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CAESAR: SLAIN WITH DAGGERS BUT STABBED WITH WORDS

OR

CICERO AS A FAILURE AND FRAUD
Of all the figures of the ancient world, none has left to posterity so much of himself in writing as Marcus Tullius Cicero. Beyond the copious speeches and philosophical works still preserved, over nine hundred letters written between 68 B.C.E.\(^1\) and his death in 43 are still extant. These writings, particularly the letters, provide insight into the personal attitudes of the man called the “Father of his country” for his distinguished service to the Republic of Rome, and through Cicero we can ascertain much of the spirit of the period of his lifetime. From around 50 until his death in 43 Cicero wrote much of the dictator Julius Caesar, during Caesar’s rise to power as well as after his death. Cicero’s attitudes, then, during the period of the Civil War, erupting in 49 with Julius Caesar’s historic crossing of the Rubicon and his subsequent war with Pompey the Great for control of the Republic, are invaluable for understanding the period. The primary sources, Cicero’s letters, speeches and philosophical works, allow for this understanding. This paper seeks to investigate, through his own words, Cicero’s relationship with and attitudes toward Julius Caesar after the crossing of the Rubicon with an eye towards the question: “Is Cicero, in his dealings with Caesar a failure and/or a fraud?”. By his own contradictions and commitment to political pragmatism, Cicero will prove to be both.

\(^1\) All dates, except where noted are B.C.E.
Cicero arose from a lineage outside the nobility of ancient Rome, and through his own talents as an orator and statesman he rose through the ranks of Roman politics to achieve the rank of consul, the highest office of the Republic. In 63, his career distinguished him as one of the senior statesmen of Rome. He was throughout his life a political animal, and his lifelong political dealings, his alliances and realliances, put him at the helm of political life-- as such must his writings be evaluated.

Cicero was ever careful of the public image which he projected. Thus, a letter to a close associate bears much more scrutiny and provides much greater insight into Cicero's true attitude than a letter to someone of dubious alliance. This realization reveals the value of the letters to Atticus. Titus Pomponius Atticus had been a schoolmate of Cicero in Rome and proved a lifelong friend and steadying influence. Atticus, because of his family connections with an unpopular tribune of 88 chose to move to Athens where he resided more or less permanently for much of the remainder of his life. "To Atticus, Cicero unburdened himself of his hopes and fears with delightful frankness...; and Atticus' long absences from

\[2\text{ ee Thomas Mitchell, Elizabeth Rawson, and David Stockton for further biographical information. For a general chronology of the events of this period see Appendix.}\]
Rome meant that there were many occasions for correspondence between the two friends.”

From the multitude of letters written to Atticus we can derive with much confidence real insights into the attitudes of Cicero. There are many letters preserved to various associates of Cicero, his ad familiares, and many of these provide valid insights; these, though, must be weighed against Cicero’s own political and personal motivations, whereas the letters to Atticus, as well as those written to Cicero’s brother Quintus, reveal a Cicero outside the political light as well as within. This evaluation of Cicero’s attitudes toward and relationship with Julius Caesar after the crossing of the Rubicon will depend largely upon the letters to Atticus.

Plutarch’s Life of Cicero has also been employed as a primary source. It serves essentially to fill in gaps of historical space which the letters leave, and it has been employed with a realization that the bare facts of ancient historical writing at times fall second to literary program and writing style. I have employed only those details of Plutarch’s biography which are generally accepted by Ciceronian scholars.

Invaluable to this evaluation of Cicero, also, are the Caesarian speeches, pro Marcello, pro Ligario, and pro Rege Deiotaro, delivered by Cicero to Caesar after Caesar’s power was already well established and his command virtually absolute. These show a remarkably different Cicero.

---

from the man illustrated in the letters of the period, and a diametrically opposed portrait to the one painted after Caesar’s murder in Cicero’s *de Officiis* and *Philippics*. The contrasts and contradictions of these works will prove Cicero to be a failure and a fraud.

***

BEFORE THE IDES OF MARCH

A. Evidence from the letters

Cicero returned in the beginning of 49 from his governorship in Cilicia to find a Rome divided between the interests of two men. His high hopes for a triumph were crushed under the egos of Caesar and Pompey, and to a great extent the lines had been drawn. Before his return Cicero had hoped for peace, and fostered respect for both men, as evidenced when, in a letter to Caelius Rufus, formerly under Cicero’s patronage and successfully defended by him on a criminal charge in 56,\(^4\) written August of 50 on his way back from his governorship in Cilicia, he states, “I want to see Caesar respected, I can lay down my life for Pompey; but nothing is closer to my heart than the commonwealth itself.”\(^5\) Cicero was truly the great republican of Rome, and nothing ever commanded more reverence from him than the Roman Republic itself. Despite the reports of increasing

---

\(^4\) Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero’s letters to his Friends*. p.799

\(^5\) Fam. 2.15.3 to Caelius Rufus (note, all translations from Shackleton Bailey’s *Cicero’s Letters to his Friends*).
tensions in Rome, he fostered hopes that all could be settled apart from armed conflict.

Cicero had grown up during the turmoil of the 90’s and 80’s and had witnessed the devastation of the proscriptions of property and the slaughter of nobles. With this in mind he tells Atticus in December of 50 that “Caesar will be no more merciful than Cinna in the slaughter of leading men and no more temperate than Sulla in plundering the rich.”6 To such an uncertain Rome Cicero returned in January, still clinging to empty hopes for a triumph.

Cicero’s foresight about the intentions of Caesar proved myopic, for by the end of the war even Cicero the great Republican, the Pater Patriae of earlier years, had to admit Caesar’s magnanimity and clemency. Nonetheless, his beloved Republic, at least in the form Cicero had known and loved, was shattered- all the power of the state rested effectively in one man. Cicero’s attitude toward Caesar, evidenced in his letters and philosophical works, was anything but constant during this tumultuous time, and in his unwavering commitment to political pragmatism Cicero would prove to be a fraud; in his inability to restore the Republic he had loved, a failure. Plutarch relates how in his last living moments Cicero “clasped his chin with his left hand, as he was accustomed to do, and

6 Att. 7.7 (note, all translations from Shackleton Bailey’s Letters to Atticus).
looked intently at his murderers, covered as he was with dirt and hair and his face wasted with worry, so that the majority hid their faces when Herennius was slitting his throat.”7 Without license to speak openly of tyranny during Caesar’s life, he became the great apologist for tyrannicide after Caesar’s death and betrayed the kindnesses paid him by the dictator. In Caesar’s presence, Cicero acted with deference; in private he complained.

Julius Caesar came from one of the oldest and most revered families of Rome. He would come to claim lineage from Aeneas of Troy and thus Venus herself. He rose to power in the Roman political system and was elected consul in 59, an administration which would incite much discord among the nobility for its program of populist reform. So much discord would it arouse that Caesar was to be tried for treason against the state upon his return from Rome from his campaign in Gaul. Caesar had legal immunity so long as he did not relinquish his command, a move he understandably resisted. He attempted to stand for consulship for 48 in his absence which would prolong his immunity from prosecution, but when the senate denied him he saw no other course but outright war to protect his dignitas. Caesar’s greatest asset was his military prowess, and by means of this solely would he attain sole control of Rome.

7 Plutarch, Cicero. 48.4
When war broke out in 49 Cicero’s views were explicit— he was for peace and the Republic; and in his own mind this meant alliance with Pompey. Caesar had tried before the war to enlist Cicero’s help to add some legitimacy to his cause, to which Cicero quips that “Caesar’s side lacks nothing but a cause, all else they have in abundance... Caesar sends me smooth letters and Balbus does the same on his behalf. I am determined not to stray an inch from the path of strict honour.” Only weeks into the war Cicero writes of Caesar to Atticus: “Where is honour without moral good? And is it good to have an army without public authority, to seize Roman towns by way of opening the road to the mother city, to plan debt cancellations, recall of exiles, and a hundred other villainies ‘all for that first of deities, Sole Power’?” This is hardly to say that Cicero was all in favor of Pompey’s actions, for in the same letter he condemns Pompey’s abandonment of Rome to leave it open for slaughter. Cicero is for the restoration of the Republic and at all times urges peace. The power of personal obligation, though, constrains Cicero and binds him to join Pompey in Greece. Despite real hopes that he could somehow avoid the war, Cicero tells that “I shall do this for Pompey; it is what I owe him. No one else influences me, neither the honest men’s talk (there are no honest men) nor the cause, which has been conducted without scruple. I do it

---

8 Att. 7.3.5,11
9 Att. 7.11
simply and solely for Pompey who does not even ask it of me and is, so he says, fighting not for himself but for the country.”

A critical meeting between the orator and Caesar occurred on 28 March of 49, where again Caesar tried to enlist Cicero’s aid. From the meeting which the orator had for some time been dreading Cicero writes to Atticus an account of their exchange. At Caesar’s prompting for Cicero to come to Rome and speak in favor of peace, Cicero replies, “I shall take the line that the Senate does not approve of an expedition to Spain or of the transport of armies into Greece, and...I shall have much to say in commiseration of Pompey.’... On that note we parted. So I imagine Caesar is not pleased with me. But I was pleased with myself, an experience I have not had for quite a long time.” At this point in the war Cicero is singular in purpose. He sees no reason to trust Caesar; he sees the republican cause in the hands of Pompey. After some months of deliberations since the onset of the war, whether to seek some neutral haven or participate in the war, whether to concede to Caesar or oppose him openly, Cicero resolves to join Pompey in Greece. “[D]oubt if you can that Caesar will institute a massacre when he returns, victor or vanquished. I shall snatch myself from the clutches of these criminals in a rowing boat if I cannot find a ship.” In the end Cicero found a ship.

10 Att.9.1.4
11 Att.9.12
12 Att.9.18
13 Att.10.10
Cicero took no real military part in the war, and in fact refused the command at Dyrrachium offered him by Cato after Pompey’s defeat at Pharsalus, a refusal which nearly cost him his life. Pompey fled to Egypt after his defeat at Pharsalus and was assassinated upon landing. Cicero said of his colleague only that, “I knew him for a man of good character, clean life, and serious principle.” Earlier in the same letter Cicero expresses his position: “I have never regretted quitting the war. There was so much cruelty on our side, such association with barbarian races;...and it was already agreed by universal consent that the possessions of all of you should be the plunder of the victors.” Cicero sees himself then stuck without suitable alliance. In May of 47, while Caesar has been detained in the east with the problems of revolt in Alexandria and resistance of Pharnaces, Cicero laments that “I can neither go back to my former party nor on the other hand do these people here [i.e. the Caesareans in Italy, particularly Antony] give me any sign of encouragement.” After the defeat of the Pompeians at Pharsalus and the death of Pompey, Cicero seems to switch his position to one in which he must seek mercy at the hands of Caesar, though this at great mental price. “I cannot believe any honest man could possibly think I was not paying too dearly for safety by begging it at his [Caesar’s] hands, especially as I no longer have a single

14 Plutarch, Cicero. 39.2
15 Att. 11.6
16 ibid.
17 Att.11.15
companion in this course." The delay at Alexandria had caused the tide of opinion to shift in favor of the republicans. It also allowed the Pompeians time to rally for a resistance in Africa- the war, even without Pompey, was not yet over. Cicero, in his attempt at pragmatism, is foiled.

On his return from Spain late in 49, Caesar had appointed himself dictator whereby he was able to oversee his own election to consulship of 48, his original intention. In October of 48 Caesar was again made dictator, this time for a year, and in April of 46 dictator for ten years. This would prove a moot appointment both because he would soon be declared dictator in perpetuum and because he would die only two years later. Cicero at this time begins his recognition of the despotism of Caesar. He quips in August of 47 that “Caesar’s concessions, from a master to slaves, are his to revoke at will.” Years earlier, when the conflict between the two warlords, Caesar and Pompey, was just coming together and outcomes were wholly undecided, Cicero had noted that the “Republic is not at issue. This is a fight for a throne.” Early in the war, Cicero had no faith in either side for the preservation for the Republic, but personal obligation, faith in Pompey’s military prowess, and hope for the restoration of the Republic spurred him on. Even earlier, pondering upon the outcome of the

---

18 Att.11.16
19 Att.11.20
20 Att. 10.7
war in March of 49, Cicero, writing in Greek, waxes philosophical to Atticus:

Ought a man to remain in his country under a despotism? Ought he strive for the overthrow of a despotism by every means, even if the existence of the state is going to be endangered thereby? Ought he to beware of the overthrower lest he be set up as a despot? Ought he try to help the country under a despotism by taking opportunity as it comes and by words rather than by war? Ought a statesman live quietly in retirement while his country is under a despotism or ought he take every risk for freedom’s sake? ...Ought a man who has rendered his country a great service and has on that account brought himself irreparable suffering and hostility voluntarily to incur danger on his country’s behalf, or may he be allowed to begin to think of himself and his family, giving up political opposition to those powers?\(^\text{21}\)

And so, by the end of 47 Cicero begins to see all of his fears coming to pass. Caesar has won the war, though much “cleaning up” of the Pompeian resistance continues for the next two years; he thus has essentially absolute control. The despot is, in Cicero’s mind and for all practical purposes, in place.

Cicero opts for the life of quiet retirement; to Servius Sulpicius Rufus, consul of 51 and a long associate of Cicero’s, he writes in 46, “I have devoted all my time and attention to philosophy. Little more is left for your branch of knowledge [jurisprudence]...than for mine. [oratory]”\(^\text{22}\)

Cicero has by this time reconciled himself to a life of quietude outside of public office, outside of his beloved Forum where his talents used to shine

\(^{21}\) Att.9.4  
\(^{22}\) Fam 4.4
beyond compare. In his private correspondences he makes jokes as to Caesar's tyranny. He remarks to Atticus that his house will surely go up in value with Caesar as a neighbor and that, after the installation of Caesar's statue in the temple to Romulus, he prefers Caesar sharing a temple with Quirinus than with Weal. All of this private disgruntlement confounds absolutely the words and arguments Cicero offers to Caesar himself in his Caesarean speeches.

B. Evidence from the Caesarian Speeches

After Caesar has won the war, he enters into a course of clemency whereby he recalls exiles and grants forgiveness to those who opposed him in the war. One such opponent was Marcus Marcellus who as consul of 51, after Caesar's defeat of Vercingetorix virtually concluded the Gallic Wars, called for Caesar's immediate relinquishment of command and return to Rome. The question was postponed until the following year, and upon the outbreak of war Marcellus followed Pompey to Greece and may have fought at Pharsalus. He lived in exile at Mytilene refusing to seek pardon. Marcellus' case was brought up in 46 at a meeting of the Senate by Caesar's own father-in-law, Lucius Piso, and Marcellus' cousin, and was supported by the whole body of senators. Caesar conceded pardon, and in

23 Att.12.45
response Cicero broke his long kept silence in the Senate to respond to Caesar's act.  

There is no reason to doubt that the gratitude Cicero expresses for the clemency shown by Caesar toward Marcellus is sincere, but the tone of deference and pandering will mark a stark contrast to private feelings and public writings and utterances after Caesar's death. "There is no genius so overflowing, no power of tongue or pen so lofty or so exuberant, that it can adequately describe, let alone embellish, your achievements, Gaius Caesar." The discussion of Caesar's assassination in the speech marks the most troublesome attitude expressed in light of the views expressed later. Cicero characterizes an assassination plot in terms of an "atrocissimam suspicionem" and asks who is so deranged to commit such an act. Cicero even asks, "what man on earth is there so ignorant of life, so unversed in politics, so utterly careless of his own well-being and that of the community, as not to realize that his own well being is bound up in yours, Caesar?" Throughout the speech Cicero links the welfare of the people to Caesar's own well-being; every word is laudatory, every word contradicting Cicero's philosophical loathing for despotism. While surely it should not be argued that instead Cicero ought to have condemned the dictator and his magnanimity, as this would be political, if not bodily,
suicide given Caesar’s power, Cicero’s words drip with a flattery which belies Cicero’s attitudes toward Caesar as a tyrant. In the *pro Marcello*, Cicero blatantly lies when he says, “we all promise you not merely our sentinels and bodyguards, but the shelter that our own breasts and bodies can afford.”

Certainly Cicero had need to keep in Caesar’s good graces if he was to play any role at all in reconstructing the Republic and restoring the constitution, but such lies, even in oratory where facts fall second to persuasion, constitute fraudulent misrepresentation. R.R. Dyer has argued that “[I]n publishing *pro Marcello* Cicero saw the opportunity in Caesar’s clemency to arouse a sense of outraged *dignitas* and *gloria* in his noble peers.” Dyer essentially argues that some elements of Cicero’s audience would feel shame at a loss of honour, outrage at a need for clemency, and at Caesar’s position to allot it. Cicero even writes to Atticus after Caesar’s death, “clemency was his undoing, but for which nothing of the sort could have happened to him.” While this doling out of clemency, “like a master to slaves,” surely could not have sat well with some disgruntled senators, it does not seem to be Cicero’s intent to incite these to tyrannicide, as Dyer claims.

---

28 *pro Marcello* 31.
29 Dyer, “Rhetoric and Intention in Cicero’s *pro Marcello,*” p.21
30 Att.14.22
31 see note 15
Writing to Sulpicius of the speech, Cicero claims that his “[resolution [to keep silent] was so overborne by Caesar’s magnanimity and the Senate’s solicitude. So I expressed gratitude to Caesar at considerable length... so as to meet his wishes on the one hand and the claims of my literary pursuits on the other.”\(^{32}\) To Marcellus himself after his pardon by Caesar, Cicero wrote, “One is not free, it may be so, to say what one thinks, but one is quite free to keep silence. All power has been handed over to one man; and he follows no counsel, not even that of his friends, except his own.”\(^{33}\)

Cicero, though, forfeited his right to remain silent in order to appease Caesar, and his aim was not even to persuade Caesar to allow Marcellus’s pardon- Caesar had already granted clemency! The pro Marcello, instead, merely serves to flatter the dictator in order for Cicero to reside in Caesar’s good graces. The pro Ligario and the pro Rege Deiotaro, later speeches delivered to Caesar to win the pardon of former dissidents, were indeed given in order to persuade the dictator, and both contain arguments to that effect, though still veiled in flattery. Cicero, when he argued in court, meant to win. In the case of Ligarius, perhaps encouraged by the reception of his speech pro Marcello, Cicero relied on an approach of a deprecatio, a defense essentially conceding guilt but making as an excuse “some

\(^{32}\) Fam. 4.4
\(^{33}\) Fam 4.9
predestinate calamity." He thus depended on the clemency of the dictator, but nonetheless argued with all his oratorical skills for a pardon; and given Caesar as sole judge, some amount of deference was in order. Craig argues that the effectiveness of the speech rests in its ability to obfuscate the charges (Cicero wholly passes over Tubero’s charge of perduellio, or high treason) so that Caesar is able to grant clemency while at the same time appearing a fair judge and not a mere arbiter of absolute power.

There is also no reason to think, as some scholars have posited, that the affair was planned in advance as a ploy to highlight Caesar’s clemency, with Cicero acting as virtual henchman for showcasing Caesar’s clemency. Plutarch records the event: “When Cicero began to speak and moved him [Caesar] tremendously, and the speech as it proceeded was both varied in emotion and wonderful in charm, Caesar let many shades of emotion show on his face and was quite clearly experiencing all the challenging emotions of the soul, he became completely overcome by emotion- his body shook and he let some documents fall from his hand. At any rate, he acquitted the man of the charge under compulsion.” While this account, undoubtedly embellished for effect, has come under attack on the grounds that Caesar was not a man given over to displays of emotion,

---

34 pro Ligario 17
35 Craig, “The Central Argument of Cicero’s Speech for Ligarius.” p.198
36 see Craig, ibid. note 1, p. 193.
37 Plutarch, Cicero. 39.
Gottoff argues that “in a highly rhetorical society like that of Rome, men of wit and discernment must have kept a delicate balance between an intellectual appreciation of the techniques of oratory and a willingness to be moved emotionally by the effects of those techniques.” The speech for Ligarius, then, was legitimately aimed at persuasion and not propaganda. Whether planned or not, however, Cicero’s speeches do showcase Caesar’s clementia, as both the pro Ligario and the pro Rege Deiotaro rely heavily upon clemency for acquittal. Cicero’s speeches essentially provide excuses for Caesar to promote his program of forgiveness and his appearance of benevolent, if absolute, rule. Cicero must surely have realized that his oratory would, if successful, highlight Caesar’s clementia, for by no other means could a deprecatio such as the pro Ligario meet with acquittal, and as such Cicero actively promoted Caesar’s program. If Cicero was at this time taking aim at a role in the Caesarean government, which seems unlikely, his later writings prove him a fraud. If, on the other hand, Cicero indeed harbored loathing for Caesar as a tyrant, his pandering to him in the Caesarean speeches and in personal interaction prove him a fraud bent upon mere expedience, only to gloat in the wake of Caesar’s demise. Dyer’s view that Cicero’s promotion of Caesar’s clementia was actually an incitement to the republican senators does not hold up both because Cicero’s letters describing the pro Marcello privately acknowledge

---

38 Gottoff, Cicero’s Caesarean Speeches, p.26
Caesar’s magnanimity, and Caesar himself was quite conscious of his public image and as such would be among the first to notice an attempt on Cicero’s part to use Caesar’s *clementia* against him. Despite various instances indicating a drift toward kingship, Caesar publicly disavowed the title of “King,” and at the Lupercalia early in 44 refused the diadem offered by Antony and had an entry added to the Fasti recording his refusal.\(^{39}\) Caesar, one of the brightest men in Rome, would see a plot such as Dyer suggests at least as soon as the senators supposedly meant to be incited.

Cicero, in the Caesarean speeches, shows a great deal of deference to Caesar far beyond what would be requisite to remain in Caesar’s favor. Cicero panders to the dictator repeatedly, and in a later letter, depicting a certain encounter with Caesar at a dinner party at Philippus’ house on 18 December of 45, Cicero reports that “we talked of nothing serious, but a good deal on literary matters.”\(^{40}\) In the presence of the dictator Cicero feigned, if not outright friendship, at least amicability.

**AFTER THE IDES OF MARCH**

This apparent attitude confounds implicitly the views espoused repeatedly *post mortem Caesaris*. Again and again Cicero praises the tyrannicides to the skies, particularly in his *de Officiis*. In the introduction


\(^{40}\) Att. 13.52
to the second book of this philosophical work Cicero explains that he has written his work because Rome has been in the control of a tyrant, under whom there could be no room for statesmanship or authority. More pointedly Cicero complains that wild ambition had fueled Gaius Caesar to "trod underfoot all laws of gods and men." Over and over again he condemns tyranny and praises tyrannicide, as when he states that if anyone kills a tyrant, "the Roman People find him not guilty." This view of tyranny far predates the reign of Caesar, as well, for in his *de Re Publica*, written in the late 50's, Cicero declares "and no creature more vile or horrible than a tyrant, or more hateful to gods and men, can be imagined."

Also, in the second Philippic, never delivered though imbued with sincerity (perhaps all the more so since it required no providence in delivery), Cicero propounds, "Well then, is there a man, apart from those who were happy to see Caesar king of Rome, who did not want this to happen or disapproved of the act? So we are all guilty. And, to tell the truth, all honest men killed Caesar so far as in them lay. Some lacked design, some courage, some opportunity: none lacked the will." This is quite a drastic shift from Cicero's pledge to Caesar to protect him not only

---

41 *de Officiis* II.2  
42 *de Officiis* I.26  
43 *de Officiis* III.19  
44 *de Re Publica* II.xxvi.48  
45 *Philippics* II.29
with bodyguards but with his very body to ensure the protection of the state.\textsuperscript{46}

The letters following Caesar’s death echo this sentiment again and again. “The Ides of March are our only consolation.”\textsuperscript{47} Cicero condemns Caesar while he praises the tyrannicides: “[The Ides of March] opened the door of immortality to our heroic friends.”\textsuperscript{48} The turmoil which arises after Caesar’s death, however, proves far worse for Cicero personally: “It is clear that after the removal of the tyrant the tyranny remains... We could not bear to own Caesar as our master, but we bow to his notebooks.”\textsuperscript{49} In the wake of Caesar’s death, Marc Antony arrogated much of the power of Caesar, and continued to rule almost absolutely in the name of the dictator. Cicero makes his personal and philosophical views on Caesar crystal clear after his death, but in the wake of his demise comes to regret his loss, not as tyrant but at least as a provider of order.

By May of 44 Cicero finds “no satisfaction in the Ides of March... I was so much in his good graces (may the gods confound him, dead as he is) that at my time of life, since the killing of our master has not set us free, \textit{he} was not a master to run away from.”\textsuperscript{50} Antony’s regime proves for Cicero far worse than Caesar’s, and Cicero’s disregard for this regime,

\begin{footnotes}
\item\textsuperscript{46} see note 22
\item\textsuperscript{47} Att. 14.4
\item\textsuperscript{48} Att. 14.14
\item\textsuperscript{49} ibid.
\item\textsuperscript{50} Att.15.4
\end{footnotes}
particularly in the relentless invectives of the *Philippics*, spelled his demise.

CONCLUSION

Cicero, then, failed to rebuild his beloved Republic even in the wake of his tyrant’s death. Cicero was above all else a political animal, and his long estrangement from the world of politics during Caesar’s reign enervated him to the point that as Herennius slits his throat, Plutarch depicts the *Pater patriae* as “covered as he was with dirt and hair and his face wasted by worry.”

His long and distinguished career had led him to this. Cicero proved ultimately a failure. For all his political dealings, his lifetime of alliances and realliances, all calculated to win him prestige and honour, Cicero proved ultimately a fraud as well. His opposition to Caesar publicly evaporated after the death of Pompey, evident only in quiet jabs and laments of bad fortune. Toward Caesar personally and publicly he harbored nothing but deference. Even towards other Caesareans Cicero acts only out of personal pragmatism. In an appeal to Lucius Plancus, a Caesarean, on behalf of a financial concern of Cicero’s associate, the orator goes so far as to write, “Please believe me when I say that in this very war any action of mine not in accordance with Caesar’s wishes... was taken by the advice, instigation, and influence of

---

51 Plutarch, *Cicero*. 48
others.”52 Only after the Ides of March, Cicero’s lauded “consolation,” did he muster the will which he professes as universal among “honest men” in the Philippics. In his dealings with Gaius Julius Caesar, Cicero was a fraud.

52 Fam. 13.29
Appendix

51- 50: Cicero is in Cilicia and returning from his governorship there. Caesar refuses to relinquish his command because of threats of prosecution and injury to his dignitas.

10 January 49: Caesar crosses the Rubicon beginning the Roman Civil War.

17 Jan. 49: Pompey leaves Rome and retires in Campania with the Consuls and many of the senators.

21 February 49: Caesar seizes Corfinium, a strategic crossroads in northern Italy, and forces surrender. Pardons opposition and recruits troops.

March 49: Pompey withdraws to Brundisium; sends senators and consuls to Greece. Caesar arrives with six legions and blockades port. Pompey escapes on 17 March to Epirus.

28 March 49: Caesar visits with Cicero in Arpinum en route to his return to Rome to regularize his position.

March- early April 49: Caesar in Rome and then heads to Spain. Opposed in Massalia; Caesar’s men besiege the town, but not successful until Caesar returns.

June 49: Cicero Leaves to join Pompey in Greece.

October 49: Caesar returns to Rome from Spain, appointed dictator for 11 days, presides over his own election to consul with P. Servilius Isaucarius. Then Caesar proceeded to Brundisium to pursue Pompey.

Late 49- May 48: Caesar surrounds Pompey at Dyrrachium, though without enough troops to properly man the blockade. Caesar retires his blockade and heads east to aid Domitius Calvus who was fighting Metellus Scipio, a Pompeian.

9 August 48: Pompey defeated at Pharsalus despite larger numbers. Pompey fled first to Lesbos to rejoin his wife and then to Egypt where he was assassinated.

mid-October 48: Cicero returns to Brundisium where he become virtual exile.

12 August 48- March 47: Caesar reaches Alexandria and enters city with his lictors. He establishes himself in the palace. Etesian winds prevented departure, and
Caesar acts as arbiter between Cleopatra and her brother/husband Ptolemy. Tries to extract debts unpaid by the Alexandrians. Revolt lasts until arrival of Mithridates of Pergamum with reinforcements in March. Meanwhile Cato musters Pompeian forces and marches through the desert to Africa to join Metellus Scipio and allies with King Juba.

mid-47: Caesar sails to Syria, defeats Pharnaces at Zela, settles the East and returns to Rome. Has magistrates elected for rest of 47 and 46, borrows money for the war, sells property of Pompey and unpardoned opposition.

25 December 47: Caesar goes to fight Pompeians in Africa, but after being mauled by Labienus is driven into unaccustomed caution. Defeats Pompeians at Thapsus and Utica (Cato commits suicide rather than bow to Caesar’s clemency). Labienus and Pompey’s sons escape to Spain.

late July 46: Caesar returns to Rome. At a later meeting of the senate Caesar pardons M.Marcellus and Cicero offers his pro Marcello.

September 46: Caesar celebrates four triumphs for Gaul, Egypt, Pharnaces, and Juba.

late 46: Caesar heads to Spain to put down remaining Pompeian resistance.

March- June 45: Caesar fights Pompey’s sons in Spain and defeats them. Caesar retires to northern Italy.

October 45: Caesar returns to Rome in a triumph which makes a bad impression on public, as it was a triumph over Roman Citizens.

18 December 45: Cicero and Caesar dine together at the house of Philippus.

February 44: Caesar refuses the diadem and the title “Rex” offered by Antony at the Lupercalia.

15 March 44: Caesar assassinated in the senate by Brutus and Cassius.

September 44- April 43: Cicero delivers his 14 Philippic speeches, mostly against Antony.

7 December 43: Cicero is assassinated by Antony’s men at his villa at Formiae.
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