Summary of the Chapters

This volume brings together papers dealing with the reception of the last 21 months of Cicero's life. When on 15 March 44 BCE Julius Caesar was murdered in Rome, Cicero, after a period of indetermination, finally returned to active politics. One last time, he cast himself in the role of defender of the Republican constitution and its corresponding virtues of liberty, freedom of expression and respect for the traditions of the forefathers. Famously, his fight was unsuccessful and led to his definitive fall from grace and to his death in the course of the proscriptions of the Second Triumvirate. These final months of his life seem to enlarge themes that had been relevant for Cicero during his career up to that point; in a certain sense they could be described as a distillation of it. It is no wonder that they have also shaped his later reception in a considerable way. The contributions gathered here analyse important steps of this reception.

Ancient sources and modern scholars alike seem to agree that Cicero was killed on Mark Antony's orders. The *Philippics*, it is alleged, were what caused Antony's intense hatred. In Chapter One of this volume, however, Thomas Keeline alleges that this long-standing and convenient story is unlikely to be true, or at least unlikely to be the whole truth. Whatever Antony knew of Cicero's *Philippics*, it was not the canonical corpus that we read today. Moreover, Keeline asserts, the rhetoric of the *Philippics* was insufficient to motivate Cicero's murder, and Antony and Cicero could have patched up any breach in *amicitia*—people often changed sides in the late Republic, not least Cicero. Finally and most importantly, the young Octavian must have played an important role in Cicero's proscription, a role which he was later at pains to cover up. The commonly accepted story of Cicero's death has more to do with early imperial propaganda and two millennia of reception than with historical reality.

In Chapter Two, Caroline Bishop examines the ancient reception of Cicero's *Philippics* alongside the reception of Demosthenes' 'Philippic' speeches. Cicero and Demosthenes alike were remembered as allegories for the failure of democratic free speech at the hands of autocracy, and each also represented both the pinnacle and the end of a classical period. Bishop argues that the published collection of Cicero's *Philippics* plants the seeds for this sort of reception by imitating one of the most salient features of Demosthenes' speeches: their valorization of failure as a necessary price to pay when a society's attempt to maintain its classical glory exceeded its ability. By invoking the potential for a similarly noble defeat against Antony, Cicero's collection of *Philippics* was meant to secure a Demosthenic reputation for himself should he also fail—a reputation with which his ancient readers obliged him.

Virgil was about 25 years old when the events of 44–43 BCE unfolded, and as Andrew Sillett argues in Chapter Three, they did not go unnoticed by him. With the help of a close reading of the description of characters from the underworld in *Aeneid* 6 and the depiction of Latium's orator Drances in *Aeneid* 11, Sillett shows that Cicero, while not mentioned explicitly, was very much on Virgil's mind whilst he composed the *Aeneid*. He argues that Virgil's allusions to Cicero's role in the final period of the Republic should be seen in the context of the early reception of Cicero as a whole, so heavily influenced by the Antonian camp. He avers that Virgil consciously alludes to this tradition of anti-Ciceronian invective in order to conjure up memories of the bloodbath of the preceding decades in the minds of his readers, and to make a point to them regarding the failings of the Roman Republic.

While Cicero is only implicitly present in Virgil, he appears as a character in ancient historiography and historical epic. This is the theme of Giuseppe La Bua's contribution in Chapter Four. He analyses speeches by Cicero from Lucan and Cassius Dio, which he treats as pseudepigrapha, in order to show that Cicero's life during the final years of the Roman Republic could lead to fierce discussions about his responsibility for the civil war and the collapse of the Republican system. La Bua argues that the dichotomy of Caesar and Cicero during the Civil War of 49 – 48 BCE is of similar importance as the depiction of Cicero's deeds after Caesar's death. While Lucan famously labels Cicero a warmonger and lets him speak in favour of war, we find a more nuanced picture in Cassius Dio. On the one hand, Cicero, when speaking himself, conveys the image of a man of peace, whereas the accusation of being a disturber of order is put in the mouth of a fellow senator, Calenus. La Bua concludes that such debates were meant to question Cicero's own attempts to draw a consistent image of himself, whereas later authors were interested in the inconsistencies of Cicero as a historical figure.

Lex Paulson in Chapter Five reviews Cicero's theory of free will in his late philosophical writings, especially in *De fato*. Having summarized the major position Cicero defends in the treatise and having clarified how innovative Cicero's concept was in comparison to his Greek predecessors, Paulson shows that the notion of free will, which depended on virtuous behaviour, was Cicero's answer to the political challenges of his time. If political virtue could no longer be put into action due to the rupture Caesar's dictatorship had caused, at least politicians like Cicero could retreat to a kind of inner exile: if philosophy cannot save the state, it can at least save Cicero's soul and reconcile him to his failures. In the second part of his contribution, Paulson shows that Augustine's notion of free will depends heavily on Cicero's concepts, but that he substitutes the political with a religious interpretation. If human societies prove to be imperfect by

nature, it is wiser to direct one's attention to God as the true source of man's free will.

Chapter Six is concerned with Late Antiquity as well. Bram van der Velden studies the pseudo-Ciceronian Epistula ad Octauianum, in which 'Cicero' vents his anger after Octavian's betrayal, as a reception document. He argues that its author alludes to multiple strands of Ciceronian reception at once, strands which are usually kept separate in other ancient re-workings of the Ciceronian legacy: Cicero is portrayed as a politician, rhetorician, philosopher, letter-writer and master of the Latin language all at once. The result is a 'hyper-Ciceronian' text which combines themes which we would not expect to be combined even in one single genuine Ciceronian document. Van der Velden argues that the mosaic-like form of intertextuality found in the letter is most characteristic of Late Antiquity. Besides, he submits that the depiction of Cicero as employing overthe-top rhetorical features and as a conduit of the thought of various philosophical schools has distinct late antique features to it.

Cicero continued to be read as an important source of auctoritas in the Middle Ages, but the extent of his influence on actual social or political debates remains debatable. As Carole Mabboux in Chapter Seven shows with the help of examples of late medieval debates about tyranny, Cicero's impact on political theory formation remained marginal. When discussing the role of Julius Caesar, medieval authors did refer to Cicero as his contemporary, but the notorious (and well-known) Ciceronian texts about Caesar's tyrannical behaviour, especially passages from *De officiis*, were hardly quoted, let alone used for their evaluation. And even if authors like Thomas Aguinas and Brunetto Latini referred to them, their main focus remained on Cicero the moral authority, while his role as political actor was only fully rediscovered and re-evaluated in the second half of the fourteenth century.

For such a new interpretation of the political Cicero, Leonardo Bruni's Cicero nouus is a fascinating specimen, as Leanne Jansen discusses in Chapter Eight. While Bruni's biography is initially presented as a translation of Plutarch's *Cicero*, it turns out to be an examination of the Roman roots of the political concept of libertas. By focusing the narrative on the (unequal) relationship between Caesar and Cicero, the humanist is able to rewrite the latter's life as essentially a struggle for freedom of speech and mind. On this level the Cicero nouus offers an analysis of the development of Cicero's mature political theory. Furthermore, Bruni is bent on affirming and reinstating the orator's historical value. By producing his major works during Caesar's dictatorship Bruni's Cicero is seen to surpass his mighty rival intellectually and politically. Bruni's reconstruction of Cicero's life is intended to demonstrate that he, indeed, is the timeless embodiment of true Republican values.

In Chapter Nine, Christoph Pieper analyses the intermediatedness of an early sixteenth-century commentary on Cicero's Philippics (thus one century after Bruni's influential re-interpretation of Cicero's life). The commentary was printed by Josse Bade, who inserts it via his preface into the ongoing Ciceronianus-debate to which Erasmus had made an extraordinarily influential contribution. At the same time, Bade reprints three authoritative commentaries of the fifteenth century. Pieper argues that on the one hand, the edition serves as a mediator for the intellectual heritage of Italian Quattrocento humanism in Northern Europe. On the other hand, the Italian commentators themselves read the *Philippics* as Cicero's legacy, and discuss his importance as an oratorical, political and moral authority. The reception of the *Philippics* in the commentaries is at the same time 'reception of Cicero' and 'reception of the Ciceronian tradition', as it relates closely to early imperial, late antique and early humanistic moments of transforming Cicero into a cultural icon.

A few decades later, Marc-Antoine Muret made heavy use of Cicero's De officiis while teaching at the University of Rome 'La Sapienza', as Barbara Del Giovane expounds in Chapter Ten. Del Giovane claims that Muret saw a cornerstone of Cicero's views as of great importance for his own times: the idea that moral philosophy is indispensable for eloquence to function as a political tool, and that every citizen should feel compelled to contribute to the community. In his reading of Cicero, Muret sees close similarities between the political upheaval in the last days of the Roman Republic and the turmoil in the times of the Counter-Reformation. For that reason, De officiis—together with selected works of Aristotle and Plato—is made into a didactic tool to form Muret's students into good Christians, dicendi periti.

The volume concludes with two epilogues, both of which cover the last 500 years of the reception of Cicero's final years. In the first epilogue, Gesine Manuwald surveys the (early) modern plays dramatizing events from 44 and 43 BCE in which 'Cicero' appears as a character. These cover a period from 1616 to 2017 and are written in Latin, English, Italian, French and German, All playwrights remain generally faithful to the historical record and also take advantage of the dramatic potential of these events, sometimes making minor alterations to increase the vividness of the dramas. Putting the events of 44-43 BCE on stage enables the dramatists to showcase the positive and negative characteristics of different political systems without committing explicitly to a particular view. At the same time how they are presented implicitly conveys a certain attitude. The switch from Republic to Principate is thus seen more or less favourably and Cicero is presented as a hero or given a share of the guilt depending on the perspective taken in the various dramatic versions.

In the second epilogue, Christoph Pieper and Bram van der Velden conclude this volume with a coverage of scholarly appraisals of Cicero's final years during the last half millennium. They show that Cicero's 'final stand' has continued to interest readers far beyond the early modern period, and that it has served many scholars in discussing Cicero's overall political, philosophical and moral heritage.

Even though the chapters of this volume cover a vast array of time periods and literary genres, they are linked by a common thread. It appears that Cicero's final years can serve as a magnifying lens through which the essence of his legacy can be brought into focus. Later authors are often fascinated by his fight for freedom and his Republican ideals: they read Cicero's works from this period as his philosophical testament and as a guide for moral behaviour during troublesome circumstances. At the same time, they also notice Cicero's shortcomings when applying his moral ideals to his own personal life. This volume hopes to show that as his 'swan song', the last year and a half of Cicero's life were at the centre of many of the most influential debates around Cicero's legacy.