PATHE:
THE LANGUAGE AND PHILOSOPHY OF EMOTIONS

Proceedings of the Conference
held in Belgrade on 16 and 17 March 2017

Edited by
Ljiljana Radenović,
Dragana Dimitrijević and Il Akkad

University Library
2019, Belgrade

Dragana Dimitrijević
Faculty of Philosophy
University of Belgrade

UDK 821.124'02.09-5 Cicero M. T.
808.51(37)

Changing Audiences, Changing Emotions? Cicero's Philippics 3-4[1]

Abstract: From the bulk of scholarship on Cicero his popular speeches have gained less attention than other parts of the corpus. The two most influential works on the subject are those written by Mack (1937) and Thompson (1978), who have compared Cicero's popular speeches with speeches addressed to other audiences. The aim of this paper is to chalenge the generally accepted view formulated by Mack (1937) that differences between Cicero's popular and senatorial speeches are based primarily on the different social position and, consequently, educational level of the audience. Furthermore, this paper argues against Mack's view that the tone of Cicero's popular speeches is far more emotional than his senatorial speeches, using *Philippics* 3 and 4 as an illustration.
Keywords: Cicero, oratory, *Philippics* 3-4, audiences, emotions

1. INTRODUCTION

Currently, Cicero's reputation is suffering one of its periodic reversals. The admiring attitude in the Renaissance changed as early as the beginning of the Modern Era. Since then he has been out of favor, and what has been written about him has been critical of both his policy and his originality as a thinker. This change in the attitude to Cicero is nothing new. A similar thing happened in antiquity. It seems that he is one of those authors whose works provoke constant debates between those who admire him and enjoy rereading his writings and those who would rather skip the whole subject and look for different themes and different authors. As it is the case with various research areas in humanities, including research in the history of emotions

1 The research carried out for writing this paper has originated from the project 'Modernization of the Western Balkans' funded by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia (project no. 177009).

(Radenović 2019), many studies on Cicero are more indicative of the author's own reaction to contemporary issues than reflective of the reality of first-century Rome. Thus, the choice of the topic, Cicero's use of emotional appeals in his political rhetoric, and its interpretation can be easily linked to the reality we live in, the post-truth era when facts have less influence than emotions, particularly in the sphere of politics (McIntyre 2018).

2. 'LOST IN TRANSLATION?' THE GREEK TERM *PATHOS* AND ITS LATIN EQUIVALENTS

Let us start with the question of terminology. In search for the Latin equivalents to the Greek term *pathos*, we have to go back to Cicero's writings. At the beginning of the third book of his *Tusculan Disputations*, written in 45-44 B.C.,[2] we read the self-reflective statement of the orator/translator:

> Ut enim in Academiam nostram descendimus inclinato iam in postmeridianum tempus die, poposci eorum aliquem, qui aderant, causam disserendi. tum res acta sic est: 'Videtur mihi cadere in sapientem aegritudo.' Num reliquae quoque perturbationes animi, formidines libidines iracundiae? haec enim fere sunt eius modi, quae Graeci πάθη appellant; ego poteram 'morbos', et id verbum esset e verbo, sed in consuetudinem nostram non caderet. nam misereri, invidere, gestire, laetari, haec omnia morbos Graeci appellant, motus animi rationi non obtemperantis, nos autem hos eosdem motus concitati animi recte, ut opinor, perturbationes dixerimus, morbos autem non satis usitate, nisi quid aliud tibi videtur.
>
> 'As we were going down to our Academy in the early afternoon, I asked one of those who were there to suggest a topic for discussion. This is what followed. 'It seems to me that the wise person is subject to distress.' Would you say the same about the other emotions, about the various forms of terror, desire, and anger? For all such things are covered by the Greek term *pathē*. A literal translation for *pathē* would be 'sickness', but

2 The evidence for date of the composition of the *Tusculans* is not secure. For the evidences from the sources see Graver 2002: XXXII.

> that would run counter to normal Latin usage. For pity, envy, elation, gladness, and so forth are all called by the Greeks 'sicknesses', as being movements of mind not obedient to reason. But I think I was right to refer to these same movements of the mind when aroused as 'emotions', since 'sicknesses' would sound peculiar. Or do you prefer another word? 'My preference is the same as yours'.' (Graver 2002: 7)

As it has already been recognized, Cicero makes his case look stronger than it is by insisting that the word *pathos* could appropriately be translated as 'sickness' (morbus). In fact, *pathos* is a broader term, but Cicero intentionally chose to underline this particular semantic possibility, in order to gain precedence over those 'who would treat the emotions as normal and natural experiences' (Graver 2002: 79), and to stress his own Stoic position.[3]

In the fourth book of the same treatise Cicero presents the position of the Peripatetics, his present opponents, who say that emotions are useful:

> Primum multis verbis iracundiam laudant, cotem fortitudinis esse dicunt, multoque et in hostem et in inprobum civem vehementioris iratorum impetus esse… oratorem denique non modo accusantem, sed ne defendentem quidem probant sine aculeis iracundiae, quae etiamsi non adsit, tamen verbis atque motu simulandam arbitrantur, ut auditoris iram oratoris incendat actio.

> 'First, they have many words of praise for anger. They call it 'the whetstone of courage' and say that those who are angry are much more vigorous in attacking the enemy or the wicked of their own country… Moreover, they disapprove of the orator who speaks for the prosecution or even for the defense without the stimulus of anger. They think that even if the orator is not angry himself, he should still make a show of anger in his words and gestures, so that his delivery may kindle anger in the hearer.' (Graver 2002: 54)

3 All we read here is not in accordance with Cicero's views presented in his treatise *De Oratore*, written ten years earlier. For possible reasons and motifs for Cicero's change in philosophical preferences at the end of his life, see, for example, Kennerly 2010. In Kennerly's words, 'That Cicero wrote his *rhetorica* while the Republic was slipping, and *De Officiis* when it was in a fallen state, might account for his altering his position' (p. 123).

3. CICERO'S POPULAR VS. SENATORIAL SPEECHES

It is surprising that Cicero's popular speeches have gained less attention than other parts of his corpus. To put this fact in a wider context, the importance of the public sphere of Roman politics has until recently tended to be downplayed in favor of the patron – client model, no doubt in good part because of the great influence of Ronald Syme's *Roman Revolution* and his interpretation of Roman politics. According to Syme, 'in all ages, whatever the form and name of government, be it monarchy, republic, or democracy, an oligarchy lurks behind the façade; and Roman history, Republican or Imperial, is the history of the governing class' (Syme 1939: 7). However, thirty years ago Fergus Millar called upon us to 'place in the center of our conception the picture of an orator addressing a crowd in the Forum' (Millar 1986: 1). Before this call only a few scholars have paid special attention to Cicero's popular speeches. The two most influential are Dietrich Mack (1937) and Christine Thompson (1978) who have compared Cicero's popular speeches with his speeches addressed to other audiences. Mack's main thesis is that differences between Cicero's popular and senatorial speeches are based primarily on the different social position and, consequently, educational level of the audience. According to Mack, Cicero argues with more technical legal language before the Senate than before the people (Mack 1937: 76-78). Furthermore, Mack asserts that Cicero uses philosophical sources, particularly Stoic ideas, addressing the Senate while to the people his use of philosophy is only superficial (Mack 1937: 76-77). In addition, he argues that the tone of Cicero's popular speeches is far more emotional than his senatorial speeches. Mack's conclusions have been generally accepted[4], with very few exceptions (Heibges 1969; Thompson 1978). Mack's assumption that Cicero's popular speeches suffer from a lack of philosophical elements in comparison to his senatorial speeches has been refuted by Heibges (1969). She cites a number of examples in which Stoic ideas are used also in Cicero's popular speeches. According to her, there is no strong evidence that the orator significantly simplified his ideas for members of the popular audience. In the dissertation *To the Senate and to the People:*

4 It has already been stressed in Thompson 1978: iii-iv. For example, Kennedy (1972) follows Mack's theses, without putting them into question.

Adaptation to the Senatorial and Popular Audiences in the Parallel Speeches of Cicero, Thompson (1978) argues against Mack's thesis that Cicero uses more complex legal language in his senatorial than in his popular speeches. Thompson's refutation of Mack's thesis has not been correctly understood, or properly read, since even when scholars cite her dissertation, they are doing it in a manner of adding weight to Mack's arguments. The question still remains: Is there anything left to investigate? In my opinion, there is still some work to be done in investigating the real scope, nature and motivations of the similarities and differences between Cicero's popular and senatorial speeches, and it seems to me that the sphere of emotions could be a fruitful field for further research.

4. EMOTIONAL TONE IN CICERO'S *PHILIPPICS* 3-4

I take Mack's thesis that the tone of Cicero's popular speeches is far more emotional than his senatorial speeches as a point of departure. Things are not as simple as Mack would like us to believe, especially, if we take seriously the refutation of other supposed differences between the two types of Cicero's orations mentioned above. My aim is to challenge Mack's view, particularly in the case of *Philippics* 3-4, and to try to show that the orator's use of emotional appeals illustrates dependence on the whole set of questions being addressed rather than the type of audience. In my opinion, apart from some arguments which Mack did put on the table, his theses are much more the result of his prejudices about the one or the other audience, their capability to follow the orator's argument and, finally, Cicero's supposed attitude towards his audiences than a thorough investigation. Furthermore, if we assume that there is a possible change in the sphere of emotions, maybe it could be argued that there is a difference in the intensity of a particular emotion in a particular segment of these two speeches, but certainly not in their overall emotional tone. Why? We can try to give an answer by raising another question – what was the purpose of these speeches? The Third Philippic, addressed to the Senate, aimed to persuade that Body to act against Marc Anthony, and the fourth, addressed to the people, came afterwards, as a way of giving a summary and a personal comment on what happened in

the Senate. If we agree that playing upon the feelings is an important part of persuasion, why should we assume that Cicero was more willing to do that in his popular speech than in its senatorial counterpart? I will give two set of examples to illustrate my point of view.

The first set of examples deals with Cicero's praise of Brutus in *Philippics* 3 and 4, which is given in chapter 8 in both speeches[5].

In *Philippic* 3, Cicero praises Brutus with the following words:

> O civem natum rei publicae, memorem sui nominis imitatoremque maiorum!
> 'Truly a citizen born to serve the State, mindful of the name he bears, and an imitator of his ancestors!' (Ker 1926/1969: 197)

In *Philippic* 4, the orator uses a different approach to the subject:

> Si consul Antonius, Brutus hostis: si conservator rei publicae Brutus, hostis Antonius. Num igitur utrum horum sit dubitare possumus?
> 'If Antonius is a consul, Brutus is an enemy; if Brutus is the savior of the State,
> Antonius is its enemy. Can we then doubt which of these alternatives is true?'
> (Ker 1926/1969: 243)

It is obvious that we cannot say that Cicero's tone is more emotional in *Philippic* 4 than *Philippic* 3. I would say that the situation is quite the opposite – in the first quoted example from Cicero's speech addressed to the Senate, the orator uses a highly emotional tone, while in the second quoted example from his speech addressed to the people, he employs a device from formal logic.

Let us see how Cicero formulates the concluding thoughts in *Philippics* 3 and 4.

At the end of *Philippic* 3, the orator chooses to mention Gaius Pansa and Aulus Hirtius, consuls elect, as safeguards of the Republic.

5 For the outlines of *Philippics* 3 and 4 see Appendix.

> Senatui placere, uti C. Pansa A. Hirtius, consules designati, cum magistratum inissent, si eis videretur, primo quoque tempore de his rebus ad hunc ordinem referrent, ita uti e re publica fideque sua videretur. (3.39)
>
> 'That the Senate resolves that Caius Pansa and Aulus Hirtius, consuls elect, when they have entered upon their office, should on the earliest occasion refer these matters to this body as it shall appear to them consonant with the interest of the State and their own loyalty.' (Ker 1926/1969: 231)

Cicero ends *Philippic* 4 with the following words:

> Hodierno autem die primum referente viro fortissimo vobisque amicissimo, hoc M. Servilio, collegisque eius, ornatissimis viris, optimis civibus, longo intervallo me auctore et principe ad spem libertatis exarsimus. (4.16)
>
> 'Today, on the motion of Marcus Servilius here, a most courageous man and your very good friend, and his colleagues, most distinguished men, and most loyal citizens, we have, for the first time after a long interval, with my counsel and at my instance, been fired by the hope of liberty.' (Ker 1926/1969: 251)

We can easily conclude that even in the peroration, which is reserved for an emotional tone, there is no sign of Cicero's intention to make addressing the people more emotional than addressing the Senate. In my opinion, here the main difference lies in the different focus rather than the intensity of emotions.

5. CONCLUSION

The history of audiences suggests that relations between reception and effect are not easily investigated, and it seems that the invisibility of what audience members are really thinking or feeling is a rather old problem. Yet people's action before, during, and after the speech reveal their emotional (and cognitive) en-

gagement. On the one hand, Cicero's orations carry multiple, diverse and widely applicable messages, and, on the other hand, his audiences' interpretative actions are almost entirely inaccessible to modern researchers. Such uncertainties on the part of the researcher invite prejudiced interpretations inflected by class of the audience, as it is the case with Mack (1937). Quite contrary to Mack's view, in this paper, I argue that Cicero's use of emotional appeals with a variety of its modes[6] depends on the whole set of questions rather than the type of audience.

Today, given the growing range of information and communication technologies, the changing communication environment demands continued investigation into the concept of audience, but while the nature of 'audiencing' (Fiske 1992) is changing, audiences are likely to remain central to any analysis of the communication process from antiquity to modern times.

Appendix

Outlines of *Philippics* 3-4[7]

	Philippic 3	*Philippic* 4
1. Exordium	Ch. 1-2 Cicero regrets that the Senate delayed acting against Antony	Ch. 1
2. Praise of those who opposed Antony	Ch. 3-13 3-5 Octavian 6-7 Martian and Fourth legions 8-13 Brutus and Cisalpine Gaul 8-11 Antony compared to Tarquin 13 Approval of tribunes' proposal to protect the Senate so that there may be free discussion	Ch. 2-10 2-5 Octavian 5-7 Martian and Fourth legions 7-9 Brutus and Cisalpine Gaul 10 Even the gods agree that the freedom of the people must be guarded and that Antony must be punished

6 One of Cicero's favorite ways of showing and/or raising emotions is by using rhetorical questions. See, for example, Dimitrijević 2017.

7 I used the outlines presented in Thompson 1978: 121-122, with some minor changes.

3. Arguments against Antony	Ch. 14-36 14 Approving the acts of Brutus and Octavian is de facto declaration that Antony is an enemy 15-18 Antony's edicts are barbarian 19-24 Antony's shameful attitude toward Senate 24-27 Allotment of provinces 30-31 Review of Antony's actions against the state 32-36 The Senate must protect the freedom of the Roman people	Ch. 11-15 11-12 Antony is not just a criminal, but a monster 13 Roman virtue will defeat him 14 Antony is worse than the enemies faced by the *maiores* 15 Antony will be defeated just as Catiline had been
4. Peroratio	Ch. 37-39 Proposing the decree praising those who oppose Antony and urging the consuls designate to introduce this matter to the Senate at the first meeting in 43 BC	Ch. 16 Prepared to do anything to safeguard the freedom

Bibliography

Dimitrijević, D. 2017. 'The Functions of the Rhetorical Question 'Quid?' in Cicero's Philippics I-II', *Studia Classica Anniversaria: Proceedings of the International Conference Held on the Occasion of the 70th Anniversary of the Institute of Classical Studies, 22nd – 23th November 2016, Skopje*. Skopje: 107-126.

Fiske, J. 1992. "Audiencing: A Cultural Studies Approach to Watching Television." *Poetics* 21: 345-359.

Graver, M. 2002. (trans.) *Cicero on the Emotions: Tusculan Disputations 3 and 4*. Chicago, London.

Heibges, U. 1969. "Religion and Rhetoric in Cicero's Speeches." *Latomus* 28.4: 833-849.

Kennedy, G. 1972. *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World*. Princeton.

Kennerly, M. 2010. "*Sermo* and Stoic Sociality in Cicero's *De Officiis*." *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 98.2: 119-137.

Ker, W. C. A. 1926/1969. (trans.) *Cicero: Philippics*. The Loeb Classical Library. Harvard, Massachusetts, London.

Mack, D. 1937. *Senatsreden und Volksreden bei Cicero*, diss. Kiel.

McIntyre, L. 2018. *Post-Truth*. Cambridge, MA.

Millar, F. 1986. "Politics, Persuasion and the People before the Social War (150-90 BC)."

The Journal of Roman Studies 76: 1-11.

Radenović, Lj. 2019. "Do Emotions Have a History? A Psychological Framework for the History of Emotions", in this volume.

Syme, R. 1939. *Roman Revolution*. Oxford.

Thompson, C. 1978. *To the Senate and to the People: Adaptation to the Senatorial and Popular Audiences in the Parallel Speeches of Cicero*, diss. Ohio State University.