

Gesine Manuwald

# 'Political Intratextuality' with regard to Cicero's Speeches

## 1 Introduction

Over the course of research on Cicero's writings it has long been noted that his speeches contain references to arguments advanced earlier and repetitions of points, that he refers to earlier speeches in later ones and that he comments on his speeches in treatises and letters. If one looks at such connections from the perspective of 'intratextuality',<sup>1</sup> therefore, one cannot restrict oneself to single speeches, but will have to consider the entire oratorical corpus: from the point of view of intratextuality<sup>2</sup> a 'text' can be defined as a single work or a text with paratexts or the entire oeuvre of a single author consisting of a number of self-contained works. The various manifestations of 'intratextuality' can thus be viewed as placed on a scale ranging from connections within a single work to links between several independent texts by the same author, when intratextuality approaches intertextuality.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 The main work on intratextuality with reference to ancient Greek and Roman texts is the collection edited by Sharrock/Morales (2000). The volume's framework and approach are outlined in Sharrock's (2000) introduction; this discussion is complemented by the methodological and theoretical observations in a review by Edmunds (2004). The essays in the volume apply different concepts of intratextuality to a range of selected texts. The collection includes an article on intratextuality in Cicero's *De re publica*, discussing intratextual relations within a single Ciceronian philosophical work (Fox 2000).

2 For a definition see e.g. Chandler/Munday, 2011, s.v. intratextuality: 'Internal relations within a text, in contrast to intertextuality, which involves 'external' relations with other texts. Within a single code (e.g. a photographic code) these would be simple syntagmatic relationships (e.g. the relationship of the image of one person to another within the same photograph). However, a text may involve several codes: a newspaper photograph, for instance, may have a caption (see anchorage).'

3 See Broich 1985, 49–50: 'Wenn die Bezüge von Texten auf einzelne Prätexte untersucht werden, dann handelt es sich bei den Prätexten in der Regel um Texte anderer Autoren. Es darf jedoch nicht übersehen werden, daß ein Text sich auch auf einen Text des gleichen Autors beziehen kann und daß dieses Phänomen ganz ähnliche Züge wie die Intertextualität aufweist. Hier ist zunächst der hin und wieder als Auto- oder Intratextualität bezeichnete Verweis eines Textes auf andere Stellen des gleichen Textes zu nennen. Gehen wir auf einer gedachten Skala einen Schritt weiter von der Intra- in Richtung auf die Intertextualität, so gelangen wir zu den für die Einzeltextanalyse ebenfalls wichtigen Verweisen eines Textes auf Nebentexte des gleichen Autors, wie z.B. Vor- und Nachworte, Erläuterungen in Briefen, Interviews und dergleichen.'

Intratextual links to be observed with respect to Cicero's speeches predominantly rely on correspondences and consistency in the use of ideas and concepts. That, therefore, Cicero's individual speeches and further texts alluding to them can be seen as a coherent corpus and thus open to intratextual analysis, is a result of their shared themes and argumentative character. Obviously, there is a fundamental difference between speeches and comments in treatises and letters since the speeches were originally delivered orally on a particular occasion. What is available nowadays are the written versions, and they have been revised before publication (see section 4), even though the extent of the changes cannot be established with certainty. At any rate, as only the revised published versions are extant, it is almost impossible to explore in what way intratextual links within individual speeches may have arisen from positive or negative reactions among the audience at the point of delivery.<sup>4</sup> Thus, because the surviving written versions were composed after the event, noticeable intratextual connections in the extant versions are likely to have been created by the author on purpose. The different forms these can take, initially within a single speech and then across the oratorical oeuvre, shall be described in this case study, so that their functions can be analysed.<sup>5</sup>

## 2 Intratextual references within single speeches or groups of speeches

As for individual speeches, it can be inferred that written versions were typically more carefully constructed and polished than their delivered counterparts:<sup>6</sup> when Cicero says about the speech of thanks to the Senate given after his return from exile (57 BCE) that, because of the magnitude of the matter, it was delivered

---

Wiederum ein Stück näher in Richtung auf die Intertextualität sind solche Texte lokalisiert, die auf andere, eigenständige Texte des gleichen Autors verweisen.'

4 The opposite strategy, namely that Cicero changed his original tactic in the course of the delivery because of the hostile reactions of the audience, has been assumed for *Philippic Twelve* (Hall 2008 [2009]): the fact that this procedure is not immediately obvious might be seen as proof that Cicero turns the edited versions into coherent wholes.

5 Works by Cicero will be referred to by their titles only without the addition of the author's name. – Since this study is a brief consideration of structural principles rather than an analysis of specific passages, secondary literature on individual speeches will not be recorded and discussed in detail.

6 For some orators, however, Cicero claims in the *Brutus* and also in the *Orator* that they were better speakers than their written speeches indicate (e.g. *Brut.* 82; *Orat.* 132): this typically refers to their strengths in delivery, which are not replicated in the written text.

from a written text (*Planc.* 74), this indicates that for a speech delivered in the usual way comprehensive coverage and sophisticated structure could not always be guaranteed. The extant speech *Pro Milone* (52 BCE) is not the one given at the trial, as Cicero's appearance there was unsuccessful and not a great performance due to fear and frequent interruptions, but another that Cicero wrote as the proper speech for this occasion after the event, which was regarded as brilliant (*Asc.*, pp. 41–42 Clark; *Schol. Bob. Arg. in Cic. Mil.* [p. 112 Stangl]; *Plut. Cic.* 35; *Cass. Dio* 40.54.2–4; 46.7.3). One reason why Cicero published speeches was to provide models for aspiring young orators, and he discussed the effectiveness and accuracy of certain phrases with Atticus before publication (see sections 4 and 6).

Accordingly, it is not unexpected that the extant (written) versions of speeches appear coherent and persuasive by means of intratextual references, though some of these are likely to have also been included in the oral version. In the orations on Catiline, delivered towards the end of his consular year (63 BCE), Cicero repeatedly presents Catiline and his followers as contemptible, irresponsible, non-human enemies of the Republic, without making an effort to discuss the reasons for their behaviour or offering alternatives, and announces that they should leave or have left Rome (e.g. *Cat.* 1.12–13; 1.20; 1.23; 2.1; 2.7–10; 2.12–14; 2.27; 3.3–4; 4.6). While Cicero only rarely marks the repetition or refers to events at an earlier stage in the process (*Cat.* 1.23; 2.12–14; 2.27, 3.3), the repeated negative characterization gradually creates a particular and consistent image of Catiline among the audience as well as of his opponent Cicero, and the appropriate reaction; this conditions them to agree to Cicero's policy and ensures a coherent argument and presentation of the situation. In addition, in the *First Catilinarian Oration* Cicero inserts two speeches of the personified *patria* to Catiline and to himself respectively (*Cat.* 1.18–19; 1.27–29): while both speeches are obviously products of Cicero's invention, the repeated structure invites a comparison between the two men without forcing Cicero to juxtapose their behaviour in his own voice.

Over the series of speeches Cicero's presentation varies and adapts to the circumstances in line with the developing situation; yet his main argument and his characterization of Catiline remain consistent throughout the group of four orations. This is probably not a coincidence since Cicero delivered more speeches in the context of the conflict with Catiline (e.g. at the meeting of the Senate when the *senatus consultum ultimum* was decreed: *Cat.* 1.3), but these are not extant, presumably because Cicero did not choose to write them up. On the other hand he regarded these four speeches as part of a consular corpus outlined in a letter to Atticus, which was meant to illustrate what he did and what he said as consul (*Att.* 2.1.3). The notion of viewing several speeches referring to a political event or a period in his life as a corpus (consular orations; *Philippic Oration*s) is another

indication that in Cicero's view a text may extend beyond a single speech and this may be indicated by internal links. In the *Philippic Orations* (44–43 BCE) too a consistent portrayal of Mark Antony is created by the repetition of his negative characteristics within the same speech and across speeches.

### 3 Intratextual references to oratorical activity across speeches

When, within oratorical corpora relating to the same incident, Cicero refers to statements made in earlier speeches or events connected with earlier speeches in later ones, these may serve to reinforce the argument in the new situation by appealing to consistency, often in combination with a particular interpretation of the original situation.

When Cicero reports the effect of *Philippic Three* to the People in *Philippic Four*, he tells them that Mark Antony has been declared a public enemy, if not in word, at any rate in actuality (*Phil.* 4.1). In fact, the motion Cicero put forward during the preceding meeting of the Senate (which was accepted) called for honours for generals and their armies who had opposed Mark Antony (*Phil.* 3.37–39); this could be interpreted as implying a denunciation of Mark Antony, but these consequences are not even indirectly stated in the adopted motion. Interpreting the decree of the Senate in the strong fashion of *Philippic Four* enables the orator to publicize the preferred reading of his intervention to the immediate and the wider contemporary audience and also to later readers of the group of speeches.

Again with reference to *Philippic Three*, Cicero says later in the struggle against Mark Antony that he was the first to recall liberty on that day (*Phil.* 14.19–20): this is another far-reaching interpretation of his efforts to make the Senate support Octavian and confront Mark Antony to avoid another dictatorship in Caesarian style, and again it contributes to creating an image of a consistent position in word and deed for Cicero.

Similarly to what he does in *Philippic Four*, during a slightly later sequence of discussions in the Senate extending over several days, Cicero's proposal to confront Mark Antony immediately was eventually turned down; instead, the Senate decreed the sending of an embassy to Mark Antony for negotiations. When reporting this outcome to the People in *Philippic Six*, Cicero claims that for three days almost everyone agreed with him, but that suddenly, on the present day, the majority followed another view for some reason (*Phil.* 6.3). Here Cicero could have

referred back to his speeches given in the Senate; but since they were ultimately unsuccessful, he does not insert any intratextual references and instead keeps the report vague. This applies in particular to the description of the change of mind, so that there is no need to point out that in the end the Senate followed someone else's advice rather than Cicero's. The aim to counter the impression of defeat is pursued towards the end of the speech, when Cicero claims that he spent less effort in the meeting of the Senate earlier that day because he thought that it would be better if everyone agreed with him in twenty days' time than if he received criticism from a few at this point (*Phil.* 6.16). The speech Cicero gave in the Senate on that day is not included in the corpus of the *Philippics* and does not survive. Nevertheless, since Cicero strongly argued for speed rather than universal support at the beginning of the debate (*Phil.* 5), the statement sounds like a measure to obscure an unsuccessful initiative. Because in ongoing political discussions intratextual references also have a practical dimension related to an immediate aim, in cases where they were deployed unsuccessfully, they are not included or kept vague. Moreover, their insertion would affect the impression of a consistent and successful oratorical persona across Cicero's works.

Vice versa, when Cicero makes a strong statement and delivers speeches on the same issue both in the Senate and before the People, he sometimes emphasizes that he says the same in both settings (e.g. *Leg. agr.* 2.6; *Phil.* 6.5). Such comments create an oratorical link between the two elements of a pair of speeches; predominantly, they are meant to assure the audience that Cicero is a reliable and honest politician who does not change his mind and gives the same information to everyone even in difficult circumstances. An exact report of an earlier occasion is as much an element of political tactics as its suppression; the selection of procedure depends on the political context.<sup>7</sup>

Such tactics indicate that, besides reinforcement of arguments, intratextual links between different speeches, in the same corpus and beyond, mainly serve to create a consistent and successful image of the orator's persona or address any activities and incidents that might detract from it.

In another of the *Philippic Orations* Cicero feels prompted to explain that, contrary to his previous support for peace, he does not approve of peace with

---

<sup>7</sup> On a single occasion Cicero seems to divide up material over several connected speeches, rather than repeating or interpreting what he said previously. In the *Agrarian Orations* (63 BCE) Cicero says in the speech in the Senate (*Leg. agr.* 1.21) about a particular argument that he will not deal with it in this speech, but will reserve it for the speech in the *contio* (*Leg. agr.* 2). This remark has been read as an allusion to an arrangement of these speeches as a corpus or as an element of an extended *praeteritio* (see Classen 1985, 367).

Mark Antony (*Phil.* 7.7–8). Because it means a move away from what he argued for in the past and what is regarded as the general preference, he expresses the new view in a long and complex sentence with a number of parenthetical comments and explanations before he reveals the main point at the very end. There is no reference to a particular preceding oratorical situation; instead, there is a comment on the general attitude emerging from Cicero's previous utterances and writings. Apparently, Cicero intends to create a coherent persona or at least to make changes of mind and policy plausible. Within the *Philippic Orations* Cicero comes back to the issue in later speeches and points out that there can only be apparent peace with Mark Antony and that he therefore opposed such a peace from the start of the conflict (*Phil.* 13.1–7; 14.20). Such remarks explain Cicero's position in relation to Mark Antony and make it appear consistent within this conflict.

Within the corpus of the *Agrarian Orations*, delivered when Cicero has just entered office as consul (63 BCE), Cicero notes at the beginning of the *Third Agrarian Oration*, given before the People, that he is forced to make this speech in justification of himself since false rumours had been spread about him and consequently some members of the audience had changed their attitude towards him in comparison with the *Second Agrarian Oration*, his inaugural speech to the People (*Leg. agr.* 3.1–3). While Cicero thereby justifies this speech and presents himself as the victim of something he will refute immediately, the reminder of the previous favourable attitude among the People (at least according to Cicero) suggests obliquely that there is no reason for a change of mind since Cicero is still their champion.

Comments on different oratorical appearances may also illustrate the orator's attitude over an extended period of time: after Cicero had established a reputation for himself as a defence advocate in his youth, he undertook his first prosecution in the trial against Verres in 70 BCE. In the *Divinatio in Caecilium*, the speech delivered during the selection of the preferred prosecutor before the actual trial, Cicero comments that he has acted for the defence for many years and people might therefore wonder why he is now aiming to act for the prosecution (*Div. in Caec.* 1). Here Cicero does not refer to a specific instance or a particular oratorical appearance, but rather to his oratorical career more generally: he acknowledges that his past behaviour in court cases has endowed him with a certain persona; as this is connected with the production of a particular type of speeches, it implies a reference to the (defence) speeches given so far and an indication that he is ready to go on to produce something different. The change of oratorical genre is not a mere literary decision, but rather prompted by the political circumstances. A similar justification, though not as elaborate since the

situation is not as delicate, is offered when Cicero explains that he is giving his first speech before the People after becoming praetor in 66 BCE (*Leg. Man.* 2), as opposed to his previous speeches as an advocate.

Equally, where appropriate, Cicero emphasizes connections between his political appearances, usually with the implication that, as he was successful in the past, he will be so again in the present or future, and thus again works towards creating a consistent oratorical and political persona. For example, Cicero opens *Philippic Two*, composed in autumn 44 BCE, with the consideration that for the past twenty years nobody was an enemy of the Republic who was not also an enemy of Cicero; as the continuation of the argument reveals, he compares his present enemy Mark Antony to Catiline and Clodius in the past (*Phil.* 2.1). Later in the conflict Cicero claims that the People declared at a *contio* that by his initiatives against Mark Antony he had preserved the Republic a second time (*Phil.* 6.2). The point of comparison consists in his efforts in connection with the Catilinarian Conspiracy in 63 BCE; in the *Third Catilinarian Oration* Cicero reports to the People that he had been honoured for preserving the Republic (*Cat.* 3.15).

Cicero is able to link interventions at different times and against different individuals in this fashion, since he regards all his major opponents in a similar way and follows a comparable strategy in confronting them. He does not regard their different opinions or their planned activities as indications of structural problems or of the existence of different factions; instead he isolates these men as awful, non-human individuals who threaten the political system of the Republic. In response, he argues that these individuals will have to be eliminated; afterwards a return to the traditional and established system will be possible.

Accordingly, even if Cicero does not explicitly refer to the conflict with one opponent in a speech against another, there are intratextual connections owing to comparable tactics. This applies, for instance, to the speeches against Catiline in 63 BCE and those against Mark Antony in 44–43 BCE. Cicero does claim in one of the *Philippics* that Mark Antony is similar to Catiline only in crime, but not in industry (*Phil.* 4.15); yet this is meant to serve the argumentative purpose to make defeating Antony seem more achievable rather than indicating a major difference. Generally, the characterization of the two men and the arguments against them are comparable, though they are adapted to the different situations in that Mark Antony is commanding armies outside Rome while Catiline is stirring up a revolution within the city.

In both cases Cicero sets the great societal, juridical and political values offered by his side against the criminal and despicable features offered by the others (e.g. *Cat.* 2.25; *Phil.* 8.8–10). For each of the two men Cicero describes their negative character, demonstrated particularly by their sexual licentiousness and

their squandering of money (e.g. *Cat.* 2.8; 2.10; *Phil.* 2.45; 2.67). Cicero stresses that the opponents cannot be regarded as Roman citizens and not even as human beings, rather as enemies and beasts (e.g. *Cat.* 2.12; 4.10; *Phil.* 3.12; 3.28; 4.12; 5.21; 6.7). Moreover, it is emphasized that it is not only they themselves who are of appalling character, but that they also surround themselves with followers who are like them or even worse (e.g. *Cat.* 2.7; *Phil.* 6.4).

## 4 References to speeches in letters

Since Cicero the orator was also a writer of letters and talks about his oratorical activity in letters (which in this context then assume the function of paratexts), there are cross-references across genres, and remarks on speeches in letters reveal details about the production process and how Cicero wanted them to be seen.

For instance, Cicero had an epistolary conversation with his friend M. Iunius Brutus about the *Philippics* (44–43 BCE): the preserved elements of the correspondence show that Cicero sent some of the speeches from this conflict to Brutus and jokingly called them ‘*Philippics*’, presumably after the model of Demosthenes (*Att.* 2.1.3). Brutus confirmed that the two speeches he had read were of a quality to deserve this title and approved its use (*Ad Brut.* 2.3.4), so that Cicero gladly employed the name when sending another speech from the group (*Ad Brut.* 2.4.2). While this discussion is separated from the text of the speeches, in the context of Cicero’s entire oeuvre it adds a further dimension to the orations: it demonstrates that Cicero wanted these speeches to be seen as comparable to those by Demosthenes, though it remains open whether this refers to the style, the respective political situation, or both.

Brutus’ comments do not address details of these orations. Cicero’s epistolary conversations with Atticus, on the other hand, include discussions of factual issues and individual stylistic points in orations (*Att.* 1.13.5; 15.13.1; 15.13.7 [= 15.13a.3]; 16.11.1–2). Cicero sometimes feels prompted to make changes in response to Atticus’ suggestions; he almost expects him to provide such comments, uses him as a sounding board and is anxious with respect to Atticus’ ‘red pen’ (*Att.* 16.11.1). Such conversations give insight into the production process and demonstrate that the text of speeches eventually circulated is not a spontaneous effusion, but one that has gone through several drafts and may incorporate suggestions from other people besides the author. The reflection of this process in Cicero’s correspondence also means that some of the intratextual links across works do not refer to finished works, but their earlier stages. Since



Cicero may not have intended to publish all his letters to Atticus, it is not certain whether this phase of the composition process was meant to be an element of Cicero's public literary persona. At the same time this testimony demonstrates the care taken over the published version of speeches and thus the importance of this aspect as an element within Cicero's presentation of himself.

Atticus is also the addressee to whom Cicero sends a selection of speeches delivered in his consular year with an accompanying letter in 60 BCE; these he regards as his *orationes consulares* and as illustrating what he did and what he said as consul (*Att.* 2.1.3). The collection of these orations and the corresponding comments indicate that, despite some mock modesty, Cicero considered these speeches to be oratorically sophisticated and politically significant, and that he saw a close connection between his oratorical interventions and his political achievements. The list of consular orations given may encourage readers to see connections between speeches that they otherwise might not have linked apart from their shared date. In a later speech Cicero provides an overview of achievements during his consulship to distinguish himself from his opponent. In this context he mentions activities and results that are all linked to oratorical appearances; thus this summary functions as a kind of review of his major oratorical successes during his consulship (*Pis.* 3–5). By not letting them stand for themselves, but rather adding a particular presentation elsewhere in his oeuvre, the interpretation of these interventions and speeches becomes determined for later recipients, and they are explicitly integrated into the creation of Cicero's persona.

## 5 References to speeches in rhetorical treatises

Cicero as an author of rhetorical treatises could be regarded as different from Cicero the orator, though he writes on the basis of his own experience. Yet Cicero creates a link between the two as he frequently refers to examples from his own speeches in his rhetorical treatises; he thus in some way follows the principles outlined in the preface to book four of the anonymous *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, where the author argues that it is better to use one's own examples when explaining oratorical features, though he seems to think rather of invented examples (*Rhet. Her.* 4.1–10). Cicero's oeuvre can provide the required examples: he claims in the treatise *Orator* (46 BCE) that 'there is no kind of oratorical merit which is not found in our orations, if not in perfection, at least attempted and adumbrated' (trans. H.M. Hubbell), though this is qualified by comments in mock modesty. In the same context Cicero says that he does not quote detailed examples from his speeches since they are well known or easy to find (*Orat.* 102–104); such an

assessment conveys confidence in his status as a well-known orator and indicates the view that intratextual references may help to build up a reputation.

These remarks follow after general comments on some of his speeches, illustrating the variety of styles used. Cicero says about the speech *De imperio Cn. Pompei* (66 BCE) that ‘the task was to glorify Pompeius’ and about *Pro Rabirio perduellionis reo* (63 BCE) that ‘the whole principle of maintaining the dignity of the republic was at stake’ (trans. H.M. Hubbell). These descriptions do not identify the legal issues addressed in these speeches; they rather single out the aspects Cicero chose to highlight when he turned these speeches into elements within a political controversy. The backward reference in the rhetorical treatise enables him to make this explicit and thus give pointers to the preferred reading.

Again, however, although the rhetorical treatises have less of an immediate political agenda than public speeches, the comments on earlier orations there convey a particular interpretation and therefore do not always match what Cicero says elsewhere. In *Orator*, when Cicero illustrates the effects of his vigorous style in dislodging opponents (*Orat.* 129), he claims that Catiline was struck dumb when accused by him in the Senate in 63 BCE, while he says elsewhere (*Mur.* 51 [63 BCE]) that Catiline made an answer (cf. also *Sall. Cat.* 31.6–32.1). The version in *Orator* is not necessarily a complete misrepresentation. Cicero stresses the overwhelming effect, since Catiline left the Senate immediately after his reply and did not meet with a favourable reception among the senators; thus Cicero disregards the initial reaction and emphasizes the effect of his own speech. A tendentious representation might become easier at some distance from the event; at any rate it contributes to creating an image of a successful Cicero for posterity.

Elsewhere in *Orator* Cicero provides examples from his speeches and quotes passages verbatim, almost exactly in the form in which they are transmitted for the speeches; he must have either remembered these phrases or had access to written versions (*Orat.* 107–108; 167; 225). On one of these occasions Cicero distances himself from his youthful exuberance (cf. *Brut.* 316), but still notes the applause received (*Orat.* 107–108). The repetition of these passages in the rhetorical treatise makes them more widely known and suggests that Cicero felt confident to promote them.

Some comments do not refer to particular speeches or phrases in speeches, but rather to an oratorical situation including the provoking of emotions in the audience by textual and paratextual elements. To illustrate the necessity to arouse the emotions of the audience, Cicero mentions his accusation speeches against Verres and his defence speeches. He obviously thinks that the written text sufficiently indicates the emotional atmosphere created by the speeches and that these orations are known or easily accessible to the audience of the dialogue.

Again he concludes the argument by stressing the variety in his speeches and their suitability as examples (*Orat.* 131–132). This method is a convenient way of providing an overview of his output and his abilities as an orator, and of indicating the breadth covered without taking the audience through a substantial sample of speeches, though they may thereby be encouraged to read some.

Similarly, elsewhere, Cicero does not quote extracts, but rather refers to passages from his speeches, briefly defined by their topics, as examples of instances where the use of rhythmical prose is appropriate (*Orat.* 210). Again Cicero stresses the variety of patterns in his orations, though he apologizes for this in mock modesty. He seems to assume that the audience is familiar with the details of the passages and to regard them as well-developed pieces. Since the examples mostly come from the second action against Verres, which was not delivered, Cicero would have had the chance to produce elaborate versions and the text would have been available in writing. The comments help to highlight aspects of the speeches that otherwise might have gone unnoticed, and to present Cicero as an orator who not only makes the appropriate argument in a political or juridical situation, but is also technically accomplished.

## 6 Conclusion

While some of the intratextual connections within individual speeches or across several speeches pointed out for Cicero in this brief overview might be regarded as general features of sophisticated oratory, the available evidence means that Cicero is the only Roman orator for whom they can be explored and interpreted as well as supplemented by comments in other literary genres. While it is known from remarks by ancient writers that other orators too had certain habits and preferred topics in composing their speeches,<sup>8</sup> these descriptions cannot be verified by surviving examples, and it is therefore uncertain whether such repetitions had a particular aim in the composition of each speech or across a person's oratorical and political or juridical activity. For Cicero, however, the extant material demonstrates that he exploits the opportunities provided by intratextual links, cross-references, self-comments and allusions both to further the argumentative aim of the respective pieces of writing and, across his oeuvre, to create a consistent

---

<sup>8</sup> Quintilian records that the openings of many speeches by M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus included claims that he was weak, unprepared and no match for the talents of the opposing party (Quint. *Inst.* 4.1.8).

image of an oratorical persona, who produces highly-wrought, sought-after specimens of oratory and employs these successfully in political and juridical situations for the benefit of his countrymen and the Republic.<sup>9</sup>

Since, obviously, Cicero pursues a political agenda in his speeches, cross-references are not only determined by literary considerations, but also governed by political circumstances. Therefore Cicero may refer back to an earlier speech and its effect on a later occasion, but not accurately represent what he originally said since he exploits the renewed reference to give the earlier instance a particular interpretation conducive to his overall current aim. This may even trigger a reverse effect, so that recipients looking at the original text read it as Cicero later presented it when they have seen his interpretation first. Such references can be found in the later speeches within groups or in letters belonging roughly to the same period, when Cicero starts to comment on his oratorical appearances while the process is still ongoing, presumably to influence the next steps. Or they may occur in texts produced considerably later, presumably triggered by a concern to create a particular image for posterity.

In various works Cicero defines himself as an orator employing words as opposed to others using weapons; he thus creates a persona for himself based on separately available oratorical utterances (*Red. pop.* 20; *Fam.* 12.22.1). A qualitative element is added when he claims that he publishes written versions of his speeches, as he has been encouraged to do so by the enthusiasm of young men, and thus provides stylistic models (*Att.* 2.1.3; 4.2.2; *Brut.* 122–123). A similar effect of portraying himself as an accomplished and respected orator is achieved when Cicero reports the positive reaction to his speeches and indicates the hard work that has gone into composing them (*Brut.* 312). That Cicero establishes himself as an orator also on the basis of his written speeches becomes apparent when he refers to the available text of a speech as an example without mentioning further details (*Off.* 2.51). Such comments indicate that he regards all his oratorical works and the references to them as combining to create his oratorical persona.

Looking at Cicero's speeches from an intratextual point of view thus demonstrates how Cicero constantly works on creating a consistent image of himself as a successful and trustworthy orator and politician. Therefore one may conclude that intratextuality in the oeuvre of a politically active writer and applied to texts with a pragmatic function enhances the impression of unity and adds to the literary texture of the work, but predominantly is a convenient tool of controlling

---

<sup>9</sup> Cicero's recognized fondness for the clausula *esse videatur* (*Tac. Dial.* 23.1) is too much of a technical element as to be relevant for a discussion of intratextuality.

reactions of the audience and —equally importantly in Cicero's case— of self-representation.<sup>10</sup>

## Bibliography

- Broich, U. (1985), 'Bezugsfelder der Intertextualität. Zur Einzeltextreferenz', in: U. Broich/M. Pfister (eds.), *Intertextualität. Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*, Tübingen (Konzepte der Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft), 48–52.
- Chandler, D./Munday, R. (eds.) (2001), *A Dictionary of Media and Communication*, Oxford.
- Classen, C.J. (1985), *Recht – Rhetorik – Politik. Untersuchungen zu Ciceros rhetorischer Strategie*, Darmstadt; Italian translation: *Diritto, retorica, politica. La strategia retorica di Cicerone*, Bologna 1998 (Collezione di testi e studi, Linguistica e critica letteraria).
- Edmunds, L. (2004), 'Review Article: Intratextuality: The Parts, The Wholes, and the Holes', *Vergilius* 50, 158–169.
- Fox, M. (2000), 'Dialogue and Irony in Cicero: Reading *De Republica*', in: A. Sharrock/H. Morales (eds.), *Intratextuality. Greek and Roman Textual Relations*, Oxford, 263–286.
- Hall, J. (2008 [2009]), 'The Rhetorical Design and Success of Cicero's *Twelfth Philippic*', in: T. Stevenson/M. Wilson (eds.), *Cicero's Philippics: History, Rhetoric and Ideology*, *Prudentia* 37 & 38, 282–304.
- Sharrock, A./Morales, H. (eds.) (2000), *Intratextuality. Greek and Roman Textual Relations*, Oxford.
- Sharrock, A. (2000), 'Intratextuality: Texts, Parts, and (W)holes in Theory', in: A. Sharrock/H. Morales (eds.), *Intratextuality. Greek and Roman Textual Relations*, Oxford, 1–39.

---

**10** That 'intratextuality' has a political dimension was adumbrated in the volume edited by Sharrock/Morales (2000), but the potential manifestations were not explored within the scope of the case studies offered in that collection.

