon, C. 1997. *The Masks of the Parasite: A Pathology of Roman Patronage*. Ann Arbor.
- Dupont, F. 1985. *L'acteur-roi*. Paris.
- . 1997. "Recitatio and the reorganization of the space of public discourse." In T. Habinek and A. Schiesaro, eds., *The Roman Cultural Revolution*, 44–59. Cambridge and New York.
- Flower, H. 1996. *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*. Oxford.
- Goldberg, S. 1995. *Epic in Republican Rome*. Oxford.
- Gotoff, H. C. 1979. *Cicero's Elegant Style: An Analysis of the Pro Archia*. Urbana and Chicago.
- Greenblatt, S. 1980. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago.
- Gruen, E. 1974. *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*. Berkeley.
- Habinek, T. 1994. "Ideology for an Empire in the Prefaces to Cicero's Dialogues." *Ramus* 23: 55–67.
- . 1998. *The Politics of Latin Literature: Writing, Identity, and Empire in Ancient Rome*. Princeton.
- Hall, J. 1996. "Social evasion and aristocratic manners in Cicero's *De Oratore*." *AJP* 117: 95–120.
- . 1998. "Cicero to Luceius (*fam.* 5.12) in its social context: *valde bella?*" *CP* 93: 308–21.
- Hardie, A. 1983. *Statius and the Silvae: Poets, Patrons, and Epideixis in the Greco-Roman World*. Liverpool.
- Harrison, S. J. 1990. "Cicero's *De Temporibus suis*: the evidence reconsidered." *Hermes* 118: 455–63.
- Hinks, D. 1936. "Tria Genera Causarum." *CQ* 30: 170–76.
- Kennedy, G. 1963. *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*. Princeton.
- . 1972. *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World*. Princeton.
- Kubiak, D. 1989. "Piso's Madness (Cic. *In Pis.* 21 and 47)." *AJP* 110: 237–45.
- Lausberg, H. 1998. *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*. Trans. M. T. Bliss et al. Leiden, Boston, and Köln.
- Leach, E. W. 1990. "The Politics of Self-Presentation: Pliny's Letters and Roman Portrait Sculpture." *ClAnt* 9: 14–39.
- May, J. 1988. *Trials of Character: The Eloquence of Ciceronian Ethos*. Chapel Hill and London.

- Mayor, J. E. B., ed. [1877] 1979. *Thirteen Satires of Juvenal, with a Commentary*. New York.
- Mitchell, T. 1991. *Cicero the Senior Statesman*. New Haven and London.
- Moore, F. G. 1906. "Cicero's *Amaltheum*." *CP* 1: 121–26.
- Morstein-Marx, R. 1998. "Publicity, Popularity and Patronage in the *Commentariolum Petitionis*." *ClAnt* 17: 259–88.
- Murphy, P. R. 1958. "Cicero's *Pro Archia* and the Periclean *Epitaphios*." *TAPA* 89: 99–111.
- Narducci, E. 1997. *Cicerone e l'eloquenza romana: Retorica e progetto culturale*. Rome and Bari.
- Nicolet, C. 1960. "Consul Togatus: Remarques sur le vocabulaire politique de Cicéron et de Tite-Live." *REL* 38: 236–63.
- Nisbet, R. G. M., ed. 1961. *M. Tulli Ciceronis In L. Calpurnium Pisonem Oratio*. Oxford.
- Ogilvie, R. M., and I. Richmond, eds. 1967. *Cornelii Taciti De Vita Agricolae*. Oxford.
- Reid, J. S., ed. 1877. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Pro A. Licinio Archia Poeta Oratio ad Iudices*. Cambridge.
- Richlin, A. 1999. "Cicero's Head." In J. I. Porter, ed., *Constructions of the Classical Body*, 190–211. Ann Arbor.
- Riggsby, A. M. 1995. "Pliny on Cicero and Oratory: Self-Fashioning in the Public Eye." *AJP* 116: 123–35.
- . 1998. "Self and Community in the Younger Pliny." *Arethusa* 31: 75–97.
- . 1999. *Crime and Community in Ciceronian Rome*. Austin.
- Roller, M. 1997. "Color-Blindness: Cicero's Death, Declamation, and the Production of History." *CP* 92: 109–30.
- Rudd, N. 1992. "Strategems of Vanity: Cicero, *Ad Familiares* 5.12 and Pliny's letters." In T. Woodman and J. Powell, eds., *Author and Audience in Latin Literature*, 18–32. Cambridge.
- Russell, D. A., and N. G. Wilson, eds., 1981. *Menander Rhetor*. Oxford.
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R., ed. 1965. *Cicero's Letters to Atticus. Vol. 1: 68–59 B.C.* Cambridge.
- , ed. 1977. *Cicero: Epistulae ad Familiares. Vol. 1: 62–47 B.C.* Cambridge.
- , trans. 1978. *Cicero, Letters to his Friends. Vol. 1.* New York.
- . 1983. "Cicero and Early Latin Poetry." *ICS* 8: 239–49.
- Stewart, S. 1979. *Nonsense: Aspects of Intertextuality in Folklore and Literature*. Baltimore and London.
- Stockton, D. 1971. *Cicero: A Political Biography*. London.
- Timpanaro, S. 1949. "Note a Livio Andronico, Ennio, Varrone, Virgilio." *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 18: 186–204.
- Vollmer, F. 1891. *Laudationum funebrium Romanorum Historia et Reliquiarum Editio*. Leipzig.
- Williams, G. 1978. *Change and Decline: Roman Literature in the Early Empire*. Berkeley.
- Wiseman, T. P. 1982. "*Pete Nobilis Amicos*: Poets and Patrons in Late Republican Rome." In B. Gold, ed., *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome*, 28–49. Austin.
- Woolf, G. 1996. "Monumental writing and the expansion of Roman society in the early empire." *JRS* 86: 22–39.
- Yavetz, Z. 1984. "The *Res Gestae* and Augustus' Public Image." In F. Millar and E. Segal, eds., *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects*, 1–36. Oxford.