The meticulous and exhaustive research that went into this book recommends it as the standard commentary in English on the epigrams of Ausonius for many years to come.

André F. Basson
Brock University (Canada)


This very useful and long-awaited commentary (Latin text with Italian translation) by Ciro Monteleone is a welcome addition for scholars with a particular interest in Cicero's *Philippics*. With this work the author joins the recent trend in Ciceronian scholarship that concerns itself with the nature and significance of the political content of Cicero's speeches, especially those delivered during the remaining months of his life when he openly returned to the Roman political arena.²

Monteleone (M.) begins with a brief introduction (pp. 9-12) to the historical background and circumstances of the *Third Philippic*, closing with a quotation from *Phil*. 3.29.³ This gives an indication of the direction of Cicero's activity in Roman politics during the final months of 43 BC when he frequently stated that, having endured enough, the time had finally come to stand firm and rid the Republic of tyranny, once and for all. It relates to the period from late 47 BC to late 45 BC, a time during which Cicero's actions and the ideas expressed in his philosophical writings paved the way for the

---

³ *Multa quae in libera civitate ferenda non essent tulimus et perpessi sumus, aliis spe forsan recuperandas liberatis, aliis vivendti nimia cupiditate seii, si illa tulimus quae nos necessitas ferre coegit, quae vis quaeam parea fatalis - quae tamen ipsa non tulimus - etiamne huius impar latrons ferebimus tae terrimum crudelissimumque dominatum?*
events of 20 December 44 BC when Cicero himself became the strongest supporter of a bitter civil war.

The commentary is divided into two main parts. The first part consists of the Latin text and facing Italian translation (pp. 15-45) followed by the corresponding commentary (pp. 47-103). The very elaborate afterword ("Postfazione") deals in three sections with the ideological and political background of the speech: the first section (pp. 107-322) explores Cicero’s public image and self awareness in 44 BC; section two (pp. 323-400) gives insight into the formation of the alliance against Antony; and the third section (pp. 401-59) gives a discussion of the structure of the speech.

In the commentary proper M. follows a conventional approach in that his commentary is concerned not entirely with historical matters, but also provides the reader with helpful information on textual matters, explaining rhetorical and philological details. The emphasis, however, is on historical matters and is not only directed at university students but more so at a specialist readership (for whom there are frequent cross-references to the "Postfazione"), in particular scholars with a serious interest in late-Republican politics. M. gives close attention to the history of tyranny and the Bruti who were renowned for their success as tyrant slayers. Note 5 (p. 48), for instance, includes a compact military record and biographical detail about the eminent and remarkable Decimus Brutus who governed the province of Cisalpine Gaul (a map on p. 49 shows the geographical location). In notes 29 to 48 (pp. 55-62) discussion concerns Cicero’s laudatio of Decimus Brutus and the history of his illustrious ancestor who drove out Tarquin the Proud - a historical event that set the example for a distant relative, Marcus Brutus, to follow. M. complements his commentary with depictions of denarii struck

---

4 Note 14 (pp. 50-52), for instance, gives a very elaborate comment on Hirtius and Pansa, the consuls elect for 43 BC; and note 20 (p. 54) identifies Fulvia as Antony’s third wife. The cross-reference to p. 371 note 876 offers insight into the Brundisium episode and Cicero’s not too flattering depiction of her in both the Philippics and his correspondence. In addition, M. cites other relevant ancient and modern sources. Still on the topic of Fulvia’s prosopographical details, note 72 (pp. 71-72) makes for delightfully interesting reading, informing the reader about her ancestors, the insipid stammerer M. Fulvius Bambalio and the rich Sempronia Tuditana. In note 98 (pp. 79-80), for those interested in philological matters, M. gives a persuasive explanation for the reason behind Cicero’s rather obscure censure of the unusual Nulla contumelia est quam facit dignus used by Antony on occasion, apparently to show his sense of humour. With this inappropriate display of an archaic phrase (cf. Cato, Or. fr. 171), Cicero castigates Antony for making a fool of himself by stressing his unworthiness of the office he occupies, offering a blatant insult to the likes of Cato the Censor, paragon of dignitas.
by Marcus Brutus, illustrating the role of the Bruti as opposers of tyranny (figs. 3, 4). The insertion of coin depictions at appropriate junctures in the commentary (figs. 7 p. 151; 10 p. 324; 11 p. 340) makes for an attractive and innovative feature and strengthens the historical aspect of the work as a whole.

The second part of the commentary, the 'Postfazione', consists of a thorough, scholarly discussion of the political and ideological background of the Third Philippic. Here M. gives answers to the questions and problems posed in the introduction (pp. 9-10). His modus operandi takes the form of, on the one hand, a close inspection of Cicero's writing and behaviour from 47 BC onwards, with particular reference to his correspondance and personal relationships from the period, and, on the other hand, a discussion of the rhetorical structure of the speech (p. 11).

Some readers may find the first section perhaps somewhat lengthy (so the author, p. 12), but the scope of this very relevant and useful section is justified. Not only does it stress the historical importance of the events prior to the speech (the period end 47 to 45 BC), but it also sheds significant light on Cicero's reasoning, his actions and his writings during the corresponding period, and how these in the end made him an avid supporter of an extremely harsh civil war, the very thing he had formerly condemned.

Section 1.1 commences with a brief survey of the Second Philippic and Cicero's presentation of the events relating to the Ides of March, with Brutus proclaiming Cicero as the champion of Republican liberty. M. continues with Cicero's depiction of Caesar, as an indisputable rex ("indiscutibilmente rex", p. 109), arch-tyrant and antithesis to the ideas of Republican liberty, which, according to Cicero, he applied during his own consulate in 63 BC ("La memoria del consolato di Cicerone", section 1.2, pp. 112-16).

Section 1.3.1 deals with the period October 47 to July 46 BC, a relatively peaceful period in Rome under the dictatorship of Caesar. Cicero has no active role in Roman politics and resorts to the pen instead, as powerful tool of political persuasion. M. considers the Brutus (in essence a rhetorical work on Roman eloquence), to be a political manifesto of conservative Republican sentiment, with its implicit criticism of the Caesarian regime (p. 131). M. demonstrates how Cicero's serious political purpose is continued in his philosophical and rhetorical work from the corresponding period. In the Paradoxa Stoicorum, for instance, Cicero makes the distinction between two separate forms of the res publica. The old and the new are contrasted to show only the ashes of a former dispensation ("non era uno Stato", p. 143) embodied in the person and political principles of a Cato whom Cicero had eulogised in his panegyric of 46 BC. Adhering to what has become a fashionable trend among scholars, the idea that Cicero had a hidden political
agenda during these years, M considers the degree of political ambiguity inherent in the speech Pro Marcello (section 1.3.2, pp. 150-69) from the same year. Attention is given to Cicero's idea of a lost Republic and his effort to inflame the senatorial order with his hyperbolic praise of Caesar and Caesarian clemency. In section 1.3.3 (pp. 169-77) M. examines an emotionally traumatised and despondent Cicero and his perception of Caesar as a despotic ruler. Within the perilous political climate Cicero is shown over time to have reconsidered his reluctance to cooperate, and after finally abandoning the idea of a draft of his 'open letter' to Caesar, eventually decided upon a course of pretended subservience, simulating cooperation and embarking on a new line of attack against the Caesarian regime.

Section 1.3.4 (pp. 178-267) treats the year 45 BC, a period during which Cicero's literary pursuits proliferated. According to M., Cicero's philosophical writing during this year indicated the scheme of his future political conduct. First, the political reality that he had to deal with, and second, his belief that, in accepting the futility to defend the traditional mos maiorum, a reconstitution of the res publica was necessary (p. 189). M. presents Cicero's Hortensius, a revivalist or admonitory tract, as intended to act both as guide and cure ('terapia', p. 190) for Roman woes (either political or philosophical) under Caesarian autocracy (p. 198). M. detects an even stronger political undertone in Cicero's Academia Priora and particularly so in the De finibus, the latter composed and published concurrently with Cicero's 'open letter', his strenuous effort to reach out to Caesar. M. sees the treatise as a masked political attack (under the guise of philosophy) against Caesar ('... sotto la maschera filosofica piacevole e innocua, si ferra un attaco contra Cesare' ... p. 210), especially so with Cicero's reintroduction of the character of Cato (also present in the Paradoxa and the Cato) to counter Caesar (p. 224). The practical application of philosophy features very strongly in the Tusculanae where Cicero condemns tyranny as the worst possible constitutional form of monarchy. The treatise (dedicated to Marcus Brutus) abounds with historical exempla which Cicero exploits to juxtapose the virtues and vices of virtuous wise men ('il sapiens', p. 262) and tyrants respectively (p. 249f). Here M. carefully examines Cicero's use of the concepts of the rector rei publicae, sapiens, prudentia, and iustitia in a political sense as the solution to supreme statesmanship.

In the next section (1.3.5) M. takes Cicero's antithesis between ruler and tyrant further with his discussion of the Pro rege Deiotaro. He gives a very detailed and sound discussion of the speech (pp. 268-322) as an example of Cicero's covert modus operandi against the autocracy in 45 BC. The text is perceived as having a 'double reading' ('una lettura duplice', pp. 268, 274)
with elements of insinuation, ambiguity and verbal play, of, for instance, tyrannus and dementia Caesaris (also present in De finibus and Tusculanae) as main ingredients of Cicero’s political attempt to manipulate an unrelenting Caesar. After the Ides of March 44, with the danger of an ever-threatening Antony, Cicero exchanges this calculated agenda of public but veiled criticism for open condemnation of the deceased Caesar and justification of tyrannicide.

In part two of the 'Postfazione' (pp. 323-400) M. explores in seven individual chapters, allocated according to month (from March to December 44), the formation and strengthening of the coalition against Antony. M. concentrates on factual information regarding the historical events that influenced Cicero’s thoughts; his perception of his own place in the political arena and the reasons for his decision to deliver the Third Philippic. Careful consideration is given to Cicero’s perception of Antony as a remnant of a tyranny that was still alive and festering (p. 331f.), the struggle between Antony and Octavian during May and June, and Cicero’s overtures to Octavian (p. 340f.).

Part three of the 'Postfazione' relates in three main parts (pp. 401-424) Cicero’s use of rhetoric and ideology within the structure of the speech: §§ 1-14 sententia; §§ 15-36 descriptio and second peroratio; §§ 37-39 senatus consultum. M. examines Cicero’s pragmatic method in the speech, how he justifies and exalts certain controversial issues (i.e. the revolutionary actions of Octavian; the desertion of the Marian and Fourth legions; the insubordination of Decimus Brutus, p. 425f.) and positions these against the behaviour of an ‘unworthy consul’, a conviction which Cicero construes as a recurrent theme in the Third Philippic. Rule under Antony is the worst form of tyranny ever that could befall Rome (p. 427), therefore tyrannicide and civil war become justified. These ideas of Cicero’s, M. argues, are also present in the De officis, written concurrently with the publication of the speech (p. 435), and explain the direction of Cicero’s action on December 20 when he addressed the senate, a remarkable day that Cicero sees as a turning point in Roman history: the day on which he reconstituted the res publica and induced the senate under his leadership to break out from its lethargy to regain control of the political situation.5 M.’s translation says it all: Cicero on that particular day did not merely display a comprehensive survey of the entire political circumstances at hand, but he ‘embraced’ (abbracciato’, footnote 1112) it wholeheartedly in his role as leader and guide of an authoritative and independent senate (pp. 458-59).

The book is rounded off by an index locorum (pp. 463-86); a general index (pp. 487-500); an index of Greek terminology (pp. 501-02); an impressive

5 Cf. Cicero’s letters to Trebonius and Cornificius respectively, Fam. 10.28, 12.25.
bibliography which includes a very wide range of scholarship with a preference for European literature (pp. 503-28, 535); a list of illustrations and maps (p. 529), and finally an index of contents (pp. 531-33).

M. is to be commended with this scholarly enterprise. He handles his subject well and advances our knowledge and understanding, not only of Cicero's political and philosophical reasoning during his later years, but also of his ability as a statesman and orator. The commentary makes an impressive contribution to the study of the Ciceronian era.

Maridien Schneider
University of Stellenbosch

6 Scholars in English-speaking countries could benefit greatly and would appreciate an English translation of M.'s commentary - the work certainly deserves a wider readership.

7 A minor quibble is the typographical errors in the English quotations and references, i.e. on pp. 210 n. 384; 358 nn. 831, 832; 388 n. 933; 508; 511.
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