

## 'CICERO' ON THE (THEATRE) STAGE

*The earliest dramas in which 'Cicero' appears on stage as a character date from the last quarter of the sixteenth century: a piece in France, one in Germany and (at least) three in Britain were produced in fairly quick succession. In all of these 'Cicero' is not the protagonist after whom the plays are named; instead, he is a more or less important figure involved in the dramatic action.*

### 4.1 Robert Garnier, *Cornélie* (1574)

#### *Context*

Robert Garnier (c. 1545–1590) studied law and did legal work in Paris before becoming a magistrate in his native district of Maine (a region in France) and later a member of the Grand Conseil du Royaume in Paris. From his student days onwards Garnier wrote literary works, starting with lyric and later turning to dramatic poetry. He is now regarded as one of the most significant French dramatists of the sixteenth century. The majority of Garnier's plays dramatize stories from the ancient world: *Porcie* (1568), *Cornélie* (1574), *Hippolyte* (1574), *Marc-Antoine* (1578), *La Troade* (1579) and *Antigone* (1580). At the same time the themes have contemporary resonance: the pieces share an emphasis on civil war, are characterized by a republican outlook and were published during the turbulent period of the French Wars of Religion.<sup>1</sup> As for their form, Garnier's plays feature little dramatic action and rather consist of an alternation of rhetorically developed speeches and choruses; they are based on the model of Seneca's Latin tragedies.<sup>2</sup>

*Cornélie* was first performed in 1573; it was first published in 1574 and then included in an edition of Garnier's tragedies in 1585. In the introduction to the print edition the poet claims that the favourable reception of his earlier works encouraged him and that he therefore spent his last vacation writing *Cornélie*.<sup>3</sup> The piece is meant to illustrate how a great republic falls through internal conflicts among its citizens.<sup>4</sup> *Cornélie* is dedicated to the courtier Nicolas d'Angennes (1533–1611). The dedication is followed by poems in French, Latin and Greek about the poet and his work, contributed by other writers. The author mentions Plutarch's *Lives of Pompey, of Caesar and of Cato* as well as books of Caesar's *commentarii* and of Appian's and Cassius Dio's historical works as sources;<sup>5</sup> some allusions to Cicero's works have been identified.<sup>6</sup>

An English version of *Cornélie* was published as *Cornelia* in 1594, without an indication of the source or the name of the English writer on the title page; the dedication (to Bridget Morrison Radcliffe, Lady Fitzwalter and Countess of Sussex [1575–1623]) is signed 'T. K.' and mentions Garnier as the basis.<sup>7</sup> A second edition in 1595 identified Garnier's play as the starting point and Thomas Kyd as the 'translator'. Thomas Kyd (1558–1594) was an important Elizabethan playwright, best known as the author of *The Spanish Tragedy* (c. 1580s). Kyd's 'translation' of Garnier's play (based on the 1585 or a later edition) is not a translation in the literal sense, but rather an adaptation, not meant to be performed; it appeared after the first genuine English play featuring Cicero (ch. 4.2).<sup>8</sup>

### *Bibliographical information*

texts:

CORNELIE, | TRAGEDIE | DE ROB. GARNIER | CONSEILLER  
DV ROY | au siege Prefidial & Sene- | chauffee du Maine. | A  
MONSEIGNEVR DE | RAMBOUILLET. | A PARIS, | Del'Imprimerie  
de Robert Estienne. | M. D. LXXIII. | AVEC PRIVILEGE.

[available at: <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k70810x/f2.image>]

CORNELIE, | TRAGEDIE. | A MONSEIGNEVR DE | RAM-  
BOUILLET CHEVA- | *lier de l'ordre du Roy, Confeiller en son | Conseil priué,*  
*Capitaine de ses Gardes, Se- | nefchal & Lieutenant pour sa Maiesté au | pays &*  
*Conté du Maine.*, in: LES | TRAGEDIES DE | ROBERT GARNIER |  
CONSEILLER DV ROY, | Lieutenant general Cri- | minel au siege

Prefidial | & Senechauffee | du Maine. | AV ROY DE FRANCE | ET DE  
POLONGNE. | A PARIS, | Par Mamert Patiffon Imprimeur du Roy, |  
chez Robert Estienne. | M. D. LXXXV. | *Avec privilege.*

{available at: <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b86256333>}

modern edition (of 1585 edition): J.-C. Ternaux (ed.), *Robert Garnier, Cornélie. Tragédie. Édition critique, établie, présentée et annotée*, Paris 2002 (Textes de la Renaissance 53; Robert Garnier Théâtre complet III).

English version: CORNELIA. | AT LONDON, | Printed by *Iames Roberts*, for *N. L.* | and *John Busbie.* | 1594.

{available on Early English Books Online}

Pompey the Great, | his faire | *Cornelias Tragedie*: | Effected by her  
Father and Hus- | bandes downe-cast, death, | and fortune. | *Written in  
French, by that excellent | Poet Ro: Garnier; and tran- | slated into English by  
Thomas | Kid.* | AT LONDON | Printed for Nicholas Ling. | 1595.

repr. in: *The Works of Thomas Kyd. Edited from the original texts with  
introduction, notes, and facsimiles* by Frederick S. Boas, M.A., Oxford  
MDCCCCI (pp. 101–160).

{available at: <https://archive.org/details/worksthomaskyd00kydgoog>}

characters:

1574: INTERLOCVTEVRS: M. CICERON. | CORNELIE. |  
PHILIPPES, Affranchy de Pompée. | C. CASSIE. | DECIME BRUTE.  
| IVLE CESAR. | M. ANTOINE. | LE MESSAGER. | LE CHÈVVR.

1594: INTERLOCVTORES: M. Cicero. | Philip. | Deci. Brutus. |  
M. Anthony. | Cornelia. | C. Cassius. | Iulius Cæsar. | The Messenger. |  
CHORVS.

### *Comment*

Garnier's drama is the earliest identifiable play in which Cicero appears as a character.<sup>9</sup> Although Garnier was familiar with the preceding plays by Marc Antoine Muret and Jacques Grévin (cf. ch. 3), who dramatize roughly the same phase in Roman history without Cicero's presence, Garnier included Cicero among the characters, thus enhancing the political dimension from the start.<sup>10</sup> The political emphasis can already be inferred from the list of characters since only two of them (the freedman and the messenger) are not historical.

At the same time the piece differs from almost all later ones featuring Cicero by its title: it is named after an historical woman, who is not

typically associated with Cicero's life or the historical events he was involved in. Yet, just like Cicero, the historical Cornelia, the daughter of Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius Scipio Nasica and the wife of P. Licinius Crassus and then Cn. Pompeius Magnus (Pompey), was affected by the political turbulences in the late Roman Republic. In the play *Cornélie* appears as a woman who, after Pompey's death (48 BCE), is initially determined to kill herself, but then decides to carry on living although she also has to deal with the news of her father's suicide. The drama is set in 46 BCE after the defeat of Caesar's opponents. *Cornélie*'s situation gives the playwright the opportunity to present Cicero and other figures of public life, alone or in conversation with her, reflecting on recent political developments and on the history of Rome, and to demonstrate political struggles extending over several generations. Thus, the piece privileges speeches expressing personal and philosophical views of life and considering the situation of Rome, particularly in relation to Caesar usurping the position of a monarch. Correspondingly, there is not a lot of action in the play; no indication of scenery is given in the script.

Although Cicero is not mentioned in the title and perhaps not expected in a play about *Cornélie*, he takes centre stage: Cicero is the first character to make an appearance; the first act consists entirely of a long speech by him (the only act to feature a single character); he is present in three of the five acts (Acts I, II, III), in as many as *Cornélie*. In the speech in the first act Cicero bemoans the current political situation; he laments the degeneration in Rome, the power of ambition, the civil wars, a lack of direction and government, vainglorious boasting of earlier deeds and the fact that the Romans are not able to maintain their empire owing to a lack of virtuous behaviour. Thus, Cicero emerges as a representative of well-organized republican times, marked by liberty; he analyses and regrets the current situation, but does not consider any action to change it. In the second act Cicero continues to bemoan the recent history of Rome; moreover, he acts as a philosophical adviser, when he proclaims that *Pompée* has died in a good way and tells *Cornélie* that everyone and everything dies, but that one should not attempt to die before the appointed time and rather bear fate patiently. Alluding to Stoic doctrines, he advocates resilience in unsatisfactory political circumstances. In the third act Cicero becomes more political again and reflects on the fact that Rome has conquered many external enemies only to be enslaved now by one of their own; he thus comes closer

to Cornélie's views. Again, Cicero does not contemplate political alternatives. A possible reaction is shown by Cassie and Decime Brute in the fourth act, when they think of assassinating Cesar.

Writing in the time of the French Wars of Religion, Garnier presents the phase of Roman history shown in the drama as a conflict between republican liberty and a sense of community on the one hand and tyranny and ambition on the other hand; he has the positive characters support liberty and take action to preserve it against individuals abusing positions of power.<sup>11</sup> Within the depiction of such political issues Cicero fulfils the role of a representative of the traditional republican system, which has led to Rome's growth, and of a wise philosopher; his political activities as an individual and his biographical details are therefore not particularly relevant. Accordingly, there is little obvious reference to the writings of the historical Cicero. Instead, his philosophical pleading recalls works of Seneca the Younger, and the plot is based on ancient texts providing information about the historical context, as the sources given by the playwright suggest.

In Kyd's version the focus is also on characters lamenting the loss of republican liberties, initiated by Cicero and reinforced by other characters and the choruses.<sup>12</sup> Thus Cicero again appears not so much as an individual politician, but rather as a representative of the endangered republic.

#### 4.2 Stephen Gosson, *Catiline's Conspiracies* (c. 1579)

##### *Context*

Stephen Gosson (1554–1624) was educated at Corpus Christi College, Oxford (1572–1576); later he was active as a poet, playwright and (perhaps) actor in London.<sup>13</sup> Of the plays he wrote for the London stage only three titles survive, including *Catiline's Conspiracies*; none of these pieces is extant. Later, Gosson left London, became a private tutor and then took holy orders.

In 1579 Gosson published his anti-theatrical work *The Schoole of Abuse*, in which he attacked stage plays and which provoked a literary dispute (e.g. *A Defence of Poetry, Music, and Stage-plays* by Thomas Lodge and also *An Apology for Poetry* by Sir Philip Sidney). In *Playes confuted in fiue actions prouing that they are not to be suffred in a Christian common weale, by the waye both the cauils of Thomas Lodge, and the play of*

plays, written in their defence, and other objections of players friends, are truly set downe and directly answered (1582)<sup>14</sup> Gosson continued to argue against plays in a Christian community.

While the text of Gosson's play *Catiline's Conspiracies* does not survive, he comments on it in *The Schoole of Abuse* (1579);<sup>15</sup> so the play must predate this work.<sup>16</sup> Gosson writes (pp. 23–24): 'The *Blacke Smiths* daughter, & *Catilins* conspiracies vsually brought in to the Theater: The firste containing the trechery of *Turkes*, the honourable bountye of a noble minde, & the shining of vertue in distresse: The last, because it is knowen too be a Pig of myne owne Sowe, I will speake the lesse of it; onely giuing you to vnderstand, that the whole marke which I shot at in that worcke, was too shewe the rewarde of traytors in *Catilin*, and the necessary government of learned men, in the person of *Cicero*, which forfees every dāger that is likely to happen, and forstalles it continually ere it take effect. Therefore I giue these Playes the commendation, that *Maximus Tyrius* gaue too *Homers* works: Καλὰ μὲν γὰρ τὰ Ὀμήρου ἔπη καὶ ἔπων τὰ κάλλιστα, καὶ φανώτατα καὶ ἄδεσθαι μούσαις πρέποντα ἀλλὰ οὐ πᾶσι καλὰ οὐδὲ ἀεὶ καλὰ. These Playes are good playes and sweete playes, and of al playes the best playes and most to be liked, woorthy to bee sough of the Muses, or set out with the cunning of *Rofcius* himself, yet are they not fit for every mans dyet: neither ought they commonly to bee shewen. Now if any man aske me why my selfe haue penned Comedyes in time paste, & inueigh so egerly against them here, let him knowe that *Semel infaniuimus omnes*: I haue sinned, and am sorry for my fault: hee runnes farre that neuer turnes, better late then neuer. I gaue my self to that exercisē in hope to thriue but I burnt one candle to seek another, and lost bothe my time and my trauell, when I had doone. Thus sith I haue in my voyage suffred wrack with *Vlisses*, and wringing-wet scambled with life to the shore, stād from mee *Nauficaä* with all thy traine, till I wipe the blot from my forehead, and with sweet springs wash away the salt froath that cleaues too my soule.'

These remarks indicate that the play was regularly performed by 1579. It has been suggested that Gosson may have been a member of the acting company 'The Earl of Leicester's Men', who were very successful around 1580.<sup>17</sup>

Since Gosson studied at a grammar school and then at Oxford, he must have known Greek and Latin; his extant writings include references

to works by Plutarch, Cassius Dio, Sallust and Cicero, which would provide background information for a drama set in Cicero's time.<sup>18</sup> Therefore it is plausible that Gosson made use of ancient sources for his play on Catiline's conspiracy.<sup>19</sup> In particular, the title of *The Schoole of Abuse* was inspired by Cicero, to whose assessment Gosson apparently subscribed to some extent (p. 3): '*Tullie* accuftomed to read them [sc. Greek poets] with great diligence in his youth, but when hee waxed grauer in studie, elder in yeares, riper in iudgement, hee accõpted them the fathers of lyes, Pipes of vanitie, & Schooles of Abuse.'<sup>20</sup>

### *Bibliographical information*

text:

not extant<sup>21</sup>

characters:

include: Catiline; Cicero

### *Comment*

The surviving notices reveal that the play featured Catiline as a traitor as well as Cicero representing the government of learned men. Presumably, therefore, the play did not focus on Cicero's personal fate, but rather on his well-considered political actions as consul. Gosson seems to have had Cicero deliver a speech in this play, as one of the contemporary reactions to *The School of Abuse* indicates: 'but fure in that I like your iudgement, and for the ref to, I approue your wit, but for the pigg of your own fow (as you terme it) affuredly I muft difcommend your verdict, tell me Goffõn was all your owne you wrote there: did you borow nothing of your neyghbours? out of what booke patched you out *Ciceros* oration? whence fet you *Catulins* inuectiue. Thys is one thing, *alienam olet lucerni non tuam*, fo that your helper may wifely reply vpon you with *Virgil. Hos ego verficulos feci tulit alter honores*. I made thefe verfes other bear the name.'<sup>22</sup> This polemic by Thomas Lodge suggests not only that Cicero delivered a speech including elements of one of the surviving orations of the historical Cicero, but also that statements based on earlier contemporary texts were put in Catiline's mouth, characterized as 'invective'. Such an utterance may have provided a contrastive foil for Cicero as a thoughtful politician.

### 4.3 Philipp Nicodemus Frischlin, *Iulius redivivus* (1585)

#### *Context*

Philipp Nicodemus Frischlin (1547–1590) was a German Humanist, scholar and poet. The oldest son of a learned priest, he was educated first at various grammar schools and then at the Eberhard Karls Universität in Tübingen (Germany). He studied Latin, ancient Greek and Hebrew as well as theology, rhetoric, literature and astronomy. In 1568 Frischlin was awarded an extraordinary professorship at Tübingen (*Lectio Poeticae*); he mainly taught poetry and history. In 1576 he was crowned poet laureate by emperor Rudolf II, and in 1577 he was made an imperial count Palatine. His outspokenness, especially his criticism of the nobility, later forced him to leave Tübingen. He moved to Laibach (modern Ljubljana in Slovenia), then returned to Tübingen briefly and later spent time in Prag, Wittenberg, Braunschweig, Kassel, Marburg and Mainz. Eventually Frischlin was arrested on the orders of the court in Württemberg and imprisoned in the fortress of Hohenurach (near Reutlingen in southern Germany) in March 1590; he died during an escape attempt on 29 November 1590.<sup>23</sup> Frischlin produced commentaries on classical authors as well as original works in the genres of epic, elegy and drama. He wrote a number of dramas that went on to be rather popular. His piece *Helvetiogermani* (Helmstedt 1589) is based on the first book of Caesar's *Gallic Wars*.<sup>24</sup>

Nicodemus Frischlin's brother Jakob Frischlin (1557–c. 1642) also studied in Tübingen and became a teacher at a school in Waiblingen (near Stuttgart) around 1578. He taught Latin and rhetoric, and he used Latin plays and their German translations for his classes. He translated his brother's drama *Iulius Redivivus* as well as his religious comedies *Rebecca* (1576) and *Susanna* (1578) into German. That these dramas were used in teaching is confirmed, for instance, by the extant guidance on the syllabus for a school in Speyer (1594).<sup>25</sup> Jakob Frischlin also wrote a drama of his own (*Graff Hansen*, 1609) and worked on an historiographical piece, though these endeavours remained without success. After his brother's death, Jakob Frischlin composed a dialogue between Nicodemus Frischlin, returning from the dead, and his enemy Martin Crusius (1526–1607), a classicist, historian and professor in Tübingen (*Nicodemus Frischlinus P. L. et Comes Palatinus Caesarius, Orator & Philosophus praestantissimus, factus redivivus*, 1599).



This piece therefore takes up a structure that Nicodemus Frischlin used in *Julius redivivus*.<sup>26</sup>

According to his own words, Nicodemus Frischlin started working on the play *Julius Redivivus* in 1572 and returned to it in 1580.<sup>27</sup> A version of the play was performed in Tübingen between 1582 and 1584 while Frischlin was in Laibach. In November 1584 the Latin manuscript was prepared for the first printing (in five acts); it was published (without a preceding separate edition) as part of the *opera omnia* in Strasbourg in 1585 (a<sup>f</sup> – F 8<sup>v</sup>) and again in the second edition of the *opera omnia* in 1589 shortly before the author's death.<sup>28</sup> The piece was performed (in three acts) on 10 May 1585 in the castle in Stuttgart on occasion of the second marriage of count Ludwig (der Fromme) (1554–1593; reigned 1568–1593) with Ursula von Pfalz-Veldenz-Lützelstein (1572–1635);<sup>29</sup> on that occasion Frischlin seems to have played the character of the poet Eobanus Hessus.<sup>30</sup> Nicodemus Frischlin has described these festivities, including comments on the play's performance (*De secundis nuptijs illustrissimi principis ac domini, D. Ludovici, Ducis Wirtembergici ac Teccensis cum illustrissima Duce ac Domina, D. Vrsula, Duce Bavariae, comite Palatina Rheni, praeterito Majo, hujus 1585. Anni celebratio Stuccardiae. Libri quatuor. Versu conscripti Heroico*, Tübingen 1585).<sup>31</sup>

Nicodemus' brother Jacob Frischlin translated the play into German. The first version of the translation (in four acts), published in 1585, is presumably based on the original Latin manuscript (now lost) and may mirror a performance version. A second German translation by Jacob Frischlin appeared in 1592 (in five acts), based on the first edition of the Latin play of 1585 and the last edition before his brother's death in 1589; it moves further away from the Latin text. This version was performed in Strasbourg. Later German translations (e.g. by Jakob Ayrer, printed in 1618) deviate even more from the Latin original.<sup>32</sup>

### *Bibliographical information*

texts:

IVLIUS REDIVIVVS | COMOEDIA, IN | LAVDEM GERMANIAE  
| & Germanorum scripta. | Auctore | NICODEMO FRISCHLINO, |  
Poëta coronato, Cæsarij Pa- | latij Comite. | Cum gratia & priuilegio: |  
Argentorati apud Bernhardum Iobinum. | M. D. LXXXV.

{available at: <http://www.uni-mannheim.de/mateo/camena/frisc6/te07.html>; various modern reprints and editions}

OPERUM POETICORUM | NICODEMI | FRISCHLINI POETAE,  
| ORATORIS ET PHILOSO- | phi, pars scenica: in qua sunt, |  
COMOEDIAE QUINQUE, | REBECCA, | SVSANNA, | HILDE-  
GARDIS, | IVLIVS REDIVIVVS, | PRISCIANVS VAPVLANS, |  
TRAGOEDIAE DVAE, | VENVS, | DIDO. | *Ex recentissima auctoris  
emendatione.* | Cum Priuilegio Cæsario. | Apud Bernhardum Iobinum. |  
Anno 1585.

{available at: <http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/~db/0008/bsb00083216/images/>}

OPERUM POETICORUM | NICODEMI | FRISCHLINI POETAE,  
| ORATORIS ET PHILOSOPHI | pars scenica: in qua sunt, |  
COMOEDIAE SEX. | REBECCA. | SVSANNA. | HILDEGARDIS. |  
IVLIVS REDIVIVVS. | PRISCIANVS VAPVLANS. | HELVETIO-  
GERMANI | TRAGOEDIAE DVAE. | VENVS. | DIDO. | *Ex  
recentissima Auctoris emendatione.* | Cum Priuilegio Cæsario. | Excudebat  
Bernhardus Iobin. | Anno M. D. LXXXIX.

{available at: <http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/~db/0003/bsb00037595/images/>}

German translation: IVLIUS CAESAR | ET M. T. C. REDIVIVI. |  
Das ist | Wie Julius Cae- | sar der erst Roemisch Kayser vñ | aller  
freytbarist Kriegs heldt / welcher Achtzig | jar: vor Christi geburth /  
gelebt / wider auff Erden | Kompt mit Marco Tullio Cicerone Dem aller |  
gelherstê Oratore. Die sich jener ab der Teutschê | Kriegfrueftung  
Buechlen Harnischen / gebewen / vñ | gewaltigen Staetten: Der aber ab  
den gelertê Leu | ten / Druereyeyen / Allerlei Sprachen / vnd was das |  
Teutsch volck / Die tausent Sechshundert jar | Wunderbarlichs  
Erfunden vñ erdacht hat | gar artlich und luestig Spils weiß | verfallêt.  
Durch | Magistrum Iacobum Frischlinum Lateinischen | Schuelmeistern  
zu Weyblingen / auß der lateini- | schen Comœdia in die Teutsche  
transferiert vnd | gemacht seinem vilgeliebten vatterlant | zu Lob vnd Ehr  
| Zu Speyr Bei Bernard Dalbin. | 1585.

{available as a modern re-edition: *Iulius Redivivus. Comoedia. In der  
Übersetzung von Jacob Frischlin.* Herausgegeben von Richard E. Schade,  
Stuttgart 1983 (RUB 7981)}

German translation (second version): NICODEMI FRISCHLINI. P. L.  
ET | Comitum Palatini Caesarij, | IVLIVS CAESAR, | CVM M. T. C.

*REDIVIVVS*, | Das ift: | Wie *IVLIUS* | *CAESAR* Der Erft | Roemifch  
 Kayfer / vnnd aller freytbarift | Kriegßmann vnd Heldt wieder  
 durch diese Comoedi- | am auff Erden kompt / vnd lebendig wuerdt:  
 Mit *M. T. C.* | dem allerglertesten Oratore: Da fich Jener ab der |  
 Teuetfchen Kriegßrueftung: Der aber ab den | gelehrten Leuetten / Vnd  
 Truckhereyen / | Vnd allerley fprachen verwundert. | Durch |  
*M. IACOBVM FRISCH-* | *LINVM.* Latheinfchen | Schulmaifter zu  
 Wayblingen / auß der | Latheinfchen Comaedia In diese Teutfche artlich  
 vnd | Lustig verfetzt vnfern vielgeliebten gemeinen | Vatterland  
 Teuetfcher Nation zu lob | vnd Ehrn. | Gedruckt in der Kay: Reichstatt  
 Speyr / | Durch Bernard Dalbin: | Anno Domini: | *M. D. XCII.*

characters:

Latin version (1585): *PERSONAE*: Mercurius. | Cæsar. | Cicero. |  
 Hermannus. | Eobanus. | Allobrox, mercator. | Caminarius. | Pluto.

German version (1585): *PERSONAE* | Dieses Spils: Mercurius  
 Heroldt | Caesar Ein Roemer | Cicero Ein Roemer | Hermannus Ein  
 hertzog | Eobanus Ein Poett | Allobrox Ein Sophoyer | Caminarius Ein  
 kemmet feger.

### *Comment*

This play featuring Cicero as a character is unusual among dramas portraying Cicero because it does not focus on aspects of Cicero's life, works or historical events he was involved in or on references to Cicero's writings.<sup>33</sup> Instead, Cicero, along with Caesar, is brought back from the dead by the divine messenger Mercurius to visit the 'new Germany', the land the Romans conquered 1,600 years ago.<sup>34</sup> As the subtitle and the dedicatory letter indicate, this is a play in praise of Germany and the Germans (Strasbourg in particular, Free Imperial City within the Holy Roman Empire at the time). Frischlin saw this drama as a counterpart to those read and acted by the youth in praise of other countries.<sup>35</sup> To illustrate that Germany has made huge progress since antiquity and is now on the same level as or even surpasses ancient Rome, the benchmark, figures from the ancient world are needed, as they can assess and be impressed by this difference (though there is also criticism of aspects of contemporary Germany and a juxtaposition with the ancient historian Tacitus' praise of Germany in comparison with Rome's decline). Germany of that period is presented as ahead of other

contemporary countries: representatives of France and Italy, who are characterized negatively since their languages are barbaric versions of Latin, are shown as less culturally advanced. Thus, the encounters with the French merchant and the Italian chimney sweeper add a comic element (showing the influence of classical writers such as Aristophanes, Plautus and Lucian).

Frischlin chooses Caesar, whose name is the only one to appear in the title, and Cicero as representatives of ancient Rome, so as to have a military and a literary person, whose interest in and admiration of developments and (German) inventions in both fields (e.g. gunpowder and art of printing) can be plausible.<sup>36</sup> Caesar is particularly suitable since the historical Caesar visited Germany in his lifetime and can therefore realize and evaluate the changes with respect to cultural advancement; this is probably the reason why he is mentioned in the title. Cicero may have been selected alongside Caesar since the two men were contemporaries, so that it is not unnatural that they interact.<sup>37</sup> Their joining together, however, is not entirely straightforward since the two men were not on good terms throughout their entire lives: Frischlin is aware of this tension and has it mentioned that Pluto reconciled them with each other (Prologus, vv. 54–57). One might have thought that Ovid or Vergil would have been better counterparts for the character Helius Eobanus Hessus, the poet whom Cicero meets. The historical Helius Eobanus Hessus (1488–1540) was one of the most famous Neo-Latin poets of his time and already dead when the drama was written, but he is introduced as a representative of what is sketched as the contemporary period. Though not primarily a writer of poetry, Cicero may have been more suitable than the Augustan poets because of his broader intellectual interests: while he does not accompany Caesar and the general Hermannus to look at the armoury, he is still involved in political matters. Equally, as Cicero stays behind and engages in a conversation with Eobanus about poetry, books, printing, education, the survival of texts, the best approach to ‘Caesar’ and the position of poets, Cicero appears as a literary authority. Cicero shows himself impressed by the accomplishments of Neo-Latin poets presented by Eobanus as well as by the art of printing invented in Germany. Thus, Caesar and Cicero appear as representatives of the Roman military, political and literary elite, just as Hermannus and Eobanus are to represent German military men and intellectuals.<sup>38</sup>

Cicero introduces himself in the first act (I 2, vv. 333–335) as follows: *Ego sum Marcus ille Cicero, lumen eloquentiæ / Romanæ, cuius consilia non armorum, sed togæ / Et pacis fuerunt socia.*<sup>39</sup> This description highlights key characteristics of his achievements as the historical Cicero saw them: a great orator and a successful politician in a civil, not a military capacity (e.g. Cic. *Cat.* 2.28; 3.23; F 11 *FPL*<sup>4</sup>). Frischlin also adopts Cicero's historically attested scepticism with respect to Caesar's ambitions: his Cicero admires Caesar for his great military deeds and the characteristics that brought him fame, but also notes Caesar's desire for war (I 1, vv. 221–231; III 2, vv. 1407–1413; II 1, vv. 590–596). According to what Frischlin says in the dedication, all utterances of the drama's Cicero are based on what the historical Cicero said:<sup>40</sup> 'Quod si qui erunt, qui argumentum huius Comoediæ extenuare ausint, illorum ego animis hoc cogitandum relinquo, quanti illud sit, quòd, quicquid Cicero loquitur, suis loquitur verbis, quibus adhuc vivus uti solebat, quæque etiamnum in hominum extant memoria, et quòd Caesar, quicquid loquitur, id propè omne è commentariis suis depromptum loquitur.' Thus, audiences, who would have studied the writings of the historical Cicero and regarded him as a stylistic model, could recognize Cicero by his own statements as it were.

Caesar and Cicero leave the stage at the end of the third act.<sup>41</sup> The final one or two acts (depending on the version) thus do not contribute to their characterization. Instead, the fourth act helps to illustrate the context of the world that Caesar and Cicero have been experiencing: Hermannus tries to confront the dishonest merchant, bringing ruin to Germany with his foreign items, and condemns luxury, though he has to admit in conversation with Mercurius that the moral downfall has also been triggered by too much indulgence. The fifth act brings closure to the conceit of dead souls reappearing from the underworld; the encounter of Pluto, the god of the underworld, with the chimney sweeper provides a comic element, not only because Pluto initially understands his Italian as a garbled version of Latin, but also because Pluto regards the (black) chimney sweeper as his brother.

The early disappearance of the protagonists indicates that there was to be less emphasis on providing a complete and rounded character portrayal and rather more on presenting them as figures providing a contrast to contemporary life. As representatives of a culture seen as paradigmatic by the Humanists, they embody a standard relevant for

Frischlin's time; on the other hand, they are behind the contemporary Germans: they are not familiar with gunpowder or the printing press. When Frischlin has the two Romans admire these new inventions and introduces the primitive figures from Italy and France, the backwardness of the two Romans does not appear as worthy of criticism. On the contrary, Cicero admires and is pleasantly surprised by the fact that German poets write poetry in Latin (II 2, vv. 638–660); this creates an impression of equality with the personified intellectual authority of antiquity.

#### 4.4 Robert Wilson / Henry Chettle, *Catiline's Conspiracy* (1598)

##### *Context*

From the payments recorded in the so-called *Diary* (fol. 49v) of the Elizabethan theatrical entrepreneur Philip Henslowe (c. 1550–1616)<sup>42</sup> it is clear that in August 1598 Robert Wilson and Henry Chettle were paid for a play called *Catiline's Conspiracy* (*cattelan'es consperesey*) or *Catiline* (*cattelyne*). There is no evidence of a performance, but it is regarded as likely that the acting company The Admiral's Men performed the play in the Rose Theatre in London in 1598, during one of their most successful periods. A text is not extant.<sup>43</sup>

Robert Wilson (fl. 1572–1600) was an Elizabethan dramatist and is particularly connected with the production of sixteen collaborative plays for Philip Henslowe's theatre in 1598–1600, almost all of which have not survived and not all of which may have been completed. The titles include *Hannibal and Hermes* (with Thomas Dekker and Michael Drayton, July 1598); otherwise there is no particular reference to themes from the ancient world.

Henry Chettle (c. 1564–c. 1607) started out as a publisher and later became a popular dramatist, writing plays for London theatre companies. He is known to have been involved as the author or co-author in at least almost forty plays. Some of the titles may or may not indicate a story from the ancient world; this is the case for: *Aeneas' Revenge, with the Tragedy of Polyphemus* (February 1598–1599), *Agamemnon* (with Thomas Dekker, June 1599) and *The Golden Ass and Cupid and Psyche* (with Thomas Dekker and John Day, April 1600).

Since a contemporary reaction (1579) to Stephen Gosson's *The School of Abuse* (see ch. 4.2), attributed to Thomas Lodge, states that the author prefers Wilson's dramatic version of the story of Catiline to that of Gosson,<sup>44</sup> it is possible that there existed an earlier play by Wilson alone, which was revised in 1598.<sup>45</sup>

### *Bibliographical information*

text:

not extant<sup>46</sup>

characters:

include: Catiline

### *Comment*

The drama (probably a tragedy or a history play) is named after Catiline, which points to the Catilinarian Conspiracy as its subject matter. Therefore, Cicero, as the historical opponent, is likely to have been a character, though nothing can be inferred about his portrayal. If the authors did not go back to the original ancient sources, such as Cicero's *Catilinarian Orations* and Sallust's *De coniuratione Catilinae*, they may have used the English version of Costanzo Felici's *Historia Coniurationis Catilinae* (see ch. 2.2). Such a basis would suggest a positive presentation of Cicero as the saviour of the republic.

## 4.5 William Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar* (1599)

### *Context*

William Shakespeare's (1564–1616) famous drama *Julius Caesar* was first published in the First Folio of 1623; it was probably first staged in the Globe Theatre in London in 1599.<sup>47</sup> The Swiss physician and traveller Thomas Platter the Younger (1574–1628) records in his diary that he saw a tragedy about Julius Caesar in a theatre with a thatched roof on the south bank of the Thames in London on 21 September 1599;<sup>48</sup> this was almost certainly Shakespeare's play.<sup>49</sup>

Shakespeare's drama soon became a classic, and many translations and reworkings appeared.<sup>50</sup> This wide dissemination contributed to making this section of Roman republican history in a dramatic representation widely known.

*Bibliographical information*

text:

printed in First Folio of 1623 and in three later Folios of 1632, 1663 and 1685; numerous further editions (some with introductions and notes)

film versions:

1953: directed by Joseph L. Mankiewicz (1909–1993) and produced by John Houseman (1902–1988)

1970: directed by Stuart Burge (1918–2002) and produced by Peter Snell (b. 1938)

characters:

Julius Cæsar; Octavius Cæsar, Marcus Antonius, M. Æmilius Lepidus [Triumvirs after the death of Julius Caesar]; Cicero, Publius, Popilius Lena [Senators]; Marcus Brutus, Cassius, Casca, Trebonius, Ligarius, Decius Brutus, Metellus Cimber, Cinna [Conspirators against Julius Cæsar]; Flavius and Marullus [Tribunes]; Artemidorus [a Sophist of Cnidos]; A Soothsayer; Cinna [a Poet]; Another Poet; Lucilius, Titinius, Messala, Young Cato, and Volumnius [Friends to Brutus and Cassius]; Varro, Clitus, Claudius, Strato, Lucius, Dardanius [Servants or Officers of Brutus]; Pindarus [Servant to Cassius]; A Cobbler, a Carpenter, and other Plebeians; A Servant to Cæsar; to Antony; to Octavius; Calphurnia [Wife to Cæsar]; Portia [Wife to Brutus]; The Ghost of Cæsar; Senators, Guards, Attendants, etc.

*Comment*

Shakespeare's drama focuses on the personalities of the main characters Caesar and M. Brutus. It shows how, in response to Caesar's success, popularity and powerful (almost monarchical) position, the republican conspirators, Cassius and Brutus in particular, plan and carry out Caesar's assassination (Ides of March 44 BCE). It then continues to the triumvirate set up by Mark Antony and Octavian and to their fighting against the conspirators, ending with the death of their major representatives (42 BCE).

In this play, which features a large number of characters, the figure of Cicero does not have a major role in the dramatic depiction of Caesar's assassination and its consequences:<sup>51</sup> Shakespeare's Cicero only speaks in



a single scene (I 3); besides, there are a few comments about him in other scenes (I 2: 183–186, 275–281; II 1: 141–153; IV 3: 176–179).<sup>52</sup> Still, the figure of Cicero helps to situate the action in its historical context and to provide a foil to the political eagerness of the conspirators.

Cicero's reaction, after Mark Antony has offered a crown to Caesar in public, is described by Brutus as follows: 'and Cicero / Looks with such ferret and such fiery eyes / As we have seen him in the Capitol, / Being cross'd in conference by some senators.' (I 2). In the same scene the fellow conspirator Casca (Publius Servilius Casca Longus, d. 42 BCE) reports that Cicero delivered a speech in Greek, which only some people understood (I 2). Thus, Cicero is shown as someone concerned about the political situation and as learned, but somewhat disengaged from the political realities. This impression is confirmed when Cicero is depicted in conversation with Casca, who is upset about ominous portents (I 3); later, Casca is the first to strike Caesar (III 1; cf. Plut. *Caes.* 66.7–8; App. *B Civ.* 2.117). Cicero does not realize the seriousness of the situation and downplays the worrying nature of the portents; instead, he asks for confirmation whether Caesar will come into the senate on the following day (I 3); obviously, he is keen to see things moving on. When it is suggested at a meeting of the conspirators to include Cicero, since his reputation would be helpful for their standing and influence, Brutus argues successfully against it since Cicero will never go along with something other people have started; Casca supports this view since Cicero is not 'fit' (II 1).

Towards the end of the play it is mentioned, in line with the historical record (though without a reference to the intervening conflict with Mark Antony), that Cicero died in the proscriptions (IV 3). Cicero thus appears as a person who, like the conspirators, has to die because of his republican principles and whose death is of almost symbolic relevance for the end of the republican system; at the same time the behaviour and the assessment of his character demonstrate that he has not interpreted the signs of the time correctly.

Plutarch reports in the *Life of Brutus* that the conspirators kept their plans secret from Cicero since they were afraid of his age-related caution and his natural timidity as well as his usual weighing up of risks, which would slow them down in their actions (Plut. *Brut.* 12.1–2). As is well known, the plot of Shakespeare's drama is mainly based on information in Plutarch's biographies of ancient Romans, especially those of Marcus Brutus, Julius Caesar and Marcus Antonius, which were accessible to

Shakespeare in the English translation by Thomas North (see ch. 2.2). In shaping the character of Cicero, Shakespeare presents the facts basically in line with the details provided in Plutarch, but attributes more negative reasons to the conspirators for their refusal of Cicero's participation.

*In the seventeenth century further dramas on Caesar or Catiline, featuring 'Cicero' among the characters, were composed, particularly in Britain. At the same time the first plays named after 'Cicero' started to appear in Britain and other European countries.*

#### 4.6 *The Tragedie of Cæsar and Pompey or Cæsars Reuenge* (1606/07)

##### *Context*

This anonymously transmitted play was written for a performance by the students of Trinity College, Oxford. The printed version was entered into the Stationers' Register on 5 June 1606. A quarto was printed by George Eld (d. 1624) for the bookseller John Wright (*fl.* 1602–1658); Eld also printed works by William Shakespeare (ch. 4.5), Ben Jonson (ch. 4.9) and Christopher Marlowe; Wright sold works by William Shakespeare. The piece was reissued in the following year 'with a cancel title page referring to the Oxford performance and naming Nathaniel Fosbrook and John Wright as booksellers'. It is generally thought that the play was written and performed a few years before it was printed.<sup>53</sup>

##### *Bibliographical information*

text:

THE | TRAGEDIE | OF | Cæfar and Pompey | OR | CÆSARS |  
Reuenge. | Priuately acted by the Students of Trinity Colledge in  
Oxforde. | AT LONDON | Imprinted for *Nathaniel Fosbrooke* and *Iohn  
Wright* and are | to be sold in Paules Church-yard at the | signe of the  
Helmet. | 1607.

{available on Early English Books Online}

characters:

The names of the Actors: *Discord.* | *Titinnius.* | *Brutus.* | *Pompey.* |  
*Cæfar.* | *Anthony.* | *Dolobella.* | *Cornelia.* | *Cleopatra.* | *Achillas.* |  
*Sempronius.* | *Cassius.* | *Cato Sen.* | *Casca.* | *Roman 1.* | *Roman 2.* | *Bonus*

*Genius.* | *Calphurnia.* | *Augur.* | *Præcentor.* | *Senators.* | *Bucolian.* | *Octavian.* | *Cæfars Ghost.* | *Cicero.* | *Cato Iun.* | *Camber.*

### *Comment*

As the title suggests, this play mainly displays the relationship between Caesar and Pompey (Cn. Pompeius Magnus) as well as the reactions of other Romans, including the 'historical' figures of M. Brutus, Cassius, Mark Antony and Octavian, to the deaths of Pompey (48 BCE) and Caesar (44 BCE). The piece involves a number of *dramatis personae* (including personifications).

The character of Cicero does not really influence the plot. He only comes on stage in two scenes as a commentator on the situation (II 4; IV 1). At his first appearance Cicero regrets that civil strife has destroyed Rome's powerful position in the world; after having learned of Pompey's death, he admonishes the others not to lament Pompey's death and the lack of a grave, since Pompey will be known and praised in the entire Roman world. Cicero and the conspirators fear that Caesar intends to triumph over conquered Rome and the commonwealth and that this may be the end of Roman liberty (II 4). At the second appearance, seeing Caesar's hearse, Cicero defines it as the hearse of virtue and renown (IV 1). This is not an entirely coherent position, but Cicero seems to be designed to function as the supporter of the traditional republican system and Roman virtues, which he even sees in his opponent.

The author of the play was well read: there are allusions to contemporary and classical literature (e.g. I 1: 'Take we our last farewell, then though with paine, / Heere three do part that ne're shall meet againe' [Shakespeare, *Macbeth*]; II 5: 'And Catoes Sonne, of me do vertue learne; / Fortune of others' [Sophocles, *Ajax*]). There is little engagement with the writings of the historical Cicero although the author must have been familiar with those. Cicero is not to be characterized by a particularly literary element and is not meant to acquire much prominence.

## 4.7 William Alexander, *The Tragedie of Iulius Cæsar* (1607)

### *Context*

William Alexander, First Earl of Stirling (c. 1567–1640), a Scottish courtier, was one of the most highly regarded Scottish poets in early

seventeenth-century Scotland and England. He had political roles in Scotland and was involved in the Scottish colonization overseas, though he was not very successful and lost his fortune in the process.

As a poet, he assisted King James I (VI of Scotland) in preparing *The Psalms of King David, translated by King James*. Moreover, William Alexander wrote several dramas inspired by the ancient world (*Cræfus*; *Darius*; *The Alexandræan*; *Iulius Cæsar*). *Cræfus* and *Darius* were released in 1604 as *The Monarchick Tragedies*; all of these plays were published together in an enlarged edition in 1607 (further editions in 1616 and 1637, with revisions).<sup>54</sup> For *Iulius Cæsar* William Alexander not only drew on the ancient sources, Plutarch's biographies in particular, but also on earlier dramas, especially *Iulius Cæsar* (1552) by Marc Antoine Muret (ch. 3) and *Cornélie* (1574) by Robert Garnier (ch. 4.1).<sup>55</sup>

### *Bibliographical information*

texts:

THE | MONARCHICKE | TRAGEDIES; | Cræfus, | Darius, | The Alexandræan, | Iulius Cæsar. | Newly enlarged | By *William Alexander*, Gentleman | of the Princes priuie | Chamber. | LONDON | Printed by VALENTINE SIMMES for | ED: BLOVNT. | 1607.

{available on Early English Books Online}

modern editions: THE TRAGEDY OF | IULIUS CÆSAR, in: *The Poetical Works of Sir William Alexander, Earl of Stirling, &c.* Now first collected and edited, with memoir and notes. In three volumes. Vol. II, Glasgow 1872 (pp. 211–324).

{available at: <https://ia802304.us.archive.org/16/items/poetical-workssi00stirgoog/poeticalworkssi00stirgoog.pdf>}

L.E. Kastner / H.B. Charlton (eds.), *The Poetical Works of Sir William Alexander, Earl of Stirling. Volume the First. The Dramatic Works. With an Introductory Essay on the Growth of the Senecan Tradition in Renaissance Tragedy*, Edinburgh / London and Manchester 1921, 343–442.

{available at: <http://digital.nls.uk/publications-by-scottish-clubs/archive/106499869>}

characters:

The Actors Names: IVNO. | CAESAR. | ANTONIVS. | CICERO. | DECIVS BRVTVS. | CAIVS CASSIVS. | MARCVS BRVTVS. | PORTIA. | CALPHVRNIA. | NVNTIVS.

*Comment*

*The Tragedie of Iulius Caesar* focuses on Caesar's assassination (reported in a messenger speech), including the lead-up to the event and its aftermath (44 BCE).<sup>56</sup> As in other plays with this subject matter, Cicero is not one of the protagonists actively involved in the deed. Yet, he takes part in political discussions involving the conspirators both before and after the assassination (II 2; V 1), and there are comments on him in other scenes (II 1; III 1; IV 1). Although Juno's appearance and announcement in the first act, numerous references to inauspicious signs and reflections on the appointed time of death suggest that Caesar's assassination is predetermined, there are extended discussions among the Romans about whether this is the right course of action and whether it is justified.

From the start Cicero is grouped among the people potentially opposed to Caesar, but eventually accepting Caesar, as Antonius (Mark Antony) places him among Caesar's pacified foes in a conversation with Caesar (II 1). When Cicero appears in the subsequent scene, he speaks as an experienced politician with an historical view of Rome's political development and is proud of his earlier successes, the defeat of the Catilinarian Conspiracy in particular. Cicero defends the traditional republican government and is worried that under Caesar liberty has been lost and a tyranny has been established. His interlocutor Decius (i.e. Decimus Brutus, though also displaying features of the historical Marcus Brutus)<sup>57</sup> comments that Caesar's achievements, like his military successes, could be admired as such, but also be interpreted in the context of a desire for tyranny, which goes against Roman values and conventions. Cicero agrees, but recommends adapting to the circumstances, trusting in revenge coming from the gods (II 2), which does not sound unjustified in view of the opening remarks of the goddess Juno (I 1). In a discussion among the conspirators (III 1) Cicero's career serves to illustrate that, traditionally, in Roman society men aimed for honour and good deeds in the interest of the country and could achieve successes irrespective of their background, whereas in the present time everything depends on Caesar. Cicero is mentioned, as an example from the recent past, among those who have achieved glory despite a non-noble background: even though he has a 'ridiculous name' (presumably alluding to the fact that 'Cicero' literally means 'chickpea'), he has become as famous as the 'Fabians' (among the many members of this

family, presumably alluding to Q. Fabius Maximus Verrucosus Cunctator, well known because of his tactics in the Second Punic War). This comparison might also hint at the shared feature of inactiveness: in a later discussion the conspirators agree not to include Cicero in the plot because he is old and timid, but rather to have recourse to his eloquence later (IV 1). Cicero participates in a subsequent political discussion after the assassination, involving the conspirators and Antonius (V 1). Cicero emerges as an elder statesman, who takes a philosophical and historical view of the events: he sees Caesar's assassination as justified, despite the man's successes, because Caesar enslaved Rome, but he also encourages the others to regard the matter as settled, to stop civil wars and to promote freedom, peace and justice.

That Cicero was not actively involved in Caesar's assassination is historically attested,<sup>58</sup> and this motif is adopted in several dramas on Caesar's assassination (e.g. Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*; see ch. 4.5). Yet in contrast to Shakespeare's version, William Alexander (taking material from ancient sources and earlier dramas) presents Cicero's exclusion or passivity in a more differentiated way: while the determined conspirators regard Cicero as too old and timid, he is also characterized as a respected representative and defender of the traditional republic, an experienced and knowledgeable statesman and an accomplished orator. Consequently, Caesar's assassination is ultimately presented as justified since he has not respected the values and political traditions of the country and intended a tyranny. Cicero, who does not obtain a pronounced personal profile in this drama, still is an important figure for conveying its message: this 'Ciceronian' message can be interpreted as a warning against excesses caused by an absolute desire for power as well as self-destructive conflicts.

#### 4.8 *Everie Woman in Her Humor* (1609)

##### *Context*

This play was printed in 1609 and was probably first performed shortly before this date.<sup>59</sup> It has been transmitted anonymously, but has been attributed to the poet and playwright Lewis Machin by some.<sup>60</sup> In terms of its title and comic plot the piece is indebted to two early comedies by Ben Jonson (ch. 4.9): *Every Man in His Humour* (1598) and *Every Man Out of His Houmour* (1599); for the sequence

concerning Cicero it relies on Robert Greene's (1558?–1592) *Ciceronis amor: Tullies loue* (1589), a prose text about the young Cicero's relationship with his future wife Terentia, intended to fill the gaps left by the ancient sources.<sup>61</sup>

### *Bibliographical information*

texts:

EVERIE | VVoman in her | Humor. | LONDON | Printed by E. A. for Thomas Archer, and are to be | folde at his shop in the Popes-bead-Pallace, neere | the Royall Exchange. | 1609.

[facsimile available at: <https://archive.org/details/everywomaninher-h28unknuoft>; Google Books]

modern edition: A.M. Tyson (ed.), *Every Woman in Her Humor. A Critical Edition*, New York / London 1980 [1952] (Garland Series: Renaissance Drama 2:26).

characters:

(no list of characters in original printing; list according to Wiggins / Richardson 2015a, 374–377, no. 1532:) Flavia, Flaminius' daughter, Terentia's sister, a virgin; later Lentulus' wife | Acutus, a young gentleman; poses as a lame soldier; also called Acute | Signor Gracchus, Acutus' friend | Mistress Gaetica, a gentlewoman; later betrothed to Scilicet | Bos, Gaetica's man | Signor Servulus, a gentleman; a lover of neologisms | Signor Scilicet, a gentleman; a lover of oaths; later betrothed to Gaetica; also called Sir Scilicet | Signor Philautus, a gentleman; a lover of singing | A Boy, servant of Scilicet and Servulus; said to be little | The Host of the Hobby inn, the Hostess's husband | The Hostess of the Hobby, the Host's wife; variously called Dame Helena, Dido, and Penelope | Prentices at the Hobby | Mistress Dama, Cornutus' shrewish wife, the Hostess's gossip | Lord Lentulus, a soldier; later Flavia's husband | Marcus Tullius Cicero, a poor young scholar and orator, Lentulus' friend; later Terentia's husband; also called Tully | Flaminius, an old senator, father of Terentia and Flavia | Terentia, Flaminius' daughter, Flavia's sister; later Cicero's wife | A Drawer at the Hobby | Cornutus, a citizen, Dama's seventh husband, the Host's neighbour | A Friar at the funeral | Attendants carrying Philautus' body | A constable | Two porters | Caesar, the Emperor; possibly Augustus

*Comment*

This play is unusual in the sequence of Cicero dramas in many respects. The title in no way indicates that the piece includes characters from antiquity and that Cicero is one of them. The plot does not relate to a politically and publicly important phase in Cicero's life; instead, he is presented as a young man about to get married. While his marriage to Terentia is historical, the circumstances displayed here are fictional. The underlying idea of the play is based on the text by Robert Greene: Cicero is shown as a young man about to marry Terentia. In the play, however, this serious love plot is combined with a comic plot, involving numerous characters and several other love affairs, and the presentation of the Cicero element is simplified and shortened in comparison with Greene.<sup>62</sup> While, besides Cicero, there are other 'historical' characters with Roman names, the play features a number of fictional and / or contemporary names or functions, and the action of the piece as a whole seems to take place in a contemporary environment rather than in a setting representing ancient Rome.

Lentulus, here a friend of Cicero, is a suitor of Terentia and enlists the help of Cicero, who is still a young man, yet already well known as a great orator, to win her over. Terentia, however, has fallen in love with Cicero: he ignores that for a considerable time and actively supports his friend instead. Eventually, they all realize what is going on: Lentulus generously agrees to the union of Terentia and Cicero while Terentia's sister Flavia will marry Lentulus; the women's father Flaminus is also happy with this arrangement. The play ends with the wedding ceremonies for the four young people.

In Robert Greene's version there is a third suitor for Terentia, and the controversies between her admirers lead to riots and the intervention of the senate: thus, Cicero's marriage to Terentia has a small political dimension since he thereby carries out a public service and restores peace. In this play, though, the love relationships are a personal affair, and the other characters in the serious plot are more active than Cicero. Thus, Cicero is presented as an uncertain young man, but still endowed with some of his 'typical' characteristics: he is worried about his non-noble background and is appreciated as a good orator by the people around him.



#### 4.9 Ben Jonson, *Catiline His Conspiracy* (1611)

##### *Context*

Ben Jonson (1572–1637), the poet, playwright, actor and literary critic, is regarded as the most important English playwright after William Shakespeare (ch. 4.5) in that period. Apart from two tragedies, *Sejanus: His Fall* (1605) and *Catiline*, Jonson mainly wrote comedies, masques and poetry; some of these pieces take their inspiration from classical antiquity.

*Catiline* was first published in quarto by Walter Burre (*fl.* 1597–1622) in 1611 (without entry in the Stationers' Register). The London bookseller and publisher Walter Burre was particularly known for publishing failed stage plays for an educated readership and thus turning them into successes. This drama was reprinted in the folio edition of Jonson's works in 1616, printed by William Stansby, the first instance of a collected edition of the dramas of a contemporary playwright (and in later editions).<sup>63</sup> According to the title page *Catiline* was first performed by the acting company The King's Men in 1611 (probably before 29 August).<sup>64</sup> The first audience responses were apparently rather negative; the preliminary matter suggests that Jonson was more interested in praise and lasting fame among the learned. The title page bears an epigraph from Horace's *Epistles* (Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.186–188 [with *non* instead of *nam*]), indicating that the common people and even the knights are not interested in high-quality dramatic texts. In the dedication Jonson claims that this drama is 'the best' in his view: 'It is the first (of this race) that euer I dedicated to any person, and had I not thought it the best, it should haue benee taught a lesse ambition.' The piece was published again in 1635, with the note on the title page 'And now Acted by his MAIESTIES Servants with great Applause.'<sup>65</sup>

*Catiline* is dedicated to William Herbert, 3rd Earl of Pembroke (1580–1630), who was Chancellor of the University of Oxford, founded Pembroke College, Oxford, with King James and was Lord Chamberlain from 1615 to 1625. The (posthumous) First Folio of Shakespeare's plays is also dedicated to him and his brother. William Herbert is known as an important patron of the arts.

Jonson was familiar with key ancient sources: in the address 'To the Readers' prefaced to *Sejanus* he refers to Lipsius' edition of

Tacitus and Stephanus' edition of Cassius Dio and mentions Suetonius, Seneca and others as basis for the Latin quotations in this play. 'Jonson says that he used the 1600 edition of Tacitus's works, annotated by Lipsius, and the 1591 edition of Dion's *Roman History*, "ex Gulielmi Xylandri interpretatione". According to the library list given by Herford and Simpson, Jonson possessed an edition of Sallust containing copious commentaries, the works of Cicero and others dealing with the Catilinarian Conspiracy, and the *Historia Coniurationis Catilinae* by Constantius Felicius Durantinus.<sup>66</sup> A number of almost literal translations of Constantius Felicius Durantinus' work have been noted in *Catiline*.<sup>67</sup> Jonson also seems to have used Plutarch's biography of Cicero.<sup>68</sup> For *Catiline* Jonson did not identify the sources by references throughout the play, as he did for *Sejanus*.

### *Bibliographical information*

texts:

CATILINE | his | CONSPIRACY. | VVRITTEN | by | BEN:  
IONSON. | LONDON, | Printed for *Walter Burre*. | 1611.

CATILINE | HIS | CONSPIRACY. | *A Tragædie*. | Acted in the yeere  
1611. By the Kings MAIESTIES Seruants. | The Author B. I. | LONDON, |  
Printed by WILLIAM STANSBY. | M. DC. XVI.

[available at e.g.: [https://archive.org/details/catilinehiscons00\\_jongooq](https://archive.org/details/catilinehiscons00_jongooq); <http://hollowaypages.com/jonson1692catiline.htm>; The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson Online (partly only available with subscription)]

opera version:

*The Catiline Conspiracy*. Opera in two acts. Music and text by Iain Ellis Hamilton (1922–2000), based on the works of Ben Jonson, Sallust and Cicero.

First performance at MacRobert Centre, Stirling, by Scottish Opera, 16 March 1974.

characters / cast: Fulvia – Catherine Wilson; Sempronia – Johanna Peters; Galla – Nan Christie; Aurelia – Patricia Kern; Cicero – Alexander Young; Cato – Richard Angas; Quintus – David Hillman; Caesar – Thomas Hemsley; Catiline – Donald Bell; Crassus – William McCue. Conductor – Alexander Gibson.

characters:

*The names of the Actors:* SYLLA'S GHOST. CATILINE. CICERO. LENTULUS. ANTONIUS. CETHEGUS. CATO. CURIUS. CATULUS. AUTRONIUS. CRASSUS. VARGUNTEIUS. CAESAR. LONGINUS. QU. CICERO. LECCA. SYLLANUS. FULVIUS. FLACCUS. BESTIA. POMTINIUS. GABINIUS. SANGA. STATILIUS. SENATORS. CEPARIUS. ALLOBROGES. CORNELIUS. PETREIUS. VOLTURTIUS. SOULDIERS. AURELIA. FULVIA. SEMPRONIA. GALLA. PORTER. LICTORS. Servants. Pages. CHORUS.

### *Comment*

Although it is uncertain which earlier plays on Cicero, Caesar or Catiline Ben Jonson may have known, he is likely to have been familiar at least with Shakespeare's drama (ch. 4.5); yet his version dramatizes another phase in Cicero's life.<sup>69</sup> Like many dramatists after him and at least two before him (whose works are now lost; ch. 4.2; 4.4), Jonson focuses on the Catilinarian Conspiracy.<sup>70</sup> Since Jonson's drama thus dramatizes incidents during Cicero's consulship in 63 BCE, Cicero plays a more important role in the underlying historical events and then as a character (appearing in Acts III, IV, V)<sup>71</sup> than in pieces revolving around Caesar's assassination.<sup>72</sup>

Jonson does not indicate the specific sources for this play. He seems to have taken essential historical details as well as some passages (sometimes almost literally translated) from Sallust's monograph *De coniuratione Catilinae*, but also to have had recourse to Cicero's speeches and Constantius Felicius Durantinus' account of the conspiracy (along with texts of other classical Latin authors). All these were combined to create a 'historical tragedy'.<sup>73</sup> Elements taken from Sallust with reference to Cicero include: Cicero gives his consular colleague C. Antonius Hybrida another province and surrounds himself with a bodyguard (Sall. *Cat.* 26.4); Cicero learns about the conspiracy and the assassination attempt through the betrayal of Q. Curius and his mistress Fulvia (Sall. *Cat.* 26.3; 28.2); C. Cornelius and L. Vargunteius come to Cicero as clients when they intend to kill him (Sall. *Cat.* 28.1).<sup>74</sup>

At the end of the play, while Cicero is still consul (i.e. in 63 BCE), it is reported that Catiline died in battle; according to the historical accounts this happened at the very end of the year or rather at the beginning of 62 BCE (e.g. Sall. *Cat.* 60.7): the version in the play makes for a satisfactory conclusion within a limited timeframe. Thus, the drama presents the events from Cicero's election to the consulship in 64 BCE to

Catiline's death in compressed fashion.<sup>75</sup> The list of seven candidates for the consulship of 63 BCE (Act II) matches the record in the commentary on Cicero's speeches by Asconius (*Asc. on Cic. Tog. cand.*, p. 82 Clark). Because of the close adherence to a variety of historical sources on the one hand and significant choices of particular versions or divergences on the other hand, it has been remarked that, to understand the play fully, readers need to be familiar with the historical sources.<sup>76</sup> Knowledge of the background may enhance the enjoyment of the piece; yet, on its own too, it provides a coherent version of the events.

Some of the speeches of the play's Cicero and other details are based on orations of the historical Cicero:<sup>77</sup> Cicero's speech in the senate against Catiline in the fourth act (IV 2, 111–402) recalls the *First Catilinarian Oration* while Catiline's reactions (IV 2, 158–169) have been developed from what Sallust describes in his monograph (*Sall. Cat.* 31.5–9) and take up the metaphor of the two bodies of the state, reported as a statement of Catiline in another speech of the historical Cicero (*Cic. Mur.* 51); that the senators move away from Catiline is derived from Cicero's *First Catilinarian Oration* (*Cic. Cat.* 1.16). Cicero's inaugural speech as consul at the beginning of the third act (III I, 1–83) takes its inspiration from the introduction of the *Second Agrarian Speech* (*Leg. agr.* 2.1–10), delivered before the People by the historical Cicero when he entered office as consul. The overview of the different types of conspirators has been transferred from Cicero's address to the People in preparation for the future (*Cic. Cat.* 2.17–24) to Petreius' encouraging speech to the army before the decisive battle against the Catilinarians (V 1, 1–66), where it has a more immediate dramatic function. The meeting of the senate in the fifth act dramatizes what the historical Cicero describes in the *Third Catilinarian Oration*, the unmasking of the conspirators and the decree of honours for Cicero. The discussion on the fate of the conspirators in the senate (Act V) is based on both Cicero's *Fourth Catilinarian Oration* and Sallust's report (*Sall. Cat.* 50.3–53.1).<sup>78</sup>

Recalling Senecan tragedy, the play opens with the appearance of Sylla's Ghost (the dictator L. Cornelius Sulla), as an embodiment of evil, announcing the intention to bring destruction to Rome and encouraging Catiline to continue what Sulla and other revolutionaries did (I 1). The addition of choruses at the end of each act, for whose lack Jonson apologizes in *Sejanus* ("To the Readers"), aligns the structure of the play to ancient models; this element increases the impression of the exemplarity

of its characters and their actions,<sup>79</sup> but also ensures a representation of the populace in the play.<sup>80</sup> Such a framework helps to sketch the context in which Cicero operates.

In line with the presentation in Constantius Felicius Durantinus' *De coniuratione L. Catilinae* (see ch. 2.2) Cicero's role is enhanced; he is more prominent and more favourably depicted than in Sallust's version. Cicero becomes consul not only because of the situation, but also because of his virtue (III 1, 56–57), and he is credited as 'the only father of his country' by Cato (V 3, 228; cf. Cic. *Pis.* 6; *Sest.* 121). Yet Cicero is not presented as an entirely positive and faultless character, especially since he wins by political skill and can only combat the conspiracy thanks to the intervention of others with questionable character, and he employs methods similar to those of the conspirators, such as bribery and obtaining information from disloyal members.<sup>81</sup> Accordingly, the assessment of this Cicero has been debated in modern scholarship; some have seen him achieve an 'equivocal triumph' because of faults of his character.<sup>82</sup> Clearly, Cicero is shown to be concerned about his reputation, acting, though regretfully, against other Roman citizens and keen to solve issues by talking rather than by initiatives. This ambiguous impression, however, comes close to the portrayal emerging from the works of the historical Cicero, and the measures he organizes are presented as more acceptable since the end justifies the means, and taking action against any threat to the political system shows Cicero as a pragmatist.<sup>83</sup> Tellingly, other senators praise Cicero's deeds, though he has to defend the measures taken against Catiline.

Jonson has different figures question some of Cicero's features and actions (even prior to his first appearance), particularly commenting on his non-noble background, his elevated rhetoric and his intention to save the country:<sup>84</sup> 'the new fellow Cicero's' (Cethegus: I 1, 501), 'that talker, Cicero' (Sempronius: II 1, 108), 'A mere upstart / That has no pedigree, no house, no coat, / No ensigns of a family' (Sempronius: II 1, 119–121), 'most popular Consul' (Caesar: III 1, 85), 'He save the state? A burgess' son of Arpinum' (Catiline: IV 2, 421); his 'prodigious rhetoric' (IV 2, 406; cf. II 1, 136–139; III 4, 23–26; IV 2, 100–102).<sup>85</sup> These elements have been developed from the biography of the historical character, as it can be pieced together from his writings: that Cicero did not come from a noble family and had to fight for his career as a *homo novus* features prominently in many of his works (e.g. Cic. *Leg. agr.* 2.1–7) as well as his pride in having saved the republic from the Catilinarian Conspiracy and

his aim to do it a second time when faced with the threat created by Mark Antony (e.g. *Cic. Cat.* 3.15; 4.23; *Phil.* 6.2). That Cicero's oratory was not always plain and restrained emerges from his responses to the controversy between Atticism and Asianism, underlying his later rhetorical treatises such as *Brutus* and *Orator*.

Thus, this dramatic Cicero has many traits of the historical Cicero as he appears from his writings and those of other ancient authors; these are brought out by his own behaviour and the comments of other figures. Yet Jonson's drama is not historical in the sense that it conveys a portrait of Cicero's personality based on the ancient sources. Instead, Jonson showcases paradigmatically the problems connected with political activity based on the divergent characteristics of Cicero: Cicero is a successful politician, who has risen from a disadvantaged background, who intends to save the political system he approves of, but, in order to achieve this aim, is ready to exploit problematic means. Thus, his outstanding oratory too turns out to be a means to an end, as the inserted speeches demonstrate. Since Cicero is shown within the context of the political life of the period, he does not primarily appear as an individual, but rather as an (important) element within the Catilinarian Conspiracy.

#### 4.10 Caspar Brülöw, *Caius Julius Caesar Tragoedia* (1616)

##### *Context*

Caspar Brülöw (1585–1627) was born in Pomerania (the border region of modern Germany and Poland) and moved to Strasbourg (in modern France, at the time a Free Imperial City within the Holy Roman Empire) as a young man. From 1612 onwards Brülöw taught at the grammar school and since 1615 also at the academy (later the university) in Strasbourg (Argentoratum). In 1622 he became the first headmaster of the now independent grammar school, and in 1626 he was appointed Professor of History. In 1616 he was made poet laureate.<sup>86</sup>

As a teacher at the Strasbourg grammar school, Brülöw wrote his first Latin drama, a play on a mythical story from the ancient world (*Andromeda*), in 1612; he then regularly produced dramas in Latin to be performed at the Strasbourg Academy Theatre. There were also German versions of the same plays, but those were not performed.<sup>87</sup> Strasbourg was a key centre of school theatre in the German-speaking countries.<sup>88</sup>

*Caius Julius Caesar* is one of the few historical dramas in Latin from the German-speaking area.<sup>89</sup> According to the title page, *Caius Julius Caesar* was shown in the theatre in Strasbourg in summer 1616; the dedication is dated to 24 June 1616.<sup>90</sup> The dedication defines the Latin drama as the author's fifth play and mentions titles of four earlier pieces.<sup>91</sup> A German translation of the piece ascribed to Jacob Gerson was published in the same year.

The drama is dedicated to Philip II, Duke of Pomerania (1573–1618), who was married to Sophia of Schleswig-Holstein-Sonderburg and was a patron of the arts. In the printed edition, after the title page, there is a page with a picture of the duke and a Latin poem in praise of him underneath. This is followed by a dedication to *Illustrissimo et celsissimo principi ac domino, Dn. Philippo II, Duci Stetinensium, Pomeranorum, Cassubiorum, Vandalorum; Principi Rugiæ, Comiti Gutzcoviæ, Terrarum Leoborgensium & Bütoviensium Dynastæ, Heroi fortissimo; Literis & pietate excultissimo, Patriæ Patri benignissimo, Domino meo clementissimo.*

Brülow's dramas were meant to offer good theatre and to have an educational element in historical, linguistic and moral terms.<sup>92</sup> This may be one reason why this play gives an overview of Roman history from the beginnings to emperor Augustus: while it focuses on the events around Caesar's assassination, Romulus appears in the first scene, and the final acts deal with the assassination's aftermath and Octavian's coming to power.

The title mentions the following ancient authors as sources for the plot: Plutarch, Appian, Suetonius, Cassius Dio and Xiphilinus, i.e. mainly historical writings from periods long after the events dramatized. At the same time the author states in the address to the reader that he writes in a different time for a different audience in comparison with the ancient writers and therefore writes differently.<sup>93</sup> Accordingly, he tries to compensate for the adaptation to performance conditions different from those in the ancient world and the reduced knowledge of Latin among the audience by enhancing the non-verbal elements, such as using an extremely dramatic style.

#### *Bibliographical information*<sup>94</sup>

texts:

CAJUS JULIUS CÆSAR | TRAGOEDIA, | EX PLUTARCHO, APPIA- |  
NO ALEX. SUETONIO, D. CAS- | fio, Joh. Xiphilino &c. maximam

partem | concinnata, & aduersus omnem te- | merariam feditionem  
 atque | tyrannidem ita con- | scripta | *Ut ἄξιωμανημόνευτα & præcipuas*  
*Roman. hifto- | fitorias, ab V. C. ad Imp. usq; Octav. Aug. | breuiter*  
*commemoret.* | AUTHORE | M. CASPARO BRÜLOVIO, | Pomerano,  
 P. C. Secundæ Curix Argen- | toratenfium in Academiâ | Præceptore. |  
*Publicè exhibita in Academia Argentor. Theatro, | nundinis æstivalibus, Anno*  
*fundatæ salutis, | M. DC. XVI. | ARGENTORATI, | Impenfis Pauli*  
 Ledertz Bibliopolæ, Typis Antonij | Bertrami, Academiae Typographi.

{available at: <http://digital.slub-dresden.de/werkansicht/dlf/23684/1/cache.off>; text of act one also in Grzesiowski 1991, 442–478}

second printing: Halle 1618 (with minor typographical changes and corrections).<sup>95</sup>

{available at: [https://www.uni-regensburg.de/sprache-literatur-kultur/lateinische-philologie/medien/fabulae-neolatinae/praetextae/brulovius\\_\\_caesar.pdf](https://www.uni-regensburg.de/sprache-literatur-kultur/lateinische-philologie/medien/fabulae-neolatinae/praetextae/brulovius__caesar.pdf) (with some modernisation)}

German translation: Herrn M. CASPARI BRULOVII | Pryricenfis  
 Pomerani Poëtæ Coro- | nati Cæfarei etc. | CAJUS JULIUS CÆSAR |  
 Oder | Tragœdia vom Cæfare / | wieder Auffruhr vnd Tyrannen also |  
 gefchrieben / Das fie die vornembften Hifto- | rien von Erbauung  
 der Statt Rohm biß | auff Regierung Octaviani Augusti | kürztlich  
 erzehle. | Auffm öffentlichen Theatro der | Academien zu Straßburg /  
 in wehren- | der S. Johans-Meffe 1616. | gehalten. | Auß der  
 Lateinifchen Sprach ins Teutfche | tranfferieret / und publicieret |  
 durch | M. JACOBUM GERSONEM | Tanglymium Pomeranum. |  
 Gedruckt zu Straßburg / bey | von der Heyden / am Kornmarkt. |  
 Anno M. D CXVI.<sup>96</sup>

{available at: <http://digital.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/werkansicht/?PPN=PPN810697270>}

characters:

Latin version (1616): PERSONÆ TRAGOEDIÆ LOQUENTES:  
 QUIRINUS, vel Romulus, Primus Romanorum Rex. | CAIUS JULIUS CÆSAR,  
 à Senatoribus in Curia nefandè cæfus. Anno ætat. 56. die 15. Martij. ab v.  
 c. 709. | M. ANTONIUS, Conful & Triumvir crudeliffimus. | M. TULL.  
CICERO, à tyranno Antonio Fulviaq; uxore, refiftente & connivente  
 tandem Octaviano, profcriptus, & occifus. | Percuffores Cæfaris. | M. JUNIUS  
BRUTUS CÆPIO, A pugna Pharfalica non tantum vitâ cum reliquis  
 fubfequentibus conjuratis à Jul. Cæsare confervatus: verùm inter amicos



etiam habitus, Galliam & Præturam urbanam obtinuit. Post benefactoris sui cædem, cum fratre Decimo & Callio gladio se trajicit. | DECIMUS JUNIUS BRUTUS ALBINUS. Consul constitutus à Cæfare, & inter secundos hæredes ab eodem scriptus fuit. | C. CASSIUS, à Jul. Cæfare ad Præturam evectus: & Consul designatus est. | C. TREBONIUS, Legatus Cæfaris in Gallijs, deinde Prætor & Consul ejusdem beneficio Cæfaris. | P. SERVILIUS CASCA. Hic primus Cæfari infixit vulnus. | L. TULL. CIMBER. | L. DOMITIUS. | CORNEL. CINNA. | Q. LIGARIUS. | PONTIUS AQUILA. | PUBL. TURULLIUS. | LIVIUS DRUSUS. | AMBIORIX, Dux Celtarum sive Germanorum veterum. | CAVARILLA, Fœmina Germ. adultera. | LUC. GENUTIUS, Apparitor. | PORCIA, M. Bruti uxor fidelissima, marito mortuo, vitæ pertæfa, ardentes (verba sunt Martialis Epigr. l. I.) avido bibit ore favillas, oréq; concludo & compresso, carbonibus femetiplam suffocavit. | CALPURNIA. C. Jul. Cæfaris conjux. | HORTENSIA. Fœmina facundissima, mulierum Romanarum causam agit apud Triumviros. | M. ÆMILIUS LEPIDUS. Prætor, Consul, Mag. Eq. & Triumvir. Cæfaris amicus. Ab Octaviano coactus triumviratu sese abdicavit. | SPURINA, Augur. | VENUS. | JUPPITER. | ALECTO. | MEGÆRA. | TISIPHONE. Furiæ. | C. JUL. CÆSAR OCTAVIANUS AUGUSTUS, Secundus Roman. Imperator, C. Julij Cæfaris Sororis nepos, à quo non solum hæres scriptus, sed in filium etiam adoptatus est, ideóq; in nomen familiámq; ejus transivit. | FULVIA, Antonij uxor, quæ nihil muliebri præter corpus habebat; gladio enim cincta Triumviros ad cædes perpetrandas, virúmq;, ad supplicium de Cicerone fumendum, armavit, & cuncta miscuit. | HERENNIUS, Centurio. | CN. POPILIUS LÆNAS, à Cicerone aliquando in judicio capitis defensus, ingratiſſimus illi caput & dexteram amputavit. | SPECTRUM, M. BRUTO apparens. | CLEOPATRA, Ægypti Regina ultima, victa & capta ab Octaviano, aspide sese necat. | PSELLA, Cleopatræ Virgo nobilis; eodem mortis genere occumbit. | PROCULEIUS, Octaviani intimus. | REGULUS, Dux Puerorum, à partibus Cæfaris stantium. | PUERI Octaviani. | LENTULUS, Dux Puerorum, pro Antonio pugnantium. | PUERI Antoniani. | MILITES Antoniani.

German version (1616): Personen in dieser Tragœdien. | Romulus Quirinus / Erfter Koenig der Roehmer. | Cajus Julius Cæfar / Erfter Roemischer Keyser von den Rathsherren auff der Pfalz erschlagen / im 56. Jars seines Alters den 15. Martii im 709. Jahr nach Erbwener Statt Rohm. | M. Antonius Ammeister und Dreyherz / ein wuetender Tyrann / Von Octaviano überwunden / Erficht sich selber. | M. Tullius Cicero

gewesener Ammeister vom Tyrannen M. Antonio und seinem Weibe Fulvia wieder Octaviani willen / Doch endlich zulaßung proscibiert und Getoedt. | Rathsherren und Edle Roemer so Cæsarem Erschlagen. | M. Junius Brutus Cæpio / Welcher als er mit Pompeio wieder Cæsarem Gekriegt / Ist er mit folgenden Todtschlaegern nicht allein zu Gnaden vom Cæsare wieder angenommen / sondern auch zum Freunde erwehlet / und mit 2. Præturen begabet. Nach Cæsaris Todt / hat er sich mit seinem Bruder Decimo und Calsio erstochen. | Decimus Junius Brutus Albinus / Ammeister vom Cæsare erwehlet und zu seinem Erben nach Octaviano ernennet. | C. Calsius Ammeister vom Cæsare erwehlet. | C. Trebonius Cæsaris Statthalter in Franckreich hernacher Ammeister. | Pu. Servilius Calpa / Dieser hat zu erst den Cæsarem verwundet. | L. Tull. Cimber. | L. Domitius. | Cornelius Cinna. | Quintus Ligarius. | Pontius Aquila. | Publ. Turullius. | Livius Drusus. | Ambiorix der Celter oder Alten Teutschen Herzog. | Cavarilla ein Teutsch Weib. Ehbrecherin. | Lucius Genutius Rathsbott. | Porcia. M. Bruti getrewe Gemæhlin / diese hat sich nach ihres Manns Todt weil sie ohn Ihn nicht leben wolte mit glueenden Kohlen selber erstickt | Calpurnia Cæsaris Haußfraw. | Hortensia ein Wolberedte Roehmerin / fuehret der Roehmischen Weiber sache fuer den Dreyherzn. | M. Aemilius Lepidus Ammeister unnd Dreyherz Cæsaris Freund / von Octaviano gezwungen das Dreyherznamt aufzugeben. | Spurina / Wahrsager. | Venus Heidnisch Goettin. | Juppiter Oberster Heidnischer Gott. | Alecto, Megæra, Tefiphonæ, Drey Hoellische Gottin. | C. Julius Cæsar Octavianus Augustus / der Ander Roemischer Keyser C. Cæsaris Schwelster Kinds Sohn / nechster Erb / und adoptierter Sohn. | Fulvia / Antonij Ehgemahl Tyrannisch / ein Maennlich und Blutgierig Weib. | Herennius Hauptmann der Dreyherzn die proscibierten zu toedten. | Cn. Popilius Lænas / hat dem Cicerone das Haupt abgeschlagen / wiewol im Cicero zuvor fuerm Rath das Leben erhalten. | Spectrum Teuffels gespenst / Die Brutos unnd Calsium engstiget. | Cleopatra Antonij Bulerin / Letzte Koenigin in Aegypten / wird von Octaviano gefangen und toedt sich selbst durch Schlangen. | Psella / Der Cleopatræ Edel Jungfraw / bringt sich auch durch Schlangen umbs leben. | Proculeius Octaviani Freund unnd KriegsObrister. | Regulus ein KriegsObrister im Spiel der Buben / in nammen Octavij wieder Antonium. | Octavianische Buben. | Lentulus ein KriegsObrister der Buben in namen Antonij wider Octavianum. | Antonianische Buben. | Antonij Kriegsleute.

*Comment*

Caspar Brülöw's *Caius Julius Caesar* is named after Caesar and revolves around his assassination, but covers a longer stretch of the historical development than most plays on this sequence of events (thus violating the dramatic unities).<sup>97</sup> Though this extension is partly connected with the aim to educate and to convey information about Roman history, it also serves to shape the assessment of Rome's history and political systems as Quirinus / Romulus is introduced as the first Roman king in a system based on laws. This opening, in combination with the explicit characterization of the protagonists in the initial list of characters, provides a clear indication of how the author would like to present this section of Roman history and the political questions it raises: as becomes particularly clear in the German version, Caesar is portrayed as the legitimate holder of institutional power, and those who assassinate him are depicted as ungrateful. Because of the play's extent, it includes Cicero's interaction with Caesar still alive (Act I), Cicero's attitude to Octavian assuming power and Mark Antony's views of him (Act IV) as well as Cicero's death upon the orders of the triumvirs (Act IV). Because of his appearances at key points in the play Cicero can be regarded as a relevant protagonist although the play is not named after him and features a large number of characters.<sup>98</sup>

When the dramatic Cicero first comes on stage, he is shown praising Caesar's military successes and his *commentarii* about these exploits (I 2). Thus, Cicero is introduced as a literary authority, but also as someone who accepts Caesar's rule (perhaps on the basis of the *Caesarean Orations* of the historical Cicero).<sup>99</sup> Cicero continues to praise Caesar's clemency and the reinstatement of particular individuals in a further scene; Cicero claims that Caesar has restrained himself as a monarch and acted like a god (I 4). While this reinforces Cicero's portrait as someone bowing to Caesar's authority, it also contributes to establishing a positive image of Caesar and has his eventual assassination appear unjustified. In contrast to Cicero, Caesar is depicted as more experienced: in the subsequent scene Cicero is afraid of figures approaching while Caesar knows that these are Germans and can inform Cicero about their character and customs on the basis of his previous stays in Germany, obviously developed from what the historical Caesar narrates in the *commentarii* (I 5).<sup>100</sup> This section of the play is reminiscent of Frischlin's *Iulius redivivus* (ch. 4.3), including praise of the Germans and their

customs (albeit different in some ways from those of the Romans), though the setting is more 'realistic' as the characters have not come back to life in a different period.<sup>101</sup>

After Caesar's assassination the play's Cicero discusses future strategy with Octavianus: he asks Octavianus to confront the rebellious minds of Antonius and his partner Fulvia and thus free the republic; Octavianus promises to follow Cicero (IV 2). While there are historical sources for Octavianus trying to liaise with Cicero (e.g. Cic. *Att.* 14.11.2; 16.8.1; 16.9.1; 16.11.6; App. *B Civ.* 3.82), in the historical record Cicero acts less directly, and the relationship between the two men remains rather vague. The positive interaction in the play leads Cicero to proclaim at the start of the following scene that a republic ruled by Octavianus will be happy and to be confident in Octavianus' reign as he represents a legitimate and morally sound model of government (IV 3). At this point Antonius and Fulvia appear and attack Cicero with reference to his oratory and political record while Cicero reproaches them for their misbehaviour (IV 3); some of the details mentioned are taken from the historical Cicero's *Philippic Orations* and the ancient historiographical tradition. Fulvia as well as Antonius are characterized as morally inferior.

The two scenes demonstrating the different kinds of relationship and attitude to Cicero in relation to Octavianus on the one hand and to Antonius and Fulvia on the other hand prepare the conflict between these two sides in the subsequent scene: Antonius and Fulvia demand Cicero's death in the proscriptions; Octavianus initially resists, explaining that Cicero has not done anything meriting death and has always been honoured, but eventually gives in when threatened, though he denies responsibility (IV 4). This conversation thus indicates that Octavianus is not as strong an ally as Cicero might have thought. The historical fact that Octavianus eventually agreed to Cicero's proscription cannot be ignored; but by being shown reluctant to agree, his behaviour is not questioned entirely. Just before his death Cicero recalls the great number of dangers he has undergone for Rome's sake and regrets that he has wrongly trusted Octavianus, as the historical Cicero realizes his failed assessment when it is too late (e.g. Cic. *Ad Brut.* 1.18.3–4). Still, the drama's Cicero calmly awaits death, like a philosopher, as this is determined by nature, and he reflects on the life of the soul after death (inspired by topics treated in philosophical treatises of the historical

Cicero). The play's Cicero is confident that his writings, which he enumerates, will continue to be read; this is put into his mouth from the perspective of hindsight (IV 5).<sup>102</sup>

The play's subtitle *adversus omnem temerariam seditionem atque tyrannidem* indicates that the piece is meant not only to provide entertainment for the audience by a re-enactment of an exciting phase of history, but also to convey a moral message. Therein Cicero's characterization plays an important role. With his moral and intellectual competencies he symbolizes the appropriate position towards Caesar and then Octavianus if the latter follows Cicero's advice. While Cicero supports republican virtues, he does not oppose Caesar's reign since the senate established it; in fact, already in the list of characters the author introduces Caesar as having been assassinated *nefandè*. Yet Cicero confronts someone who acts like a tyrant and in immoral ways such as Antonius, who is given a correspondingly negative character portrayal. That a monarchical system is ultimately legitimized by Roman history is indicated from the start via the appearance of Quirinus / Romulus. Accordingly, there is some tension in Cicero's characterization since he both embodies positive standards and supports a political system that clashes with the drama's dedication to a duke. At the same time Cicero is characterized as a human being displaying weaknesses; for instance, he is timid and rather credulous as regards Octavianus, when the latter is not yet established. Some of these elements would have been familiar to the students in the audience; the play can thus consolidate this knowledge via another medium.<sup>103</sup> Even though there are ancient sources for the individual components of this drama's Cicero, the presentation as a supporter of the monarchical system does not accurately represent the position of the historical Cicero.

#### 4.11 *Cicero Triumphans* (1619)

##### *Context*

Some overviews of Jesuit drama include a play entitled *Cicero Triumphans*, first performed in Ingolstadt (in Bavaria, Germany) in 1619,<sup>104</sup> while it is not listed in histories of Jesuit activity.<sup>105</sup>

Those mentioning the play assume that the topic may have been similar to the piece *De regno humanitatis* by Jakob Gretser (1562–1625), who is known to have written Latin school dramas. That piece is a

treatment of education in the humanist sense, features a character called 'Ciceronianus' and is heavily based on texts by ancient authors. It has also been suggested that the author of *Cicero Triumphans* might be Georg Spaiser (1594–1669),<sup>106</sup> a German Jesuit, best known for the work *Plausus Symbolicus In S.R.I. Pomo Quod Maximiliano Serenissimo Com. Pal. Rbeni, Boiorum Duci S.R.I. Archidapifero Et Electori Meritissimo Traditum* (1623); he was head of the college in Munich from 1639 to 1646 and of the Wilhelmsgymnasium in Munich from 1646 to 1648.<sup>107</sup>

Enquiries at libraries, archives and Jesuit organizations in Ingolstadt and Munich did not produce any further information that would make it possible to locate this play.

The historical Cicero, both the writer and the individual, had an important position in the Jesuit school syllabus, not only with reference to rhetorical training, but also as a model for the humanities and as an historical source (cf. ch. 4.19). Therefore it would not be surprising if what may be the first drama named after Cicero originated in a Jesuit context.

#### 4.12 Marten Frank Besteben, *De 't samensweringe Catalinae* (1647)

##### *Context*

Marten Frank Besteben was a Dutch writer in the seventeenth century; precise dates are not known; he came from Nieuwendam (now part of Amsterdam). Besides the play on Catiline he seems to have produced further tragedies and poems or texts for songs.

*De 't samensweringe Catalinae* does not name the author on the title page, but the manuscript is signed at the end by 'Beraemt ten besten'. For the play *De Bedroge Bedriegers* (1646) the name of the author has been cut out from the title page and the name 'Marten Frank Besteben' pasted there instead.<sup>108</sup>

##### *Bibliographical information*

text:

*De 't samensweringe Catalinae*, 1647.<sup>109</sup>

[available at: <http://www.let.leidenuniv.nl/Dutch/Ceneton/Cati1647.html>]

edition of manuscript: M.F. Besteben, *De 't samensweringe Catalinae* 1647 & A. De Koning, *Het tweede Dochters-Speeltjen* 1616. Archiefeditie

door G. van Eemeren, Leuven / Amersfoort 1988 (Centrum Renaissancedrama, handschriftencahiers 1+2).

characters:

Personagien: Lucius Spurius Catalina | p: Lentulo sura / p': A/antronus [Autronius] | L: Cassius Longius | C: Cethegus, | p: sijlle [Sulla] | L: Verguterus [Vargunteius] | Q annius | M: portius Leca | L: Bestia, | Q Curius | M: F/fulvius nobilior | L: Cornelius | Umbrenus | Statillus [Statilius] | Gabinus | C: Manlium | Vulturtio [Vulturcius], 't samensweerders: | F/fulvia: Curius huijs vrou | Bode: | Q: marcius | Q: mettellus Creticus | pompeius refus | M/mettellus Celer | Q: catulus | Q: F/fabro sange [Q. Fabius Sanga] | D: Junius silanus | C: Cesaris | M/m: portius Cato, roomsche raden. | m: t: Cicero | C: antonius, roomsche Burgermeesteren. | L: Valerio F/flacco | C: promtinio [Promptinius], roomse Schouten: | Gellius | Lenius, roomse Burgers | Juliette: een vrouw'. | pontifice: | atius nalus: Vogel wiggelaar | reij van priesters | Bode. | Twee gesanten: Der A/allobroges: nu Savojien, | Megera een Helse geest, | roomsche gemeente, | romeijnen. | krijgs-knegten. | M: petrio. Veltoverste, | De Geest van Catalinas Soon.<sup>110</sup>

### *Comment*

Although the precise time of the plot is never identified, it vaguely covers the period from 64 BCE, just before Cicero is made consul, until early 62 BCE, when Catiline falls in battle. Catilina, the leading conspirator ('samensweerder'), is depicted as a cunning and violent revolutionary, who wishes to upset the political system and justly dies at the end. The consul Cicero, introduced as 'burgermeester' ('mayor'), is one of the opponents upholding the traditional political order; this position seems determined by his political role and the expectations of others. There is no proper election of the consuls (at least not shown on stage). Instead, some senators agree that Cicero, though not a nobleman, is the best option in the circumstances; accordingly, they will propose him to the People. Q. Marcius (Rex, cos. 68 BCE) outlines the danger and the reasons for choosing Cicero to the People, who agree. Cicero then delivers an inaugural speech (385–399); it is rather short and general and does not bear a particular relation to the inaugural consular speeches of the historical Cicero, the *Agrarian Speeches* of January 63 BCE. The play's Cicero does say, though, what is important for the plot,

namely that he will do all he can to keep Rome safe. Later Cicero rouses the senate to withstand the enemy threatening Rome (535–550). There is a feeling that both senate and citizens are corrupt, but at least some individuals set their hopes on Cicero to call people back from this path of destruction (835–836).

In the confrontation with Catilina in the senate, Cicero takes the lead among the opponents, but the altercation is not a ‘duel’ between Cicero and Catilina, rather a conversation in which several senators participate: they support Cicero’s point and oppose Catilina; this distribution makes the latter feel isolated and has Cicero appear as the representative of the majority (859–904). Eventually, Catilina leaves the meeting (902–904; cf. Sall. *Cat.* 32.1). In this play the second consul C. Antonius (Hybrida) is working with Cicero although he had sympathized with the revolutionaries in the past. For instance, Antonius delivers a rousing speech before the troops (1261–1297). This cooperation with Cicero contributes to the impression of a united front of the ‘establishment’ against Catilina although the consuls remain uneasy because of prophecies and rumours. Against this background it matters less that Cicero has received some of the information allowing him to overthrow the conspirators from the Roman lady Fulvia, here characterized as the ‘wife’ of Q. Curius (actually his beloved; cf. Sall. *Cat.* 23.3), one of the conspirators, and from the envoys of the Allobroges.

Moreover, the play differs from other Cicero dramas by the religious and supernatural element: Megea and other Furies appear; Megea’s emergence has been provoked by Catilina’s plans; she confirms that Rome’s enemies are inside and that she will help all who want to bring Rome down (205–230). The drama also includes a Pontifex and other priests: the Pontifex berates the Romans for their godless existence and behaviour (1557–1632). Accordingly, the consuls are concerned about the influence of the priests, as they might turn against them or influence the People (1003–1046). Fear of divine punishment also motivates the Gauls to switch sides (1303–1364). Even Cicero prays to the gods for support (1683–1690).

All these elements suggest that the situation in ancient Rome is depicted as a comment on the contemporary circumstances at the time of the play’s composition, when the political discussion was dominated by different attitudes to the House of Orange and the role of the ‘stadtholder’ in a conflict between Orangists and Republicans while



there were tensions between Calvinists and Catholics.<sup>111</sup> Only in 1648 was the independence of the Calvinist Netherlands from Spain acknowledged. This drama is therefore less focused on depicting Cicero as an individual (as an orator or a moral paradigm) or on engaging with specific ancient sources. Apparently, the author was familiar with the key historical facts of Catiline's conspiracy: he presented and interpreted them in line with the overall intended message; the terminology has been adapted to contemporary circumstances, which facilitates the transfer. The figure of Cicero exemplifies that a 'burgermeester' has to guarantee the preservation of public order and the political system.

#### 4.13 *The Tragedy of that Famous Roman Orator Marcus Tullius Cicero* (1651)

##### *Context*

This English drama was published anonymously without any paratexts. There is no evidence that it was ever performed;<sup>112</sup> at any rate it was printed when the theatres were closed during the civil war under the influence of the Puritans. Some scholars have attributed the play to Fulke Greville, 1st Baron Brooke (1554–1628),<sup>113</sup> an Elizabethan poet and statesman, who, among other pieces, wrote a drama *Antony and Cleopatra*, which he later destroyed.<sup>114</sup> This is a possible theory if one assumes that the piece, like other works of his, was published posthumously; this attribution would change the historical and chronological context in which the play has to be interpreted. Irrespective of authorship, the piece might have been written before the closing of the theatres in 1642 and published, adapted to the circumstances, in 1651.<sup>115</sup>

Sources for the play include historical and biographical accounts, such as Plutarch's *Life of Marcus Antonius* and *Life of Cicero*, Cassius Dio's *Roman History* and Appian's *Civil Wars* as well as the works of the historical Cicero in contemporary editions.<sup>116</sup>

##### *Bibliographical information*

text:

THE | TRAGEDY | OF | THAT FAMOUS ROMAN | ORATOVR |  
 Marcus Tullius | CICERO | LONDON, | Printed by *Richard Cotes*, for  
*John Sweeting* | at the *Angell* in *Popes-head Alley*. | 1651.<sup>117</sup>

[available on Early English Books Online]

modern edition: J. Clare (ed.), *Drama of the English Republic, 1649–60*, Manchester / New York 2002 (The Revels Plays Companion Library) (pp. 41–151).

characters:

The persons of the PLAY: The Ghost of *Iulius Cæsar*. | *Marcus Tullius Cicero*. | *Quintus Cicero* – – his Brother. | *Marcus Antonius*, formerly Confull, now at enmity with the Senate. | *Octavius Cæsar*, | *Lepidus*, Generalls for the Senate. | *Publ. Servilius*, | *Piso* | *Calenus* | Senators. | *Salvius* | *Carnutius* | *Publius Apuleius*, Tribunes of the people. | *Minutius* – – Praetor. | *Popilius Lænas* – – – a Collonell. | *Cornelius* – – a Centurion. | *Quintus Iunior* – *Quintus Cicero*'s son. | *Philologus* – – a Scholar, *Quintus Cicero*'s man. | *Clodius* | *Lænas*, Commanders in *Lepidus*'s Army, friends to M. *Antonius*. | *Laureas* – a Poet, | *Tyro* – – a great pretender to history, *Marcus Cicero*'s men. | The Senate. | Chorus. | *Pomponia* – – wife to *Quintus Cicero*. | *Fulvia* – – *Marcus Antonius* wife. | Centurions. | Lictors. | Souldiers. | Messengers.

### *Comment*

The *Tragedy of that Famous Roman Orator Marcus Tullius Cicero* is one of the earliest plays named after Cicero. The play dramatizes the last year of the life of the historical Cicero, the period roughly from a few months after the assassination of C. Iulius Caesar on the Ides of March (15 March) 44 BCE until Cicero's death on 7 December 43 BCE.<sup>118</sup> That the play starts with the appearance of a ghost (I 1: ghost of Julius Caesar) recalls Ben Jonson's *Catiline* (ch. 4.9) and also Senecan tragedy; there are verbal resonances from the Roman plays of William Shakespeare (including *Julius Caesar*, ch. 4.5) and from Ben Jonson's *Catiline*.<sup>119</sup> The plot of *Cicero*, however, presents a period in Cicero's life not covered by either of these predecessors; in fact, it is the first known drama to focus on Cicero's death, although this incident is included in Caspar Brülow's version (ch. 4.10).

On the one hand the plot of *Cicero* follows the historical events fairly closely, based on the writings of the historical Cicero (e.g. including references to his *Philippic Orations*) and of later ancient historiographers. On the other hand there are additional subplots making the story more personal and entertaining: an enhanced role of Cicero's brother Quintus, the brother's wife Pomponia and their son

has been developed, which adds a family dimension. Marcus Antonius' partner Fulvia has become more prominent, which balances the personal aspect on the other side and prepares her (historically attested) behaviour in connection with Cicero's death. Action on the level of 'servants' has been added, which provides comic relief (as in some plays of Shakespeare and other contemporary playwrights); as these 'servants' are an aspiring historian, a scholar and a poet (Tyro, Philologus, Laureas) and discuss corresponding topics, they add the dimension of philosophy and literature to Cicero's depiction as an orator and politician, though in comic distortion.

In the first two acts there are frequent reminiscences of Cicero's *Philippics* (esp. Cic. *Phil.* 2; 12; 13; 14); the later acts, covering the period after the last *Philippic* (21 April 43 BCE), are based more on the reports of later ancient historiographers, with some references to Cicero's letters to Brutus from summer 43 BCE in the third act. The writer seems to have a good knowledge of the historical context and of Cicero's writings. Thus, he can portray Cicero's uncertainty and shifting position and have him refer to developments discussed in speeches by the historical Cicero. Some criticism of Cicero's behaviour is transferred from the historical Brutus (as revealed in Cicero's correspondence) to the character Quintus. That Cicero's support for Octavian is not shared by all his friends is indicated from early on, when Piso says: 'And I fear our Orator, / Although he think himself a profound Statist, / Is but as 'twere a visor, which *Octavius* / Covers the face of his close projects with' (I 3).

The author also converts summative accounts into drama: for instance, some of what Cicero mentions in the *Philippic Orations* is turned into dramatic scenes (e.g. Antony's behaviour or the arrival of rumours). Or when Cicero receives a letter telling him that, if he burns his *Philippics*, he will be allowed to live (IV 5), this dramatizes a situation described in *Suasoriae* transmitted by Seneca the Elder (Sen. *Suas.* 7). Cicero's soliloquy at the beginning of the same scene opens with two lines in Latin, a shortened version of a sentence from the pseudo-Ciceronian *Consolatio*, and continues with considerations on life and death and the role of the gods inspired by the *Tusculan disputations* of the historical Cicero. The presentation of the deaths of Cicero, his brother and the latter's son in the final act mainly follows the narrative in Plutarch (Plut. *Cic.* 46.5–49.2), but there is less

attention to the details of how Cicero was slain and more emphasis on the virtuous resistance of Quintus' son, inspired by a book received from his uncle (III 12), as well as on the betrayal of Philologus.<sup>120</sup> The detail of a soothsayer predicting the return of monarchy and then dying while holding his breath (IV 4) comes from Appian (*App. B Civ. 4.4*).

Since the play was published early during the so-called Commonwealth of England (after the execution of king Charles I in 1649), scholars have debated in what ways it might respond to the contemporary political situation.<sup>121</sup> While identifying parallels with specific historical figures is problematic, the drama seems to be opposed to single rule and endorse aristocratic republican values, of which Cicero is a representative, and also to indicate that these may be threatened by individuals aiming for powerful positions.

Cicero is praised in the Latin verses printed before the beginning of the play<sup>122</sup> and in the introductory monologue of Caesar's Ghost (I 1: 'thy sacred Tongue, / The great *Patritian* of the speaking Art'), which thus creates a contrast to the opening remarks of Sylla's Ghost in Ben Jonson's *Catiline*. In the course of the piece, however, as in other plays, Cicero's opponents despise him for his non-noble background and ridicule his rhetorical abilities (esp. V). In line with the personal aspect established by the presence of Cicero's brother Quintus with his wife Pomponia, the issue of marital relationships is brought to the fore, and Fulvia criticizes Cicero's treatment of his wife (Terentia): 'Is that Tongue-valiant *Cicero* worth the fear / Of *Fulvia's Antony*? / No doubt but he who has of late divorc't / His Wife *Terentia*, and in her place / Made a young Girle his consort, may as soon / Supplant *Antonius*, and set up that boy' (I 5). Such a focus may have been triggered by contemporary Puritan views on family life.

Thus, the playwright manages to fuse information about the historical Cicero, along with references to his writings and well-known characteristics of his, with fictional elements on a personal and everyday level. This creates an effective drama, but also makes it possible to convey a political statement by introducing Cicero as a representative of republican values while not denying his human shortcomings. Such a characterization of Cicero would agree with the political views of Fulke Greville, whose extant works concern the dangers of power and the fate of the individual in an absolute monarchy.

4.14 Lambert van den Bosch, *L. Catilina* (1669)*Context*

Lambert van den Bosch / Bos or Lambertus Sylvius (1620–1698) was active in the Netherlands and known as a Calvinist teacher, poet, publicist and translator. He originally worked as an apothecary; afterwards he became headmaster of the grammar school at Helmond, then assistant headmaster of the grammar school at Dordrecht (1654/55–1671); after he had to leave Dordrecht, he ran grammar schools at Heemstede and Vianen. His lifetime almost matches the Dutch Golden Age, when the Netherlands flourished culturally and economically, but also saw political conflicts between ‘Orangists’ and ‘Republicans’.

Van den Bosch produced an enormous oeuvre. He had recourse to historical subject matter in many of his works of different literary genres, including historiography, epic poems and historical drama. In *L. Catilina* he uses Sallust’s *De coniuratione Catilinae* (mentioned in the dedication) and Cicero’s *Catilinarian Orations* as sources. In the dedication (to Adrianus van Regenmorter) van den Bosch claims that the play was only written to spend some time in a useful manner without any particular aspirations.<sup>123</sup>

*Bibliographical information*

text:

L. CATILINA; | TREUR-SPEL. | DOOR | L. V. BOSCH. | TOT DORDRECHT, | By GEEMEN van CAPPEL, Boeck-verkooper, | wonende by de Beurs. Anno 1669.

{available at: <http://www.let.leidenuniv.nl/Dutch/Ceneton/Facsimiles/BosCatilina1669/>}

characters:

SPREECKERS: CATILINA. | CICERO. | CETHEGUS, | LENTULUS, | VULTURTIUS, | CURIUS, | CORNELIUS, | VARGUNTEJUS, *Medefstanders van Catilina*. | FULVIA, *Byfit van Curius*. | ALLOBROX, *Gefant der Allobrogen*. | SILANUS, | SENIUS, | SANGA, | CATO, | CÆSAR, *Roomfche Raden*. | FLACCUS, *Roomfch Amptman*. | BODE.

*Comment*

Even though the setting and the time frame are not indicated explicitly, it is clear that this drama shows the final stages of the Catilinarian

Conspiracy, from the time when Catiline's plans were already in full swing in autumn 63 BCE until his final defeat in early 62 BCE. The plot focuses on the development of these plans and particularly on the reaction of the consul Cicero and other senior senators, who are eventually successful. Because little background is given, there is no emphasis on the motivations or justifications that prompted Catilina and his followers to pursue this course of action. As a result, they appear primarily as rebels and threats to the political system; hence it appears natural that they will have to be confronted.

Although Cicero, as in the historical record, receives information from the Roman lady Fulvia and relies on the cooperation of the Gallic tribe of the Allobroges for his successful strategy (Act II), he is presented as a recognized orator and a saviour of the republic, admired by others. This impression outweighs any deprecatory comments made by the conspirators (who plan to kill Cicero) in the first act and reported in the second act. Cicero is presented as keen to follow republican rules and to involve the senate (Act II). Acts III and IV show Cicero in the senate and negotiating with senior senators; these scenes have been developed from the *Catilinarian Orations* of the historical Cicero: some of the argument is put into the mouth of the drama's Cicero, such as the famous beginning of the *First Catilinarian Oration*; other, more narrative, parts have been turned into action. At the beginning of Act V Flaccus, a 'Roomsche Amptman' (presumably alluding to L. Valerius Flaccus, praet. 63 BCE), confirms that so far Cicero has been a great orator competing with Greek eloquence, but now has added another item of glory, namely having saved Rome.

The impression of a great Cicero who looks after the republic successfully and wards off any threats is corroborated by the paratextual material in the edition. A poem added at the end thanks van den Bosch for having shown Cicero's eloquence and how his oratory defeated the traitors.<sup>124</sup> Similar sentiments emerge from poems printed at the beginning. The poem by the poet and politician Cornelis van Someren (1593–1649), who signs as 'Cameræ Bipartitæ a secretis' ('Secretary to the Bipartite Chamber'), even presents the drama as a model for the current political circumstances. Van den Bosch is known to highlight the dangers of an aristocratic model of government and to argue for support for religious groups, which creates parallels to the contemporary Dutch situation.<sup>125</sup>

*In the eighteenth century, when traditional power structures continued while a new self-confidence of the citizenry emerged, the number of plays in which Cicero's fate is dramatized (as the titles indicate) increased while the Catilinarian Conspiracy remained a popular theme.*

#### 4.15 Pier Jacopo Martello, *Il M. Tullio Cicerone* (c. 1713)

##### *Context*

Pier Jacopo (Pietro Jacopo / Pieriacopo) Martello (Martelli) (1665–1727) was a distinguished Italian playwright and dramatic theorist. Martello enjoyed a thorough education in grammar and rhetoric with the Jesuits; later he studied theology and law; he also read Greek, Latin and French dramas. Martello started his career as a playwright with translations of tragedies on classical themes from the French. His first original tragedy was *La morte di Nerone*, written around 1700. Subsequent tragedies include several pieces on stories from ancient myth or history. A volume entitled *Teatro* published in 1709 not only contains further tragedies, but also the treatise *Del verso tragico*. This was followed by *Dialogo della Tragedia antica, e moderna, o sia l'Impostore*. Martello introduced a new verse form for Italian tragedy.

In 1713 Martello travelled to France (as a member of a diplomatic mission); he is said to have had five tragedies in his luggage, one of them being *Il M. Tullio Cicerone*. A precise date of composition cannot be established; the piece was published in his collected works in 1735.

##### *Bibliographical information*

text:

IL | M. TULLIO | CICERONE. | in: OPERE | DI | PIERJACOPO | MARTELLO | TOMO TERZO. || TEATRO | ITALIANO | DI | PIERJACOPO | MARTELLO | Parte Seconda. | In BOLOGNA | Nella Stamperia di LELIO DALLA VOLPE | M DCC XXXV. | CON LICENZA DE' SUPERIORI (pp. 1–72).

{available on Google Books}

characters:

ATTORI: OTTAVIANO Triumviro. | MARCO ANTONIO Triumviro. | MARCO TULLIO CICERONE. | QUINTO Fratello di Cicerone. | POPILIA ripudiata da Marco Tullio. | POMPONIA Moglie di Quinto. | CAJO RUSTICELLO Orator Bolognese. | L. LENA confidente di Antonio.

*Comment*

This drama has the name of Cicero (without any additions) as its title: this shows that the piece is about the figure of Cicero, while there is no indication of whether the piece covers his whole life or a particular section. The plot reveals that the play deals with the last few months of Cicero's life and his death in 43 BCE. In the preface the author claims that he has merely made minor changes to the historical record and that these have mainly been necessitated by theatre conventions; he also highlights that the dramatic character Cicero only speaks in four scenes of the first act, but that the entire piece is about him.<sup>126</sup>

This structure of the play means that there is hardly any description or presentation of Cicero's death or of Cicero as a character through his own actions. Instead, the focus is on discussions of the justification of Cicero's death and on the views of different people on Cicero's role (seen positively or negatively) in the period leading up to his death and on the appropriate response to his activities. While Cicero is proscribed and killed (according to the historical record), it is made clear that this is not the result of a straightforward decision of the triumvirs.

In the first act Cicero is presented in conversation with the figure Cajo Rusticello, an orator from Bologna (alluding to the orator C. Rusticelius from Bologna, mentioned in Cicero's *Brutus* 169, but dated to an earlier period) as well as with his brother Quinto, who loyally supports him, and his brother's wife Pomponia. When Rusticello informs Cicero of the plans of the triumvirs agreed at their meeting on an island near Bononia (modern Bologna), Cicero is disappointed at Octavian, since he had expected him to save the republic (I 1–2), which mirrors feelings expressed by the historical Cicero (cf. e.g. *Cic. Phil.* 3.3–5; 5.42–51; *Ad Brut.* 1.18.3–4). Cicero's brother and his wife continue to support Cicero despite the impending danger (I 2–4). Cicero himself is more concerned for his country than for himself; eventually, he follows the advice of the others and accepts Rusticello's preparations for flight (I 5).

The subsequent acts present the contrasting positions of the triumvirs: Marco Antonio (Mark Antony) is keen to remove Cicero since he feels that Cicero is singing his own praises too much and the republic would fare better without him, Ottaviano / Cesare (Octavian) believes that this would be an attack on the father of the country and worse than attacking one's own father and that Cicero is merely proud of what he did for his country in Rome (II 3). Cicero's case is supported by two



women, who negotiate with Ottaviano and Antonio: Pomponia, the wife of Cicero's brother Quinto, defends Cicero for his own merits and for the sake of her husband; Popilia (representing the historical Publilia), Cicero's second wife, now repudiated by him, stays loyal to him and admires his virtue (II 1; II 5; III 2; IV 2). Since Ottaviano is moved by the women's intervention, and, as a result of the arguments of others, even Antonio becomes hesitant momentarily (II 5; III 1–2), it is highlighted that Cicero's death is not an obvious or unavoidable development; yet, eventually, Antonio's anger at Cicero's *Philippic Orations* proves dominant.

When Antonio demands them from Pomponia (IV 2; IV 5), Cicero's *Philippics* are not handed over in return for his life and that of members of his family, a scene developed from situations and ideas envisaged in *Suasoriae* transmitted by Seneca the Elder (Sen. *Suas.* 7). Quinto, who joins the conversation, refuses handing over the speeches, like his wife, and kills himself (IV 3). When the women's virtue and energy are starting to have an effect, and Ottaviano and Antonio are about to pardon Cicero, Antonio's follower Lena (C. Popillius Laenas, tr. mil. 43 BCE) appears with Cicero's head (cf. Liv. *Epit.* 120; Val. Max. 5.3.4; App. *B Civ.* 4.19–20; Cass. Dio 47.11.1–2; Plut. *Cic.* 48.1): he had carried out his orders. Antonio is prompted to defend Lena for this deed, but then hands him over to the two women, which indicates the condemnation of Lena's action. At the end of the play Antonio reflects on the problematic nature of his conduct although he remains convinced of his political views. Ottaviano, on the other hand, expresses his admiration for Cicero because of his fight for liberty (V 3). Moreover, the addition of Cajo Rusticello, who announces at the end that he will continue the tradition started by Cicero (V 3), ensures that, despite Cicero's death, his influence as an orator continues, while it is suggested that the impact of his political activity might not be as long-lasting.

This drama, in which Cicero as a stage character is only relevant during a single act, can be seen as a discussion on Cicero supplemented by a few dramatic elements. Overall, the positive assessment of Cicero as a fighter for liberty becomes dominant. Antonio does mention negative traits of Cicero such as his vanity, but he is not an objective witness because of feeling personally offended, and eventually, though hesitant, he gives in. The motif that Antonio will give up his revenge in return for receiving Cicero's *Philippics* demonstrates the importance of Cicero as an

orator, of political speech more generally and of the devastating effect of these speeches on the opponent. Against this background, Rusticello's announcement to continue Cicero's political and oratorical activity can be read as an encouragement to continue this tradition.

#### *4.16 Die Enthaubttung deß Weltberühmten Wohlredners Ciceronis (1724)*

##### *Context*

The literary genre of 'Haupt- und Staatsaktionen' denotes a type of comic plays popular between the late seventeenth and the early eighteenth centuries in the German-speaking world, typically a combination of scripted drama and impromptu theatre. The main narrative (in German) was generally based on stories from ancient history or myth, which had often been already presented in Italian or French operas. This thread was supplemented by a comic buffoon, called 'Hanswurst' (with different variations of the name), frequently appearing as the servant of the protagonist and dressed in a funny costume: Hanswurst enlivens the action by comic remarks and ridiculous experiences, in addition to an impressive scenery and musical interludes.<sup>127</sup>

The most famous author and performer of 'Haupt- und Staatsaktionen' was Josef Anton Stranitzky (1676–1726), an actor, puppeteer, writer, theatre director and also merchant and doctor, who developed the figure of Hanswurst for his theatres in Vienna (Austria). His dramas were typically based on plots of Italian or French operas, which he parodied and translated; he also shows knowledge of Latin and familiarity with Greek and Roman mythology.

The play on the death of Cicero including Hanswurst (HW) does not come with an explicitly mentioned author, but on the basis of circumstantial evidence it is generally assumed that it is by Stranitzky. Even if this piece is not by him, it is clearly written in the tradition of his plays. An opera that could be the model for the piece on the death of Cicero has not yet been identified.

##### *Bibliographical information*

text:

Die Enthaubttung | deß | Weltberühmten Wohlredners | CICE-  
RONIS | Mit HW: | den seltsamen Jäger, lustigen Gallioten, verwirten

Briefftreger, lächerlichen Schwimer, übl belohnten Botten ec. Daß Übrige wird die Action selbst den vorstehen. | Componiert in | Jahr 1724, den 12 Junij., in: *Wiener Haupt- und Staatsaktionen*. Eingeleitet und herausgegeben von Rudolf Payer von Thurn. I. Band, Wien 1908 (Schriften des Literarischen Vereins in Wien X) (pp. 69–132).

{available at: <https://archive.org/details/wienerhauptundst01paye>; <http://www.zeno.org/Literatur/M/Stranitzky,+Joseph+Anton/Dramen/Die+Enthauptung+des+weltberühmten+Wohlredners+Ciceronis>}

characters:

Actores: Augustus Römischer Kayser. | Marcus Antonius Burgermeister. | Julius Antonius sein Sohn, verliebt in Tulia. | Scauro Scatilio Generalisissimus der Römischen Völker und Vatter der Emilia. | Cecina Römischer Zunfftmeister, verliebt in Tulia. | Lucius Scipio ein Freund des Julij Antonii, verliebt in die Emilia. | Tullius Cicero Römischer Wohlredner und Vatter der Tulia. | Terentia seine Gemahlin. | Tulia Tochter des Ciceronis, verliebt in Julium Antonium. | Emilia verliebt in Julium Antonium, hernach in Cecina und endlich in Lucium Scipionem. | HW ein Bedienter des Julij Antonii | Scapin ein Bedienter des Cecina, Beede verliebt in | Bromiam Kamermädchen der Tulia. | Riepl mit etwelchen Bauern. | Römische Soldaten. | Raathbediente mit Marco Antonio.

### *Comment*

As the title indicates, this drama takes the well-known story of Cicero's death in 43 BCE (Plut. *Cic.* 46.5–49.2) as its starting point: Cicero is killed at the end of the first act (I 13–14). Appearing as an upright and dutiful defender of justice and the state, he is prepared to die rather than to abandon his ideals or damage his reputation (esp. I 9). In that respect this characterization agrees with his standard portrayal, but he does not become particularly prominent even while he is alive. In contrast to Cicero, 'Burgermeister' ('mayor') Marcus Antonius acts as a conceited and brutal tyrant, who will not accept that Cicero, by his eloquence, prevented Marcus Antonius Agrippa from being condemned to death.<sup>128</sup> Therefore Marcus Antonius plans revenge (I 4); he insists on his power and proclaims that he will not tolerate any opposition (I 6). Further, the historical conflict between Cicero and

Marcus Antonius serves as the background for a complex web of love affairs, which centres on Cicero's daughter Tullia and Antonius' son Julius, who are in love with each other, but first have to overcome the hatred caused by Cicero's death. The descriptions of the characters in the list of protagonists anticipate the comic complications to come.

In line with this focus on love affairs, some characters who seem to be historical figures are given a novel identity, so that they are almost unrecognizable: Scauro Scatilio, a 'general', is presumably based on M. Aemilius Scaurus (quaestor under Pompey 66 BCE, proquaestor in Syria 65–61 BCE, curule aedile 58 BCE, organizer of lavish games, owner of luxurious houses), Cecina, a 'guild master' (in love with Tullia), may allude to Caecina, a legate of Octavian. Others appear in unhistorical contexts: by the time of Cicero's death his daughter Tullia was already dead (45 BCE), and he had divorced his wife Terentia. Iulius Antonius was the second son of Marcus Antonius and Fulvia; since he was only born in 45 BCE, he cannot have been a young man (in love with Tullia) at the time of the narrative. Augustus was not yet 'emperor Augustus' at this point. Further characters are entirely fictional.

The play does not seem to aim at providing an historically accurate portrayal; it rather uses the context of events from the ancient world to enhance the action. Presenting significant historical incidents in a comic framework can increase the pleasure of an educated audience. There is a comic connection to Cicero and his works when HW uses *o tempora o mores* (III 13), the famous phrase from Cicero's *First Catilinarian Speech* (Cic. *Cat.* 1.2), or when he comically misunderstands Cicero's effusive description of justice (I 10). Nevertheless, the play has a political dimension. The desire for revenge felt by the power-hungry Marcus Antonius triggers Cicero's death and consequently his daughter's hatred; yet the love between the young people eventually enables reconciliation. Cicero, the eloquent orator, appears as a contrast to Antonius; he feels obliged to fight for justice constantly and accept death so as to remain true to his principles and his reputation. His wife Terentia, however, questions this decision since she cannot see how it will benefit the country while she feels that Cicero pays less attention to his family. Thus, the human implications of political decisions are displayed in an historical setting and in an entertaining format.

4.17a/b '*Marcus Tullius Cicero*' (1732/1741)*Context*

For the years 1732 and 1741 scholars have mentioned notices suggesting that in those years dramas on Cicero were performed in Krems (Austria) and Fribourg (Switzerland) respectively. It has not been possible, though, to verify whether these dramas existed and what aspect connected with Cicero they may have focused on.

a. In a history of the Jesuits in German-speaking countries B. Duhr (1928) records a play on Cicero first performed in Krems (Austria) in 1732.<sup>129</sup>

b. The diary of the Jesuit school in Fribourg (Switzerland) indicates that a tragedy was performed there twice, on 4 and 6 September 1741 (KUB Fribourg, L173/6, fol. 152r, 152v; L 172/10, fol. 140v). The title is not given, but it is assumed by some that it was entitled *Marcus Tullius Cicero*.<sup>130</sup> This play has been ascribed to Venantius Kumpffmil.<sup>131</sup> The diary proves that Kumpffmil was rhetor in 1740/41 (L173/6, fol. 143r), but does not identify him explicitly as the author of the tragedy performed in early September 1741. The pieces *Albani* (1742) and *Titus Manlius* (1744) have also been ascribed to Kumpffmil.<sup>132</sup>

A drama of that title or the name Venantius Kumpffmil are not registered in A. Bosson's catalogue of pieces printed in Fribourg (2009); such a play is not recorded in J. Ehret's overview of Jesuit theatre in Fribourg (1921).

4.18 Simon-Joseph Pellegrin, *Catilina* (1742)*Context*

Abbé Simon-Joseph Pellegrin (1663–1745), the French poet, playwright and librettist, originally entered the Servite order, but then started a career as a ship bursar. After his return to France in 1703, he wrote his first poems and thereupon won the Académie française prize in 1704. Pellegrin managed to escape the pressure from the Servites and entered the Cluniac order. He then worked for various schools, for which he produced religious songs.

Pellegrin's oeuvre consists of poems, dramas, libretti for operas (e.g. in collaboration with Jean-Philippe Rameau) as well as translations of psalms and canticles set to familiar tunes from operas. Because of his

connections to the church he retained the title *abbé*. Therefore, apparently, he published some of his dramatic works under the name of his brother Jacques Pellegrin, who was called 'le Chevalier'.

Pellegrin's four tragedies and some of his libretti have a theme from Greek or Roman antiquity (often Greek myth); he also translated the works of the Roman poet Horace. *Catilina*, first published in 1742, is the only piece based on Roman history.

### *Bibliographical information*

text:

CATILINA, | *TRAGEDIE*. | Par M. le Chevalier PELLEGRIN. | *Le prix est de 30 sols*. | A Paris, | Chez PRAULT pere, Quay de Gefvres, au Paradis. | La Veuve PISSOT, Quay de Conty, à la Croix d'Or. | BRIASSON, ruë S. Jacques, à la Science & à l'Ange Gardien. | PRAULT fils, Quay de Conty, à la Charité. | M. DCC. XLII. | *Avec Approbation & Privilège du Roy*.

[available via Corvey Digital Collection]

characters:

*ACTEURS*: MARCUS TULLIUS CICERON, Conful Romain. | ARMINIUS, General des Gaulois. | TULLIA, Fille de Tullius. | CATILINA, Chef des Conjurés. | PETREIUS, Lieutenant General de Tullius. | SEMPRONIE, Sœur du Préteur Lentulus. | CURIUS, Chevalier Romain. | SENNIX, Lieutenant General d'Arminius. | FLAVIEN, Confident de Catilina. | FULVIE, Confidente de Sempronie. | ALBINE, Confidente de Tullia. | LICTEURS.

### *Comment*

This play takes up the popular theme of Catiline's conspiracy; while Sallust's *De coniuratione Catilinae* seems to have been the basis for the main structure of the plot, the drama supplements historical aspects with unattested 'facts' and entertaining fictional elements, especially by adding love affairs.<sup>133</sup> The cast includes a number of historical characters, yet partly in novel relationships and / or with different biographies: the 'préteur' Lentulus must be P. Cornelius Lentulus Sura (81 BCE quaestor, 74 praetor, 71 consul, 63 again praetor), leader of the Catilinarians in Rome and one of the conspirators killed after the meeting of the senate on 5 December 63 BCE. Sempronie, here Lentulus' sister, must be the Roman lady Sempronia involved in the conspiracy

(Sall. *Cat.* 25), the wife of D. Iunius Brutus and the aunt of Fulvia (wife of Clodius Pulcher, C. Sempronius Curio and M. Antonius). In the historical record Lentulus and Sempronia were not siblings, and Fulvia was not Sempronia's confidante like Fulvie in this play (who, however, corresponds to another historical Fulvia, playing a role in conveying details of the Catilinarian Conspiracy to Cicero). In the historical record Q. Curius, one of the conspirators, was a lover of this second Fulvia, and his behaviour prompted her to investigate and to reveal details of the conspiracy to Cicero (Sall. *Cat.* 23.1–4; 26.3; 28.2). Arminius was the leader of the Germanic Cherusci in the famous victorious battle against the Roman general P. Quinctilius Varus in the Teutoburg Forest in 9 CE, but his date of birth is assumed to have been around 16 BCE. His appearance as a 'General des Gaulois' at the time of the Catilinarian Conspiracy is therefore unhistorical in two respects. Cicero's daughter Tullia married Calpurnius Piso Frugi (quaestor 58 BCE) in 63 BCE, but there is no record of other love affairs and relationships for her.

When the play opens, the Catilinarian Conspiracy is already fairly advanced: Catilina has left Rome (which he did historically after Cicero delivered the *First Catilinarian Speech* in early November 63 BCE), and Cicero is worried that he might attack Rome from Etruria. Therefore, the question of which side Arminius and his warriors from Gaul will support becomes essential. As in the historical record, the 'Gauls' eventually join Cicero's party; this is the army's wish, but Arminius is only gradually convinced by his general Sennix and Tullia's influence. There is direct interaction between Arminius and Catilina and between Arminius and Cicero. Accordingly, the play does not end with Catilina's death (V 8, apparently occurring still in Cicero's consular year), but rather concludes with Cicero agreeing to Arminius' demands as Rome's fate owes much to the Gauls (V 10). The historical Gallic tribe of the Allobroges have become Gauls, which probably makes their role more relevant to a French audience; since their leader does not have a name in the historical reports on the Catilinarian Conspiracy, Pellegrin has given him that of another prominent opponent of Rome.

Because the action is focused on the fighting, the relationship to the Gauls and the underlying love affairs, Cicero becomes less prominent as an individual: this Cicero does not make any speeches or chair meetings of the senate; thus, there are hardly any references to the writings of the

historical Cicero. For extended sections of the play he is a figure in the background while others are running intrigues. Thereby, the political conflict is reduced to the personal intentions of individuals. Since, however, part of the plot centres on the question of whether Cicero's daughter Tullia will be married to Catilina or Arminius (including rivalry on the part of Sempronie), Cicero, being her father and expressing views on the options, still plays a significant role: he believes that he is making a sacrifice for Rome (I 4) and that his daughter should do so too (I 5). He feels that glory, not love, will win (II 8) and considers his role towards his country (II 9). He does not want such a villain as Catilina for his son-in-law; at the same time, he is suspicious of the Gauls, though he is willing to make concessions to them (I 2; II 9; V 10). When Catilina is defeated in the end, this is not so much due to Cicero's activities but rather to the role of love relationships and the impact of the fighting.

#### 4.19 *M. T. Cicero, Pro Patria Exul* (1748)

##### *Context*

*M. T. Cicero, Pro Patria Exul* is the earliest example of a Jesuit drama<sup>134</sup> featuring Cicero for which an outline of the plot is extant.<sup>135</sup> According to the title page the piece was performed in Munich on 4 and 5 September ('autumn month') 1748 by the ducal school ('Lyceum'). This Jesuit school must be the college for philosophical and theological studies founded by the Bavarian duke Wilhelm V in 1597/98. Munich had a vibrant Jesuit community, and St Michael's Church in Munich, built for the Jesuits and also supported by Wilhelm V, was one of the largest contemporary theatrical spaces.<sup>136</sup>

As with most Jesuit dramas, what survives is not the full text of the play, but the *perioche*, a kind of advertisement and programme providing a summary of the plot.<sup>137</sup> While the *perioche* lists the actors involved in the performance as well as the composer of the music, there is no information on the author of the text. This is in line with standard conventions of Jesuit dramas since the plays were seen as collective achievements. It was commonly one of the tasks of the professors of rhetoric to write dramatic texts and to direct the performances of plays annually; such performances were regarded as part of the instruction in Latin.<sup>138</sup>



The composer is identified as ‘Ferdinandus Michl, Camer. Aulic. & Templi S. Michaëlis Organædus’. Ferdinand Michl (1712–1754) was a German violinist, organist and composer: he was appointed organist at St Michael’s Church in 1740; in 1745 he became organist for vocal music at the electoral court, and in 1748 he was named deputy ‘Konzertmeister’ (concertmaster). He is known to have composed secular and religious music as well as a number of plays for schools in Munich. Musical sections supporting the main plot allegorically were common<sup>139</sup> because Jesuit dramas were meant to be multi-media productions.<sup>140</sup>

In addition to the list of people involved in the performance, the *perioche* of *M. T. Cicero, Pro Patria Exul* provides an *argumentum* in Latin and in German, followed by an overview of the contents of each scene, again in Latin and in German. The play consists of a prologue and three parts of five, six and four scenes respectively. Between the parts there are choral interludes, and part two includes a ‘scena intermedia’ in the middle, a comic scene not directly connected with the main plot. At the end of the *perioche*, the Latin text of the prologue and of the two choral interludes is recorded. This is a standard format of *periochæ* in the period.<sup>141</sup>

The information in the first part of the Latin *argumentum*, sketching the historical events, is defined as ‘Ex Plutarcho, Fabricio, Pighio &c. ad annum U. C. 695.’ Thereby the plot is dated to 58 BCE, the year in which Cicero went into exile. There is no mention of Cicero’s writings as evidence, but rather of a later ancient writer and of two scholars from the early modern period.<sup>142</sup> The brief indications seem to refer to the German polyhistor and classical scholar Johann Albert Fabricius (1668–1736)<sup>143</sup> and the humanist Stephanus Winandus Pighius (1520–1604).<sup>144</sup> Three volumes of *Annales Romanorum* by Pighius appeared in 1599 and 1615 (the latter edition prepared the Dutch Jesuit scholar Andreas Schott [1552–1629]); these give an account of the magistrates and the most important events year by year. Fabricius edited a biography of Cicero’s son in 1729, to which Andreas Schott added a defence of Cicero the father. Andreas Schott also published a manual entitled *Tullianæ quaestiones de instauranda Ciceronis imitatione* (Antwerp 1610), in which he argued for the method of *interpretatio historica* for Cicero, i.e. striving for an historical understanding of Cicero’s works and the Rome of his time besides engaging with his style.<sup>145</sup> The indication of sources in the *perioche* is meant to show a scholarly basis and to endow the text with greater significance and

authority,<sup>146</sup> which can be observed also in other *periochae*.<sup>147</sup> Cicero was among the ancient writers on the syllabus of Jesuit schools, as demonstrated by the *Ratio studiorum*.<sup>148</sup>

### *Bibliographical information*<sup>149</sup>

text (*perioche*):

M. T. CICERO | PRO | PATRIA EXUL, | Das ift: | Großmüthiges | Schlacht-Opfer | Des eigenen Interesse | Aus | Liebe des Vatterlands | Auf | Öffentlicher Schau-Bühne | Vorgesteller | Von dem Churfürstlichen Lyceo Societatis | JESU in München den 4. und 5. Herbst- | Monats 1748. | Allda gedruckt bey Johann Jacob Vötter, Churfürftlichen Hof- | Landfchafts- und Stadt-Buchdrucker.<sup>150</sup>

[available at: [http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10885961\\_00001.html](http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10885961_00001.html)]

characters:

ACTORES: M. T. Cicero. | L. Aelius Lamia, Ord. Equestr. Princeps. | Q. Hortensius ex Ordine Senat. | Quintus, Ciceronis Frater. | T. A. Milo ex Ord. Equestr. | C. Curio ex Ord. Senat. | L. Val. Flaccus ex Ord. Equestr. | M. Tullius, Ciceronis Filius. | Gladiatores. | C. R. Plumbio Decurio Roman. | S. V. Gnovi-Bovius. | Tympanotriba.

Personæ Musicae in Prologo: Roma. | Amor Patriæ.

In Choris: Phæbus | Jupiter | Juno | Cybele.

### *Comment*

The first part of the Latin *argumentum* broadly follows the sequence of events according to Plutarch's biography of Cicero (Plut. *Cic.* 30–31): after his great deeds at Rome Cicero was assailed by the most dissolute tribune of the People, P. Clodius Pulcher, who had bribed the consuls (of 58 BCE) A. Gabinius and L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus by the assignation of provinces and won the favour of the People by the proposal of advantageous laws. Thereby Cicero was pushed into exile in an unjust way. 20,000 knights, assembling on the Capitol, supported Cicero.<sup>151</sup> That the senators Q. Hortensius and C. Curio were sent as intermediaries to the consuls and the senate and both consuls rejected them does not agree with what is recorded in Plutarch, where Piso deals with Cicero more gently. Also, that L. Aelius Lamia (aed. 45 BCE), here identified as 'Ordinis Equestris Princeps' (cf. *Cic. Fam.* 11.16.2), was

exiled for his support for Cicero (as mentioned in the *argumentum*) is not included in Plutarch.<sup>152</sup>

A particular role of Q. Hortensius Hortalus (114–50, cos. 69 BCE) and C. Scribonius Curio (c. 125–53, consul 76 BCE) in the controversy with Clodius is mentioned in Cassius Dio (38.16.3); this report also refers to another knight who was banned from the city and who might be Lamia, since the historical Cicero mentions the support of this friend (Cic. *Red. sen.* 12; *Sest.* 29; *Pis.* 64; *Fam.* 11.16.2; 12.29.1). The first part of the *argumentum* ends with the statement that Cicero preferred to leave the city of Rome, rather than having her upset by an armed conflict. This interpretation of Cicero's action is stated in the short summary in Pighius' *Annales*;<sup>153</sup> Pighius may have known a spurious oration by 'Cicero' entitled *Oratio pridie quam in exilium iret*, where the speaker announces his withdrawal as a selfless sacrifice to prevent civil war. This oration is found in an Italian fifteenth-century manuscript alongside Cicero's genuine speeches, but may go back to late-antique times.<sup>154</sup>

Since some of the details referred to in the *argumentum* seem to appear only in Cassius Dio among ancient writers, it is noteworthy that this author is not listed among the references. He may be included in '&c.' at the end of the list; the playwright is likely to have known about Cassius Dio, as Pighius, for instance, refers to him as a source.

In comparison with the Latin version of the first part of the *argumentum* and its aim for scholarly accuracy, the German version gives essentially the same facts, but with significant shifts in emphasis and some simplification: it omits the names of Roman historical characters (except for Cicero, Clodius and Lamia) and Roman political institutions. Political offices are described in contemporary terminology, which indicates their official function, but modifies the associated notions of their political influence (such as 'Bürgermeister' ['mayor'] for '*consul*', 'Zunft-Meister' ['guild master'] for '*tribunus plebis*', 'Rath' ['council'] for '*senatus*' and 'Platz' ['square'] for '*Capitolium*'). Detailed accounts of activities, such as those of Clodius, are replaced by summaries of attitudes and intentions. The German version gives more background and motivation to the events: Clodius' hatred is explained as 'old', and for Cicero's selfless sacrifice the context is given that he saw civil war in his native country looming, if he accepted the help of others, and therefore preferred to forego pursuing his own interests.

The second part of the *argumentum* indicates the topic of the musical interludes, defined as a not incongruous and opportune illustration of Cicero's love for his fatherland: this section takes its starting point from observations made at a solar eclipse that occurred a few months prior to the performance of the play (25 July).<sup>155</sup> In this second part the Latin and the German versions basically relate the same details; in the German version, however, the mythical personifications (Phœbus and Cybele) are replaced by the standard names for sun and earth, and where the names of divine beings such as Jupiter and Juno are retained, it is specified that they will be responsible for thunderstorm and rain respectively. That this story will be presented in the musical interludes is indicated at the start in the Latin and at the end in the German version: the 'historical' action will be punctuated by allegorical idealization, which exemplifies an individual's sacrifice for the common good.

In addition to the historical characters there is a group of gladiators, who will appear in the intermediate comic scene. Three people are singled out: a Roman *decurio*<sup>156</sup> called C. R. Plumbio,<sup>157</sup> S. V. Gnovi-Bovius<sup>158</sup> and Tympanotriba.<sup>159</sup> Although these names are fictional, they have been given the format of Latin names; the individual words are attested elsewhere and are joined together for a humorous effect.

The dramatic structure focuses on a role of Cicero's brother Quintus different from what is found in ancient historical sources. According to the information conveyed by the historical Cicero (Cic. *Red. sen.* 37), his brother was active in arranging his return from exile. At the time when Cicero went into exile, however, Quintus was not in Rome, but rather on the way back from the province of Asia, where he was *propraetor* from 61 to 58 BCE; he returned to Rome after Cicero had left the city (Cic. *Att.* 3.7.3; 3.8.1–2; 3.9.1; *Dom.* 59; *Sest.* 68). In this play Quintus, present in Rome, argues that his brother should accept the military defence offered by the knights. The presence of Cicero's son, for whom it is not certain whether he was in Rome at the time, is possibly intended as an emotional way of symbolizing the extent of Cicero's sacrifice.

While several features in this drama can be confirmed from ancient sources, this version of Cicero's exile is not historical. The overall context of domestic politics at the time is ignored, such as reasons for the plan to remove Cicero or the role of Caesar and Pompey. There seems to be more emphasis on the moral message of Cicero's intervention on behalf of his

country than on an accurate representation of the historical situation. By following Pighius' interpretation, namely that Cicero acted selflessly, the author may have thought to present a reading established by scholars.

Such an interpretation is corroborated by the explanations in the German version of the *argumentum* and the double allegorical framework, conveying the same praise of Cicero's selfless sacrifice and the expected future reward in the sense of natural justice. Even though the piece offers a sufficient number of historical details, such as accurate names of the key protagonists and locations, so that those with historical knowledge can recognize them, the emphasis on Cicero's difficult decision and his deed that will resolve the situation makes the historical context appear primarily as a framework. Thereby and by the addition of the allegorical mirror the conflict becomes a paradigmatic instance and assumes a didactic function.

The basic idea of the piece and its moral message may have been provoked by a recommendation made by Piso according to Plutarch (Plut. *Cic.* 31.4) or taken from Cicero's writings: the historical Cicero frequently says that he twice saved the republic, once as consul and again when he left Rome amid support of the populace, in both cases avoiding an armed conflict for the sake of the country (Cic. *Red. sen.* 34; *Dom.* 99; cf. also Cic. *Pis.* 78; *Sest.* 45). That others saw his withdrawal from Rome differently is attested in Cassius Dio (Cass. Dio 38.17.4): 'Then at last he [i.e. Cicero] departed, against his will, and with the shame and ill-repute of having gone into exile voluntarily, as if conscience-stricken.' (trans. E. Cary). Even in Plutarch it is criticized that Cicero praised himself too frequently and hence attracted hatred from contemporaries (Plut. *Cic.* 24.1–3). By contrast, in this play Cicero is shown as an idealized model. Those familiar with Cicero's writings will have known that he defended the republican system; in this drama there is a more personal opposition between the scoundrel Clodius and Cicero governed by love for his country.

#### 4.20 Prosper Jolyot Crébillon, *Catilina* (1748)

##### *Context*

Prosper Jolyot Crébillon (1674–1762), a French tragic poet, was educated at the Jesuit school in Dijon and later at the Collège Mazarin in Paris. He started a career as an advocate, but was soon encouraged to

write tragedies. After some successes he suffered a financial and mental breakdown, but returned to the stage in 1726. In 1731 he was elected to the Académie française; in 1735 he was appointed 'Censeur royal théâtral'.

All of Crébillon's tragedies are based on stories from the ancient world; his first tragedy, *La Mort des Enfants de Brutus* (never performed and not preserved), *Catilina* and his last tragedy, *Le Triumvirat* (1754; ch. 4.26), are the only pieces on Roman republican history. The last two dramas followed after a long hiatus in Crébillon's dramatic production, although he started on *Catilina* in 1722/23.<sup>160</sup> *Catilina* was first shown on 20 December 1748, with a run of twenty performances until 1 February 1749; it was ostentatiously promoted, mainly to demonstrate Crébillon's superiority over his rival Voltaire (ch. 4.23). Voltaire, in turn, adopted the themes of five of Crébillon's tragedies, including *Catilina*, to show his virtuosity in dramatizing these themes.<sup>161</sup> Crébillon's play appeared in five editions in 1749, after the publisher Pault had offered a substantial sum for the printing rights.

Upon Crébillon's death, Voltaire wrote a funeral 'eulogy' (*Éloge de M. de Crébillon*, Paris 1762), in which he ironically comments on *Catilina*;<sup>162</sup> among other comments, he criticizes that the play is written in a manner inappropriate to its setting (p. 27): 'Il eût vrai qu'on rioit en voyant Catilina parler au Sénat de Rome du ton dont on ne parlerait pas aux derniers des hommes; mais après avoir rit, on retournoit à Catilina. . . . Catilina étoit trop barbarement écrit. La conduite de la Piece étoit trop oppofée au caractere des Romains, trop bizarre, trop peu raisonnable, & trop peu intéressante, pour que tous les lecteurs ne fullent pas mécontents. On fut sur-tout indigné de la maniere dont Ciceron eût avili. Ce grand homme confeillant à la fille de faire l'amour à Catilina, étoit couvert de ridicule d'un bout à l'autre de la Pièce.'

As for other reactions to *Catilina*, Montesquieu and Frederick II the Great of Prussia praised it (though the latter also commented on the substantial departures from the historical record), while Charles Collé (1709–1783), in *Journal et Mémoires* (1748–1772), a collection of literary and personal criticisms of friends (including Crébillon) and enemies, was critical of *Catilina* (December 1748):<sup>163</sup> 'On commence par admirer les beautés qui sont dans le rôle de Catilina, et le nombre de vers forts et de génie qui sont répandus dans cette pièce; mais on soutient que ce ne'est pas une pièce. Nulle conduite, nul intérêt, dénouement vicieux,

même le cinquième acte est entièrement mauvais. Il n'y a point d'intérêt d'amour, et il pourroit y en avoir par la constitution même de la pièce. L'intérêt de politique est médiocre, et même il n'y en a point, parce que Catilina agit moins qu'il ne parle. Si on l'eût mis, au troisième acte, en action au milieu de ses conjurés, et qu'il les eût tous fait jurer sur la coupe pleine du sang de Nonnius; si, au quatrième acte, au lieu des déclamations qui sont dans sa bouche, on l'eût fait se justifier au sénat, de façon à convaincre de son innocence les sénateurs et les spectateurs, et que cette justification eût été la base et le fondement de l'éclat de la conjuration au dernier acte, qu'il y auroit aussi fallu actionner d'une tout autre manière qu'il ne l'est; il n'est pas douteux qu'il y auroit eu alors une chaleur d'intérêt assez forte pour pouvoir se passer de celui de l'amour.'

*Catilina* even immediately provoked a dramatic parody, *Cargula, Parodie de Catilina tragédie de M. de Crébillon, etc.* (1749), by François-Antoine (de) Chevrier (1721–1762). Chevrier was a French satirist who particularly mocked the milieu at the theatre as well as specific dramatic pieces. His best-known work is *Le Colporteur, histoire morale et critique* (1762); its publication was surrounded by a scandal, which led to his extradition to the Netherlands, where he died soon afterwards.

The German writer Gotthold Ephraim Lessing (1729–1781) produced a translation into German of part of the play's first scene. The Italian playwright Pietro Chiari (1712–1785), who wrote mostly comedies, but also some tragedies based on incidents from the Roman republic (cf. ch. 4.25), composed an Italian version with some changes in 1751:<sup>164</sup> the main differences are the removal of scenes involving the ambassadors of the Gauls, a greater emphasis on the figures of Tullie and Fulvie and the addition of a final statement by Cicero, commenting on the victory, but also on the losses suffered, at the end of the play; these modifications contribute to enhancing Cicero's standing. Hendrik van Elvervelt (c. 1710–1781) created a Dutch version of the story of Cicero and Catiline on the basis of Crébillon's French play, changing the title and adapting Roman terminology to contemporary conventions; this piece was allegedly written more than twenty years before it was published.<sup>165</sup> Van Elvervelt also wrote other Dutch plays based on existing French pieces (*De Graaf van Warwick; Treurspel. Het Fransche van den Heer M. de la Harpe gevolgd*, Amsterdam 1765).

*Bibliographical information*

texts:

CATILINA, | TRAGÉDIE. | Par M. DE CREBILLON, de l'Académie | Française. | Représentée par les Comédiens ordinaires du | Roi pour la premier fois, le 20 | Décembre 1748. | Le prix est de trente sols. | A PARIS, | Chez PRAULT fils, à l'entrée du Quay de | Conty, à la Charité. | M. DCC. XLIX. | Avec Approbation & Privilège du Roy.

{available e.g. at: <https://archive.org/details/catilinatragdie01jolygoog/>}  
translation (German): The *Dramatische Nachlaß* of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing (1729–1781) includes a German translation of part of the play: *Catilina. Ein Trauerspiel des Herrn von Crébillon. Aus dem Französischen übersetzt von G. E. L. (1749)* (in: *Lessings Werke. T. 3*, Berlin 1884 [Deutsche Nationallitteratur 60.2]; for the table of contents see: <http://d-nb.info/366660756/04>).

Italian version (1751): CATILINA | Tragedia da rappresentarsi nel teatro Grimani di S. Gio. Grisostomo quest'anno 1751 | Cavata dall'originale francese del sig. di Crebillon e adattata all'uso del teatro italiano | In Venezia: In Merceria all'insegna della scienza [Angelo Pasinelli] | MDCCLI.

Italian version (1755): CATILINA | TRAGEDIA | Cavata dall'Originale Francese | DEL SIGNOR DI CREBILLON | E adattata all' uso del Teatro Italiano | DAL SIG. ABATE | PIETRO CHIARI | BRESCIANO | *Prima Edizione Bolognese*. | IN BOLOGNA MDCCLXV. | Nella Stamperia di S. Tommaso d' Aquino. | *Con licenza de' Superiori*.

{available on Google Books}

Dutch version: CICERO | EN | CATILINA; | *TREURSPEL*. | *Het Franfche van den Heer CREBILLON | meerendeels gevolgd*, | DOOR | H. VAN ELVERVELT. | *Te Amsteldam*, | By HARMANUS SELLEGER, | Boekverkooper in de Nes, 1775.

{available at: <http://www.let.leidenuniv.nl/Dutch/Ceneton/Elvervelt/Cicero1775.html>}

characters:

French text: ACTEURS: CATILINA. | CICERON, Conful. | CATON. | PROBUS, Grand-Prêtre. | TULLIE, fille de Cicéron. | FULVIE. | LENTULUS. | CRASSUS. | CETHEGUS. | LUCIUS. | SUNNON, Ambassadeur des Gaules. | GONTRAN. | LICTEURS.

Italian version: ATTORI: CATILINA. | CICERONE Confole. | CATONE. | PROBO Sacerdote. | TULLIA figliuola di Cicerone. |



FULVIA. | LENTULO. | RUFFO. | Littori del Confole. | Soldati di Catone. | Soldati di Ruffo.

Dutch version: VERTOONERS: Cicero, *Burgermeester van Rome*. | Catilina, *Raadsbeer van Rome*. | Cato, *Raadsbeer van Rome*. | Tullia, *Dochter van Cicero*. | Fulvia, *een Romeinsche Juffer, vermond in 't gewaad van een' Slaaf*. | Probus, *Opperpriester van Tellus*. | Sunno, *Afgezant der Gaulen*. | Lentulus, *Cethegus, t' Zaamgezwoorenen*. | Gontran, *Vertrouwing van Sunno*. | Lucius, *Hoofdman der Lyfwachten*. | Bundelbyldraagers; Lyfwachten.

text (parody):

CARGULA | PARODIE | DE CATILINA TRAGEDIE | DE M. DE CREBILLON | DE L'ACCADEMIE FRANÇAISE. | *Sublato jure nocendi*. | Le prix est de 25. fols. | MDCCXLIX. | *Avec permission des Superieurs*. | Se vend chez JEAN GRAVIER Libraire | à la Loge de Banqui à Genes.

characters:

ACTEURS: CARGULA Affeur | LAMBIN Conseiller | FRANCOEUR Deputé de la Province | CIRON Baillif | CAUTELIN Doyen du Bailliage | BABET Deguisée en Huiffier | JEANNETON Fille de Ciron | SERGENTS & RECORDS.

### *Comment*

*Catilina* is set within the events around the Catilinarian Conspiracy (63 BCE), presumably at its later stages, though the timing is not entirely clear.<sup>166</sup> The events bear an approximate relation to the historical sequence; there are some historical figures, but also fictional ones such as the priest Probus or Sunnon, envoy of the Gauls, and Gontran, apparently Sunnon's confidant and servant. The historical figures appear in novel situations: Catilina is in love with Cicero's daughter Tullie; the senate is said to have appointed Catilina governor of Asia (II 3); Catilina stabs himself (dramatically on stage), instead of being killed in battle, and still within Cicero's consular year (V 7); Caesar's ambition to be sole ruler and his activity in Gaul and Germany is moved forward to 63 BCE (III 1).

The main change in relation to the historical record is the introduction of a love affair between Catilina and Tullie. It adds a further dimension to the opposition between Cicero and Catilina, especially

when Cicero, despite misgivings, feels that only by exploiting this relationship will he be able to save himself and Rome (II 4).<sup>167</sup>

Moreover, there is a meeting of the senate (IV 1), which Catilina joins (IV 2) and at which Cicero, Caton, Crassus and Catilina make speeches, but it does not seem to correspond to any of the historically attested meetings. Instead, there is a direct confrontation in private between Cicero and Catilina, where they explain their respective political views (II 3): Cicero recalls his election to the consulship (of 63 BCE) and his role in unifying the senate; he claims that Catilina intends to disturb everything and that Rome has always been against tyranny. Catilina feels pursued and suspects that Cicero is not guided by looking after the fatherland, but rather by hatred; he describes him as a weak character, just waiting for bigger proofs as a basis for attacking Catilina. In those clashes both sides claim that they wish to save Rome. Still, men such as Cicero and Caton continue to regard Catilina as a revolutionary and traitor (IV 2), and he is the one who uses violence and attacks the current political structures. In his campaign Cicero is identified as Catilina's opponent from the start (I 1; I 6).

As the title suggests, Crébillon's play tells the story of Catilina. By contrast, Cicero has a less prominent role.<sup>168</sup> He is presented as an accomplished orator and politician, whose political views contrast with those of Catilina. Because of the addition of (unhistorical) subplots, Cicero is less prominent, and his political acumen is not the only or the main factor in defeating Catilina. Instead, Cicero makes use of personal relationships, in contrast to his beliefs; and there are complex interactions between all major characters: Catilina eventually fails because of the combined effect of personal, political and military activities by his supporters and opponents.

*Cargula* is a short drama in seventeen scenes; the title defines it as a parody of the tragedy *Catilina* by Crébillon. The plot has been moved to France, and the characters who reappear have intricate names: the title character Cargula alludes to Catiline, Ciron is Cicero, Jeanneton is Cicero's daughter Tullie. The political struggle has been transferred to a controversy over jurors and bailiffs.

The piece has an explicit metatheatrical dimension, when characters frequently comment on what is appropriate for a tragedy or what should be done or not be done to make the drama interesting and conforming to

the rules (2; 4; 6; 9; 10; 11). Most significantly, when Ciron starts an eloquent speech, Cautelin comments that all this boastful talk is already in Voltaire and that the orator from Gisors<sup>169</sup> may be a plagiarist and thief (10):<sup>170</sup> this alludes both to the rivalry between Crébillon and Voltaire and perhaps also to the fact that many writings of the historical Cicero are based on Greek sources. Moreover, the character Cargula argues that there cannot be a tragedy without a love story in France (6): obviously, the love story has been added in Crébillon's version against the historical record, and it was left out again in Voltaire's slightly later version (ch. 4.23).<sup>171</sup> Finally, Ciron triumphs, and Cargula is defeated (17); thus, the structure aligned to the historical events is not contradicted entirely. But Ciron only has a limited role in achieving this result, as he appears timid (12), and the matter is decided in battle.

The existence of such a parody demonstrates the contemporary relevance of Crébillon's play, and the metatheatrical dimension illustrates the rivalry between Crébillon and Voltaire as well as ongoing discussions on dramatic conventions.

#### 4.21 *Catilina ambitionis victima* (1749)

##### *Context*

This drama was first performed in Salzburg (Austria) on 3 September 1749 and originates from the Benedictine community there. Only the *perioche* (cf. ch. 4.19) survives.

The author of the text is not identified. The music was composed by Johann Ernest Eberlin (1702–1762). Eberlin, educated at the Jesuit Gymnasium of St Salvator in Augsburg and at the Benedictine University in Salzburg, became organist for the archbishop of Salzburg in 1727; by 1749 he was 'Dom- und Hofkapellmeister' (court and cathedral chapel master). Besides composing and directing music for the theatre, he created a variety of secular and non-secular works, such as operas, toccatas, fugues as well as oratorios and masses. The piece is dedicated to the person Eberlin worked for at the time, archbishop Andreas Jakob von Dietrichstein (1689–1753; elected archbishop 1747, ordained 1 June 1749), who had studied in Salzburg and subsequently held positions at the local cathedral.

The *perioche* consists of an *argumentum*, a scene-by-scene overview of the plot (first in Latin and then in German), the text of the musical sections (prologue, two choruses, epilogue) and a list of characters.

According to the Latin *argumentum* the plot is based on the ancient historiographers Sallust (*Cat.*) and Florus (2.12.5). There are reminiscences of Florus' brief narrative in the summary of the story, while the good qualities of the consuls opposing Catilina are enhanced. The German version of the *argumentum* does not indicate any sources, is longer, gives slightly more circumstantial detail, uses contemporary terminology (e.g. 'Burger-Meister' ['mayor'] instead of '*consul*') and employs less poignant phrasing; it emphasizes more strongly that Catilina is an example of wrong behaviour for which he died, even if in battle and not by being properly punished. The scene-by-scene summary exhibits minor variations between the two languages, but is substantially the same.

### *Bibliographical information*

text:

CATILINA | AMBITIONIS | VICTIMA. | QUEM | *CELISSIMO* AC  
*REVERENDISSIMO* | DOMINO DOMINO | ANDREÆ | JACOBO, |  
 Archi-Episcopo, & S.R.I. Principi | Salisburgenſi, Sacræ Sedis Apostolicæ |  
 Legato Nato, Germaniæ Primati &c.&c. | EX ILLUSTRISSIMA ET  
 ANTIQUISSIMA PROSAPIA | S.R.I. | COMITUM DE DIETRICHSTEIN, |  
 DOMINO SUO ET PRINCIPI CLE- | *MENTISSIMO* | In humillimum  
 obſequium | D.D.D. | MUSÆ BENEDICTINÆ SALISBURGENSES. | *Anno*  
*M. DCC. XLIX. Die 3. Septembris.* | Typis Joannis Joſephi Mayr, Aulico-  
 Academici Typograhi p.m. Hæredis.

[available at: <http://www.neolatin.eu/works/catilina-ambitionis-victima.2754>]

characters:

SYLLABUS PERSONARUM.

PERSONÆ MUSICÆ: *Jupiter.* | *Typhæus.* | *Enceladus.* | *Porphyrion.*  
 [*Gigantes.*] | *Genius Libertatis.* | *Roma.* | *Berecynthia.* | *Genius Ambitionis.* |  
*Genius Italiæ.* | *Genius Asiæ.* | *Genius Africæ.*

INTERLOCUTORES: Nachbauer Jodl. | Nachbauer Stoffel. | und das  
 ganze Gericht. [Bauern-Veitl.] | Bauern-Weib, Agathl. | Kellner.<sup>172</sup>

ACTORES: *Catilina.* | *Cicero.* | *Pharmanus Legatus Allobrogum I.* |  
*Teutitius Legatus II.* | *Lentulus.* | *Cethegus.* | *Gabinus.* | *Statilius.* |  
*Vulturcius.* | *Q. Curius.* | *Civis I.* | *Civis II.* | *Civis III.* | *Marcus de amicis*  
*Lentuli.* | *Publius de Amicis Lentuli.* | MILITES PRÆTORIANI. |  
 MILITES CATILINÆ.

*Comment*

The plot of this play shows the development and containment of the Catilinarian Conspiracy (63 BCE) more or less according to the historical record, although the action seems condensed.<sup>173</sup> No unattested figures have been added to the main story (apart from the fact that the envoys of the Allobroges have been given individual names); a female character only features in the inserted self-contained comic scene.

Most plays named after Catiline merely give the name Catiline as the title or refer to Catiline's conspiracy. By contrast, the title 'Catilina, victim of his desire for power' indicates a particular perspective, an evaluation of Catilina's character and the lesson to be demonstrated. This aspect is enhanced by the allegorical framework, when Genius Ambitionis appears. Thus, the title and the allegorical sections surrounding the historical plot indicate that the piece is meant to illustrate Rome's power and standing and to condemn activities such as those of Catilina, when ambitious individuals threaten the status of Rome. There is a contrast between Genius Libertatis and Genius Ambitionis with respect to Rome, presented as the master of the empire and almost identified with Jupiter. The attempts of Genius Ambitionis at overthrowing are thwarted, and Rome, enjoying the protection of the gods, is saved.

Against the background of this allegorical framework Cicero, confronting the Catilinarian Conspiracy, is presented almost as an agent of the gods (in line with the historical Cicero's depiction of himself in his epic about his consulship); at the end Cicero transfers the praise awarded to him to the gods. Details of Cicero's actions are not clear from the summary, but it is obvious that his activities and political views contrast with those of Catilina, to the extent that his life is under threat; still he is eventually successful over the conspirators. Cicero thus appears as the representative of the 'right' political views, sanctioned by the gods. In the context of the moral derived from Catilina's striving for power Cicero serves as a positive moral example.

4.22 Jean-Baptiste Geoffroy, *Catilina* (1749)*Context*

Jean-Baptiste Geoffroy (1706–1782) was a French Jesuit, who taught humanities at Rouen and Caen and also rhetoric at La Flèche and Paris (at

the Collège de Louis-le-Grand); he was a member of the Académie de Caen (1732) and the Académie de Lyon (1774).

According to the title page, the play *Catilina* was performed on 3 and 6 August 1749 at the Collège de Louis-le-Grand (and there seems to have been another performance on 3 August 1757).<sup>174</sup> The performance apparently included a ballet as an intermezzo ('Les Héros de roman', to a choreography by Louis Dupré [c. 1690–1774], the well-known French dancer, choreographer and ballet master), and it concluded with a eulogy of the king. What survives is a programme with a detailed summary of the plot in French.

The introductory notice states that the Catilinarian Conspiracy is a well-known historical event and the play basically follows the historical facts, apart from a few changes necessitated by the 'severity' of the theatre.<sup>175</sup> Those, however, alter the focus of some of the key actions.

### *Bibliographical information*

text:

CATILINA, | TRAGÉDIE, | SERA REPRÉSENTÉE | AU  
COLLEGE | DE LOUIS LE GRAND, | POUR LA DISTRIBUTION  
DES PRIX | *Fondez par SA MAJESTÉ.* | Le Mercredi fixième jour d'Aouft  
mil sept cent quarante-neuf, | à midi précis. | *La Tragédie seule se*  
*repréſentera le Dimanche troiſième jour d'Aouft,* | *dans la Salle ordinaire des*  
*Pièces, à trois heures précifés.* | A PARIS, | CHEZ THIBOUST, IMPRIMEUR  
DU ROI, | Place de Cambray. | M. D C C X L I X.

characters:

*NOMS ET PERSONNAGES DES ACTEURS:* MARCUS TULLIUS,  
Conſul | LUC. SERGIUS CATILINA | PUB. CORN. LENTULUS,  
Préteur | MARCUS PORCIUS CATON | CAIUS JULIUS CÆSAR |  
QUINTUS CURIUS, Pontife | QUINTUS CURIUS, Fils du Pontife |  
ARMINIUS, Ambaffadeur des GAULOIS

### *Comment*

As in other dramas named after Catiline, Cicero is not the main protagonist, though he still plays a major role in being the focus of opposition for the conspirators (in 63 BCE). Yet Cicero is not characterized as the only one responsible for containing the Conspiracy. On the contrary, he is presented as worried and indecisive (e.g. Act III:

‘Tullius toujours incertain & irréfolu’). This impression is perhaps strengthened because the (historical) assassination attempt on his life has been turned into a dream (Act I; preface). Eventually, Cicero is prepared to face death and enter the fray at the Temple of Jupiter, where he had summoned Catilina, to confirm that he does not plot against the republic (Acts II; IV). The confrontation between Cicero and the conspirators is made more impressive as it is located in Rome (cf. preface) and involves the leaders of both groups: in the end, after having made an attempt to assassinate Cicero, Catilina, who considered his recent political experiences as a sufficient justification for uprooting the country, kills himself, and Cicero is honoured as an avenger and father of the fatherland (Act V; cf. *Cic. Pis.* 6; *Sest.* 121).

By virtue of being consul, Cicero takes the lead in confronting the conspiracy; yet for his success he benefits from the virtuous and courageous actions of others. A particular role is given to the two characters of father and son Quintus Curius (*Sall. Cat.* 17.3; 23.1–4): when the son, originally one of the conspirators, realizes the deadly character of the revolution, which also attacks his father, he saves the latter by his courage and loyalty.<sup>176</sup> Arminius, the ambassador of the Gauls, initially seems to embody another threat to Rome since he demands a reduction of the payments requested from his country; later he turns into an active supporter of the opponents of the conspiracy because in this play, in contrast to the historical record (cf. *Sall. Cat.* 40–41; 44–45), he demands letters from the conspirators on his own account; while he later returns these letters, he stops collaborating with the conspirators (Acts III–IV).<sup>177</sup>

Just as in Simon-Joseph Pellegrin’s drama (ch. 4.18), the representative of the Gauls is called Arminius, alluding to the leader of the Germanic Cherusci in the famous victorious battle against the Roman general P. Quinctilius Varus in the Teutoburg Forest in 9 CE. The conspirator Quintus Curius is given a new function through the familial context. This character too plays a major role in Pellegrin’s version. Therefore, it is possible that Geoffroy was familiar with Pellegrin’s piece.

Geoffroy’s drama has been interpreted as a condemnation of any kind of conspiracy against the state and as a means to respond to attacks on the Jesuit order in France at the time.<sup>178</sup> Even though the concrete reference to the Jesuits will have to remain uncertain, it is obvious that, by enhancing the conspirators’ bloodthirsty activities, the play paints an

abhorrent picture of the Conspiracy directed against the traditional order. In contrast to other plays, it is not Cicero on his own who organizes opposition; instead, a private individual and even a non-Roman also take the initiative. Cicero's behaviour is not criticized, in fact he is even honoured at the end; but he does not appear as the decisive figure.

#### 4.23 Voltaire, *Rome sauvée, ou Catilina* (1752)

##### *Context*

Voltaire (real name: François-Marie Arouet, 1694–1778) was one of the most influential authors of the French Enlightenment. He wrote philosophical, historical and scientific works, a great number of letters and was a successful poet, composing plays, poems and novels.

Voltaire was educated by the Jesuits at the Collège de Louis-le-Grand in Paris, where he learned ancient Greek and Latin. Against the wishes of his father, who wanted him to become a lawyer, Voltaire turned to writing early on. His pieces were popular with the aristocratic families of his acquaintance, but he ran into trouble with the authorities from the start because of his criticism of government and of religious intolerance. Voltaire wrote his first play while imprisoned in the Bastille. In total, he produced dozens of dramas, including others on stories from the ancient world.<sup>179</sup>

Voltaire did not think highly of the rival dramatist Crébillon; he wrote an ironic funeral 'eulogy' upon Crébillon's death (*Éloge de M. de Crébillon*, Paris 1762).<sup>180</sup> Voltaire reacted to five of Crébillon's dramas by producing pieces on the same themes: *Rome sauvée, ou Catilina* is a reaction to Crébillon's *Catilina* of 1748 (ch. 4.20) and particularly avoids the historical 'inaccuracies' in Crébillon's version.<sup>181</sup> The first draft of *Rome sauvée, ou Catilina* was written in a few days in 1749, after Voltaire had been thinking about the subject matter for a few months;<sup>182</sup> it was presented in private and court performances in 1750 (at some of which Voltaire played the character of Cicero).<sup>183</sup> Voltaire regarded this piece as one of his best plays. It underwent further revisions until it received its first full public performance on 24 February 1752 in Paris and appeared in the first authorized edition in 1753 (after six unauthorized editions in 1752<sup>184</sup>).<sup>185</sup> The drama soon received a translation into English (printed in 1760) and other European languages. In addition to Crébillon's piece,



Voltaire knew other vernacular plays on Catiline and Cicero, for instance the piece by Ben Jonson (ch. 4.9).<sup>186</sup>

Voltaire was familiar with all of Cicero's works; his library in Ferney (France) included both a Latin edition of the complete works of Cicero and individual editions of some works with commentaries and translations.<sup>187</sup> While Cicero the philosopher was more important for Voltaire than Cicero the orator, the full portrait of Cicero the man was also influential.<sup>188</sup> Voltaire refers to Cicero in several of his writings. For instance, Cicero has his own entry in Voltaire's *Dictionnaire philosophique*, which includes the following comment:<sup>189</sup> 'Le trait le plus glorieux de l'histoire de *Cicéron*, c'est la ruine de la conjuration de *Catilina*; mais, à le bien prendre, elle ne fit du bruit à Rome qu'autant qu'il affecta d'y mettre de l'importance. Le danger existait dans ses discours bien plus que dans la chose. C'était une entreprise d'hommes ivres qu'il était facile de déconcerter. Ni le chef, ni les complices n'avaient pris la moindre mesure pour assurer le succès de leur crime. Il n'y eut d'étonnant dans cette étrange affaire que l'appareil dont le consul chargea toutes ses démarches, & la facilité avec laquelle on lui laissa sacrifier à son amour-propre tant de rejetons des plus illustres familles.' In one of his letters Voltaire says:<sup>190</sup> 'Cicéron dans l'exil y porta l'éloquence, / Ce grant art des Romains, cette auguste science / D'embellir la raison, de forcer les esprits.'

### *Bibliographical information*<sup>191</sup>

texts:

SUPPLEMENT | AU | SIECLE | DE | LOUIS XIV. | CATILINA | TRAGÉDIE | ET AUTRES PIÈCES | DU MEME AUTEUR. | A DRESDE 1753. | Chez GEORGE CONRAD WALTHER. | LIBRAIRE DU ROI. | AVEC PRIVILEGES (pp. 89–172).<sup>192</sup>

{available on Google Books}

ROME SAUVÉE | OU | CATILINA, | TRAGÉDIE | DE MR. DE VOLTAIRE, | REPRESENTÉE A PARIS | EN FEVRIER MDCCLII. | NOUVELLE EDITION, | *Suivant la Copie Originale, publiée par l'Auteur, & Augmentée d'une* | PRÉFACE. | A DRESDE, | Et se vend à GENEVE | Chez ANTOINE PHILIBERT | *Libraire au Perron*. | MDCCLIII.

{available e.g. at: <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k5458622g>; [http://www.mediterranees.net/histoire\\_romaine/catilina/voltaire/index.html](http://www.mediterranees.net/histoire_romaine/catilina/voltaire/index.html); [http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10770257\\_00002.html](http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10770257_00002.html)}

modern edition: P. LeClerc, *Rome sauvée, ou Catilina*. Critical edition, in: *The Complete Works of Voltaire* 31A, Oxford 1992 (pp. 1–292).

contemporary English translation:

ROME Preferv'd: | A | TRAGEDY. | Translated from the FRENCH of | M. De VOLTAIRE. | LONDON: | Printed for John CURTIS, at Shakeſpear's Head, | oppoſite Crane-court, Fleet-ſtreet. 1760. | {Price One Shilling and Six-pence.}

{available on Google Books}

characters:

PERSONNAGES (1753): CICERON. | CESAR. | CATILINA. | AURELIE. | CATON. | LUCULLUS. | CRASSUS. | CLODIUS. | CETHEGUS. | LENTULUS-SURA. | CONJURES. LICTEURS.

### *Comment*

While scholars assume that Voltaire composed this tragedy in response to Crébillon's version (ch. 4.20) and that, in contrast to that drama, he stayed closer to the historical record and gave Cicero a bigger and more virtuous role,<sup>193</sup> according to the Préface the tragedy was written to demonstrate that there can be tragedies without love affairs and to introduce Cicero to young people.<sup>194</sup> As in other Cicero / Catilina plays, however, there is a kind of love affair since Catilina is shown in love with his wife Aurélie (Aurelia Orestilla, cf. Sall. *Cat.* 15.2). That Cicero is to be presented as the saviour of Rome becomes apparent elsewhere in the Préface and particularly in the final act, when Cicero is awarded the title of father and avenger (V 2). The stage shows Aurélie's house (which emphasizes the drama's personal aspect) on one side and the Temple of Tellus (where the senate meets) on the other, just as Crébillon's *Catilina* is set in the Temple of Tellus.<sup>195</sup>

Because of the emphasis on the personal and political conflict Catilina is faced with, of the increased role of César and Caton and of the condensed presentation of the action, the drama does not follow the sequence of events in the historical record, yet it creates the impression that it does. This is what Voltaire states in the Préface, when he proclaims that a tragedy is not a history; still, he insists that, although what Cicero, Catilina, Caton and César have done in this piece is not historically correct, 'leur genie & leur caractère' have been represented truthfully.<sup>196</sup> A noticeable change in relation to the

ancient sources is that Voltaire has Catilina's wife Aurélie turn to her father and the party of the senate, after she has been unable to dissuade her husband from his plans.<sup>197</sup> In response, Catilina kills his father-in-law Nonnius, whom he regards as the instigator of the movement against him (since Nonnius informed Cicero); Aurélie then kills herself (IV 3; IV 5; IV 6). These incidents trigger long discussions between the senators about the state of Rome and the best ways of support. Thus, the sequence of events illustrates the situation among the noblemen in Rome and reduces Cicero's role in uncovering the conspiracy.

Voltaire does not reveal which ancient sources he consulted.<sup>198</sup> Yet it is clear that he knew the works of the ancient authors Cicero, Sallust and Plutarch as well as Conyers Middleton's recent biography of Cicero (1741; see ch. 2.2). Voltaire's familiarity with Cicero's writings is well known, and he admits in the Préface that he imitated Cicero's *Catilinarian Orations* on a few occasions.<sup>199</sup> Since he does not recreate the situations in which Cicero delivered these speeches, he does not put versions of these speeches into Cicero's mouth, but reuses sentiments in other contexts. For instance, there is a meeting of the senate (IV), but it is unclear which of the historical meetings it might represent. In addition, there is a direct confrontation between Cicero and Catiline (I 5), though not historically attested; this allows both men to state their political views and their opinion of the other: Catilina accuses Cicero of being a plebeian, while Cicero points to his virtuous achievements and that he has done everything just by himself (cf. Cic. *Leg. agr.* 2.1–7). Catilina feels that Cicero unjustly focuses on him as an opponent though he too is serving the country, as he is disappointed with its current state and intends to bring it back to its former glory. Yet Cicero, as the consul, wishes to confront Catilina and thus preserve Rome. A letter plays a role (III 2), but as part of Catiline's intrigue (a letter from Aurélie's father, which Catilina wants to be delivered to Cicero as it only names César as a traitor) and not as a means to convict the conspirators, as in the historical record.

In the Préface Voltaire explains his portrait of Cicero, whom he describes as a 'homme vertueux', in the play:<sup>200</sup> this piece was not concerned with Cicero in his role as a consul, poet or philosopher, but with him having saved Rome against an unwilling senate; Cicero prepared his own downfall in exchange for the greatest service anyone

had ever done for one's fatherland. This was the theme of this tragedy, not so much the evil soul of Catilina rather than 'l'ame généreuse & noble de *Cicéron*'. Accordingly, Cicero appears as a defender of Rome's traditional system and as a moral authority, lamenting the degeneration of Rome and the lack of virtues. His views on what is best for Rome contrast with those of Catilina; the two men therefore argue about who supports Rome (IV 4). In the end, Cicero is awarded the title of father and avenger, and he is proud of his achievements (V 2). When the Roman nobility and other politically powerful people in this conflict are depicted as weak while the newcomer Cicero, who follows moral principles, takes decisive action, a contemporary relevance is probably intended.

#### 4.24 Giovanni Battista Casti, *Catilina* (1752)

##### *Context*

The Italian Giovanni Battista Casti (1724–1803) initially took holy orders, but soon abandoned the church; instead, he became associated with several European courts and was given the status of a court poet. Accompanying especially Austrian officials, he travelled widely; during the last few years of his life he lived in Paris. Casti wrote verses, satires and political texts commenting on governmental structures; and he composed many librettos.

Casti's librettos include *Catilina*, which was set to music by the Italian composers Antonio Salieri (1750–1825) in 1792 and Serafino de Ferrari (1824–1885) in 1852. The opera was not performed in the librettist's lifetime; it was first shown (with Salieri's music) on 16 April 1994 at the Hessisches Staatstheater in Darmstadt (Germany) in a German version by Josef Heinzelmann (see ch. 3).

Since the libretto also had an independent existence as a dramatic text (printed in Casti's collected works), it is included here.

##### *Bibliographical information*

text:

CATILINA | DRAMMA, in: OPERE | DI | GIAMBATISTA CASTI  
| IN UN VOLUME | BRUSSELLE | SOCIETÀ MELINE, CANS E  
COMPAGNI | LIBRERIA; STAMPERIA E FUNDERIA DI CARAT-  
TERI | 1838 (pp. 361–391).

{available on Google Books}

characters:

PERSONAGGI: CATILINA. | CETEGO. | CURIO. | SEMPRONIA. | CICERONE. | CATONE. | FULVIA, figlia di Cicerone. | CONGIURATI. | BANDITORI. | POPOLO.

### *Comment*

This drama is another dramatization of the Catilinarian Conspiracy in 63 BCE.<sup>201</sup> The play consists of two acts with a large number of diverse scenes each; thus, the sequence of events is condensed and develops towards a rapid conclusion. The play builds up a contrast between Catilina and his supporters on the one hand and Cicero and Catone on the other hand. From the beginning it is demonstrated that the conspirators regard the current political situation as rotten and are eager to take revenge on the 'establishment', which they see personified in Cicero, Catone ('ippocrita') and Pompeo ('effeminato'), and to obtain power. Catilina's protest is especially directed towards Cicero since he cannot accept that Cicero, a man from a humble background and from the provinces, obtains the office of consul that should be given to him (esp. I 1, Catilina to conspirators: 'Dovrem soffrir che un Cicerone, un fungo / Nato dalla putredine, un pallone / Di vento, un demagogo / Venga d' Arpino a farci il pedagogo? / E non con altro merto che sofismi / E rotondi periodi ampollosi, / Leggi a noi detti, ed osi / Imporne a Roma, ed usurpar si lasci / I primi gradi e i consolari fasci?').

By contrast, Catone and Cicero, who respect each other, believe that the policies they promote ensure the welfare of the republic, and lament the degeneration of Rome (I 3–4). There is not even a proper conversation between Cicero and Catilina, when the two men meet and Catilina addresses Cicero ironically (I 4: 'eroe d' Arpino', 'un console più culto, / Filosofo, orator, giureconsulto'). Catilina still cannot accept that a man from a humble background and from the provinces obtains an office that he thinks he deserves (I 5). Later Catilina tries to start a conversation with Catone, but his exaggerated flattery provides Catone with an easy opportunity to reject him (I 9).

Separately, Fulvia (here, unhistorically, described as Cicero's daughter), who belongs to the conspirators, but bears the approaches of the conspirator Curio (Q. Curius) only unwillingly, decides to reveal the conspiracy to save her country (I 7). Accordingly, it is her

betrayal that forms the starting point of Cicero's victory (cf. Sall. *Cat.* 17.3; 23.1–4; 26.3; 28.2); further informants, such as the historically attested ambassadors from Gaul, do not appear. In addition, Sempronia (cf. Sall. *Cat.* 25) assumes a major role, leading the female conspirators.

Thus, Cicero relies on Catone's support and the information about the conspiracy received from Fulvia (I 6–7; I 12). On this basis he encourages himself to deliver a speech worthy of himself, when his fame as an orator seems as important as resolving the political situation (I 13, Cicero: 'Or a noi. Qui fa d' uopo / Di tutta quanta l' eloquenza nostra. / Bisogna fare al popolo un' aringa / Degna di Marco Tullio Cicerone. / Il popolo romano / È capriccioso e strano; / Ma il popolo per tutto è sempre popolo. / Vi vuole della novità, vi vuole / Qualche scappata energica, che scuota, / Ch' ecciti entusiasmo, un tratto forte, / Un colpo d'arte ... in somma / Qualche cosa di bello ... / Sibben ... un'invettiva in sul modello / Del greche Filippiche, / E chiamarla potrem Catilinarìa ... / Ma piano, il caso varia. / Filippo in Macedonia, / Demostene in Atene, / La cosa andava bene: / Catilina sarà probabilmente / All' aringa presente ... / Colui è un muso duro: ei non rispetta / Nè fe, nè legge, e attorno ha una brigata / Di gente disperata ... / Capace d' ogni iniquità ... la cosa / È alquanto perigliosa. / Ma facciamone un saggio: / Son Romano, son console; coraggio!'). Cicero gives a speech against Catilina in front of the People, which recalls elements of the *First Catilinarian Oration* of the historical Cicero, delivered in the senate. Catilina and other conspirators are of the view that Cicero's speech mainly consists of empty threats, but still feel that they should act (II 4).

Cicero's assassination is being planned, which improves the mood of the conspirators (II 5). Their joyous feelings contrasts with a scene in which Catilina, who had withdrawn, is terrified by the appearance of threatening shades (II 7). After the conspirators' failed assassination attempt on Cicero (cf. Sall. *Cat.* 28.1–3), which historically triggered the *First Catilinarian Oration*, Cicero arrives at the Temple of Concord in armour (cf. Cic. *Mur.* 52; Plut. *Cic.* 14.7–8; Cass. Dio 37.29.4): he announces to the People assembled in front of the Temple that there has been great danger to the republic, but that the consul is taking action and sacrificing himself for the sake of the republic (II 9). Catone, in military dress, followed by Roman soldiers, arrives. Catone and Cicero

discuss their measures: Catone leaves with his soldiers, and Cicero secures himself in the Temple (II 10), from where he encourages Fulvia (II 12). Thereby the conspirators realize that Fulvia has betrayed them and decide to attack the Temple (II 13–14). The repeated cry ‘La vittoria over la morte’ (II 14) illustrates their feelings. When Catone and his troops reappear, Cicero limits himself to encouraging words: ‘Caton, costanza.’ (II 15). In view of the superior numbers of the opponents, Catilina withdraws. Catone and Cicero award civic crowns to each other; Cicero honours Catone since he has saved the sanctuary and the ‘primo funzionario’; Cato states that the senate and the People will call Cicero ‘padre e difensor’ (II 15).

According to the historical record (Cic. *Cat.* 3.21; Sall. *Cat.* 46.5), the meetings of the senate in December 63 BCE at which the activities of the conspirators were revealed and the punishment of the arrested men decreed took place in the Temple of Concord. In Casti’s condensed and dramatic version this is turned into an open battle in front of the Temple, and it follows immediately upon the first attempts of the conspirators and their discovery. The outcome of the personalized confrontation is similar to the historical result: Cicero is successful; Catilina, who not even hesitated to attack a temple, withdraws in view of the superior numbers of his opponents; he has failed in his arrogant claim for power. Despite his victory and the jubilant cries from the People, Cicero’s role remains problematic since he, like Catone, defends the system they represent also for their own benefit. For it is demonstrated clearly that, without Fulvia, Cicero could not have saved himself and the republic; still, the two men award civic crowns to each other. Cicero is marked as a man of words rather than of weapons and appears weak and ridiculous: in the dangerous situation of the fighting he withdraws into the temple and only leaves, clad in armour, after Catilina has gone.

#### 4.25 Pietro Chiari, *Marco Tullio Cicerone* (1752)

##### *Context*

Pietro Chiari (1712–1785), born in Brescia (Italy), was originally a member of the Jesuits. After leaving the order in 1747, Chiari wrote a large number of comedies, with Carlo Goldoni (1707–1793) as his rival, and became a court poet in Venice; in 1762 he returned to

Brescia. In addition to comedies, Chiari's oeuvre includes novels and tragedies; most of the latter are based on major characters from the Roman republic (cf. ch. 4.20). Chiari also translated some of Cicero's letters.

*Marco Tullio Cicerone* was performed at the Teatro Grimani di San Giovanni Grisostomo and first published in Venice in 1752.

### *Bibliographical information*

text (1755 edition):

MARCO TULLIO | CICERONE | TRAGEDIA | Rappresentata |  
NEL TEATRO GRIMANI | DI | S. GIO: GRISOSTOMO. | *Prima*  
*Edizione Bolognese.* | IN BOLOGNA MDCCLXV. | Nella Stamperia di  
S. Tommaso d' Aquino. | *Con licenza de' Superiori.*

{available on Google Books}

characters:

ATTORI: MARCO Tullio Cicerone. | LIVIA sua Moglie. | POPILIA  
da lui ripudiata, e sorella di Lepido. | QUINTO figliuolo di Cicerone, e  
di Livia. | MARCO Antonio. | MARCO Lepido. | OTTAVIANO, o sia  
Ottavio Cesare. | BRUTO. | METELLO Tribuno. | PLANCO. | LUCIO  
Lena. | Soldati d' Antonio. | Soldati di Lepido. | Soldati di Ottavio. |  
Littori.

### *Comment*

In the preface Chiari defends his choice of subject matter by the observation that the name of Cicero is so well known that everyone derives pleasure from watching his character, his experiences and his death and that the selected section of history has not yet been dramatized except in a play by Pier Jacopo Martello (ch. 4.15), which, however, was rather different and a drama for reading rather than the stage.<sup>202</sup> Indeed, both Chiari's and Martello's pieces have the name of Cicero as the title and present the final months of his life in 43 BCE; yet, they do so in different ways since Chiari has a more complex and more dramatic plot.

In Chiari's piece Cicero is introduced as a supporter of the republic, admiring Bruto as a defender of liberty, apprehensive of Antonio (Mark Antony) and confident of Ottavio (Octavian); this becomes obvious from Cicero's behaviour as well as comments by others, for instance when Bruto says that Cicero loves his country and has always been her defender (I 3).



In the opening scenes Cicero is not only shown in private conversations, for instance with his son (I 1), but also as an active orator and politician since he is expected to give a speech and then does so: he announces to the People from the Rostra that Rome has been saved and Antonio defeated and also praises Bruto (I 5). While Cicero laments the decline of Rome and the current difficult situation, he feels that recalling the past does not help and asks his son to follow in Bruto's footsteps (III 1). Cicero supports Ottavio, yet denies him the consulship since he regards him as still too young (III 2).

Cicero's main impact is seen through his oratory, especially the group of the *Philippic Orations* directed against Mark Antony. Thus, the tribune Metello (presumably Q. Caecilius Metellus) expresses his concern that Antonio might not be able to suffer Cicero's torrent of words in silence. Antonio assures him that he will survive as this cannot be worse than the fourteen *Philippics* (III 4). When Cicero delivers a long speech and recalls that he has been fighting against opponents for many decades and talks about the enemies of the fatherland (III 5), Antonio emerges and gives a speech on the political situation and against Cicero. In another long oration Cicero defends himself, accuses Antonio and argues against tyranny (III 6).

Like Martello's drama, this piece includes Popilia, characterized in the cast list as repudiated by Cicero, just as Publilia, the second wife of the historical Cicero, though Chiari also introduces a Livia as Cicero's current wife and mother of his son Quinto. Chiari's Popilia is also Lepido's sister, and both Antonio and the tribune Metello are eager to marry her while she is in love with Ottavio. She tries to intervene in support of Cicero and republican freedom, but because of the various love affairs she is equally the object of different political interests. The addition of the unhistorical Livia enables visualizing the tension between Cicero's concern for his family and that for his writings and later fame.

Livia is worried for Cicero after a bad dream and the destruction of his statue (shown on stage in Act I). She thinks that he should withdraw to private life on his Tusculane estate and turn away from an ungrateful country. She would prefer to have Cicero's *Philippic Orations* burned as these trigger Antonio's hatred; Quinto, however, is eager to honour his father's wish to preserve these speeches and plans to hide them in Caesar's mausoleum (IV 1). In a direct confrontation Ottavio announces to Cicero that he will live if he yields his *Philippics* to Antonio. Cicero, however,

replies that he is going to die soon anyway and will not do anything to reduce the fame emerging from his writings (V 1). Cicero said earlier that his glory was more important to him than his family; he is keen to have his *Philippics* preserved as they will be the basis of future fame (IV 1). Antonio is so determined to lay his hands on these speeches that he puts so much pressure on Livia, by threatening to kill her son, that she reveals the hiding place of the son and (as she believes) of the speeches. When Quinto is brought to Antonio, but does not wish to reveal the location of the text of the orations, Antonio orders him to be killed if he does not relent (V 5–6).

Ultimately, Cicero himself is killed, although Ottavio and Lepido have persuaded Antonio to agree to let Cicero live (V 7). Metello, who appears with Cicero's head, claims that he merely followed Antonio's orders, but then learns that he himself is on the list of the proscribed (V 8–9). Antonio is caught by fear; Ottavio closes the play by announcing happy centuries under Ottavio Augusto (V 9). This prospect implies that Cicero has not been able to prevent the change from republic to principate, maybe also because of his misjudgement of the situation and the characters involved, but – as the life-threatening fight over the text of the *Philippics* illustrates – his fame as a great orator and defender of the republic will live on.

Obviously, Chiari was familiar with Martello's drama (ch. 4.15) and created his own version with dramatic effects, the addition of further characters, love affairs and conflicts. Cicero remains the central figure; his significance for Roman politics, his support for republican liberties in the face of tyranny and the effect of his speeches even as texts are illustrated; critical assessments of his character do not come to the fore.

#### 4.26 Prosper Jolyot Crébillon, *Le Triumvirat ou La mort de Cicéron* (1754)

##### *Context*

This is Prosper Jolyot Crébillon's (1674–1762; see ch. 4.20) second drama featuring Cicero (in a different phase of his life) and the last play that Crébillon wrote.

The drama was first performed at the Théâtre de la rue des Fossés Saint-Germain on 23 December 1754. It seems to have been printed in France in

1755 and in Munich in 1756 after a performance there; it was reprinted several times later and included in editions of Crébillon's complete works. The first print is dedicated to Madame Bignon, Maîtresse des Requêtes. In the Préface Crébillon notes his bad experiences at the play's first performance, owing to a 'cabale', but also records with delight that the audience ignored these machinations and he therefore enjoyed the greatest applause he ever received at the second performance.<sup>203</sup>

### *Bibliographical information*

texts:

LE | TRIUMVIRAT | *OU LA MORT* | DE CICERON, | *TRAGÉDIE*.  
| Par M. DE CREBILLON, de | l'Académie François. | *Représentée par les*  
*Comédiens François, | le 20 Décembre 1754.* | Prix 30 fols. | A PARIS, |  
Chez CHARLES HOCHEREAU, | Libraire, Quai de Conti, au Phénix. |  
M. DCC. LV. | *Avec Approbation & Privilège du Roi.*

{available at: Corvey Digital Collection; [http://www.theatre-classique.fr/pages/pdf/CREBILLON\\_TRIUMVIRAT.pdf](http://www.theatre-classique.fr/pages/pdf/CREBILLON_TRIUMVIRAT.pdf); [http://www.mediterranees.net/histoire\\_romaine/ciceron/crebillon/index.html](http://www.mediterranees.net/histoire_romaine/ciceron/crebillon/index.html)}

LE | TRIUMVIRAT, | *OU LA MORT* | DE CICERON, |  
*TRAGÉDIE.* | PAR CRÉBILLON. | Représentée à Munich | en 1756. | Chez  
*Jean Jaques Vötter*, Imprimeur de la | Cour, & des Etats de Bavière.<sup>204</sup>

{available at: [http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10381944\\_00003.html](http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10381944_00003.html)}

characters:

ACTEURS (1755): OCTAVE CESAR, LEPIDE, CICERON,  
TRIUMVIRS.<sup>205</sup> | TULLIE, Fille de Cicéron. | SEXTUS, Fils de Pompée,  
& déguisé sous le nom de Clodomir, Chef des Gaulois. | MECENE,  
Favori d'Octave. | PHILIPPE, Affranchi du grand Pompée.

ACTEURS (1756): OCTAVE CÉSAR, LÉPIDE, TRIUMVIRS. |  
CICÉRON, Consul. | TULLIE, Fille de Cicéron. | SEXTUS, Fils de  
Pompée, & déguisé sous le nom de Clodomir, Chef des Gaulois. |  
MÉCÈNE, Favori d'Octave. | PHILIPPE, Affranchi du grand Pompée.

### *Comment*

This is the only play about Cicero or, more specifically, about Cicero's death that has a reference to the triumvirate (of 43 BCE) in the title. There is indeed some emphasis on the attested situation that one

member of the triumvirate, Antoine (Marcus Antonius / Mark Antony), wishes Cicero's death while another, Octave (Octavian), does not (Plut. *Cic.* 46). Overall, however, this is not a drama about the triumvirs, but rather a triangular love story combined with the political controversies of the 40s BCE. This structure enables the discussion of principles of behaviour of politicians and citizens, absolute rulers and republicans: Cicero is keen to save the republic, even disregarding his own life; yet, he is momentarily persuaded to side with Octave while his daughter Tullie is adamant in her support of the Roman republic and opposes Octave's advances. In the end both Cicero and Tullie remain true to their political convictions, but both die.

The added love story is that Sextus, the son of Pompey the Great, and Octave are both in love with Tullie, Cicero's daughter, though she prefers Sextus. The time of the dramatic action must be 43 BCE since the triumvirate is in place and Cicero dies at the end of the drama. Historically, by this time his daughter Tullia had already died (45 BCE), while here she kills herself after her father's death (V 3). Sextus initially appears in disguise as 'Clodomir, Chef des Gaulois' (name of a king of the Franks, c. 495–524 CE), which introduces the popular motif of confused identities. According to the historical record, Sextus was appointed *praefectus classis et orae maritimae* against Mark Antony in early 43 BCE (e.g. Vell. Pat. 2.73.2; App. *B Civ.* 4.84–85) (he offers to remove Cicero from Rome by his fleet in II 4), but was proscribed at the end of the year. While other plays focus on details of Cicero's death and its enjoyment by Mark Antony and his partner Fulvia, here their hatred and responsibility for Cicero's death are indicated (especially by Octave, to place the responsibility for Cicero's proscription and death on others), but Cicero's death, although mentioned in the title, happens offstage (IV 2; V 2; V 3); Marcus Antonius and Fulvia are not even included among the *dramatis personae*.

Cicero's historical negotiations with Octavian and his support of the young man at an earlier stage of the conflict are transferred to offering to accept him as son-in-law married to his daughter (II 2). Tullie, however, opposes this and strongly supports the Roman republic (II 3). Maecenas (the father of the patron of poets) is known to have been a friend and counsellor of Octavian (Nic. Dam. *Caes.* 31.133); here he is described as 'Favori d'Octave'. But there is no historical evidence for his involvement in discussions about

Cicero's fate. In this play, however, Mécène advises Octave to engage Cicero, the fierce republican, on his side since his influence and reputation could be useful to him, while otherwise he might cause problems for him (II 1). Later, Mécène turns away from Octave in view of the proscriptions, especially because Octave agreed to Cicero's assassination (V 2).

By means of the construction of unhistorical love affairs Crébillon creates a close connection between political and personal issues. Cicero's initial offer of marriage can be seen to illustrate that he even exploits his daughter's happiness to achieve a higher political goal. Still, Cicero appears as the defender and saviour of the republic and an opponent of people he regards as tyrants, attempting to incite Octave to more responsible behaviour. But since, despite the title, the focus is on Sextus and Tullie, who also fight for traditional Roman values of virtue and the principles of the republic, Cicero does not emerge as the only representative of the republican cause or opponent of the triumvirs. Just as in Crébillon's first play on Cicero, there is less emphasis on an appreciation of Cicero as an individual or his achievements as a statesman though Cicero appears as a representative of republican values; instead, there is a focus on dramatic effects such as the suicide of Cicero's daughter when she notices her father's severed head.

#### 4.27 M. T. Cicero, *Exul Spontaneus* (1755)

##### *Context*

*M. T. Cicero, Exul Spontaneus* was performed in Augsburg (in Bavaria, Germany) on 3 and 5 September ('autumn month') 1755 by secondary-school and college students of the Jesuit school St Salvator.<sup>206</sup>

As usual with Jesuit dramas (see ch. 4.19), the author of the text is not identified. The music was composed by 'Joseph. Giulini': Johann Andreas Joseph Giulini (1723–1772) became 'Kapellmeister' (chapel master) at the cathedral in Augsburg in 1760. While studying with the Jesuits, he composed music for their dramas; later he wrote masses, vespers, symphonies and other church music.

What survives of this play is not the full text, but the *periocbe* (see ch. 4.19): an *argumentum* in Latin and German gives information about the historical background and the key events of the plot; a brief description of the contents of each scene, also in Latin and in German,

indicates how the story is distributed over the five acts; a list of characters concludes the information provided.<sup>207</sup>

*Bibliographical information*<sup>208</sup>

text (*perioche*):

M. T. CICERO | EXUL SPONTANEUS | TRAGÆDIA, | Das zum Guten | des | Gemeinen Weefens | Freywillig | Erwælte Elend | in einem | Trauer-Spiel | Vorgeſtellet | Von der Studirenden Jugend | des Catholiſchen Gymnaſii | Der Gefellſchaft JESU zu Augſpurg bey | St. Salvator. | Den 3. und 5. Herbſt-Monaths 1755. | Augſpurg, gedruckt bey Joſeph Antoni Labhart, Hochfürſtl. Biſchoefflichen | Buchdrucker, auf Unſer Lieben Frauen Thor.<sup>209</sup>

[available at: <http://dlub.uni-freiburg.de/diglit/cicero1755>]

characters:

SYLLABUS ACTORUM: *Cicero* | *Piso* | *Ælius Lamia* | *Hortensius* | *A. Milo* | *Quintus, Ciceronis Frater* | *Tiburtius* | *Lucullus, amicus Ciceron.* | *Nepotes Ciceronis: Marcus, Gracchus* | *Curio* | *Tullius, Ciceronis Filius* | *Equitum Dux* | *Flaccus* | *Cluentius* | *Equitum Dux* | *Aruspex* | *Ephebus*

IN INTERLUDIO ET SALTU: *Crito* | *Poldrio* | *Eudoxus*

IN SCENA INTERMEDIA: *Ludimagister* | *Equites, Milites &c.*

PERSONÆ IN MUSICA: *Artaxerxes* | *Themistocles* | *Armiger Themistoclis* | *Fortunæ Cliens* | *Fortuna* | *Filiolus Themistoclis* | *Europa* | *Asia* | *Africa* | *Providentia*

Socii & comitatus in Prologo & in utroque Choro.

*Comment*

While the *argumentum* gives Plutarch's *Life of Cicero* as the source and the plot follows the main thread of Plutarch's narrative (Plut. *Cic.* 30–31), there are differences in details as well as the addition of material from other sources and of unhistorical elements. The piece displays similarities to the 1748 and 1761 Jesuit plays (ch. 4.19; 4.28) in title and plot structure.

While many elements included in the 1755 drama can be confirmed from ancient sources, this particular version of Cicero's exile is not recorded in any of them, certainly not in Plutarch. There seems to be more emphasis on the moral message of Cicero's intervention on behalf of his country than on an accurate representation of the historical

situation. This perspective is further suggested by the allegorical framework added by the choral interludes: the story presented shows the Greek Themistocles sacrificing himself for the sake of his country (cf. ch. 4.28). While the piece offers a sufficient number of historical details, such as the accurate names of the key protagonists and locations, to identify the setting, the emphasis is placed on Cicero's difficult decision and on his deed that will resolve the situation. The aspects adumbrated in the prologue, when personified Providentia confronts the claim of Fortuna to be mistress of human fate, point to the moral basis of Cicero's decision. The consultation of an oracle before Cicero's taking action might indicate that the gods support his proactive decision to leave Rome.

On the human level the role of Cicero's brother Quintus is different from what is recorded in the ancient historical sources. According to the historical Cicero (Cic. *Red. sen.* 37), his brother was actively involved in arranging his return from exile. When Cicero went into exile, however, Quintus was not in Rome, but on the way back from the province of Asia (propraetor 61–58 BCE); he returned to Rome after Cicero had left the city (Cic. *Att.* 3.7.3; 3.8.1–2; 3.9.1; *Dom.* 59; *Sest.* 68). In this play Quintus is present in Rome and argues that his brother should accept the military support offered by the knights. Quintus is apparently meant to embody the position of an active and strong counterpart to his brother's reluctance. The appearance of Cicero's son, who may not have been in Rome at the time, is possibly intended to illustrate the extent of the sacrifice and the level of engagement in an emotional way. Cicero's daughter Tullia gave birth to a son twice as a result of her marriage to Dolabella: the first was born in 49 BCE (Cic. *Att.* 10.18.1); the birth of the second son in 45 BCE caused Tullia's death; they are both believed to have died at a young age. Thus, the historical Cicero did not have any grandsons as he does here, where they vigorously support him.

The prominence of Q. Hortensius Hortalus and C. Scribonius Curio in the controversy with P. Clodius Pulcher might have been taken from Cassius Dio (38.16.3); he also refers to another knight who was banned from the city and who might be identified with L. Aelius Lamia (aed. 45 BCE), since Cicero mentions the friendship, support and exile of this knight (Cic. *Red. sen.* 12; *Sest.* 29; *Pis.* 64; *Fam.* 11.16.2; 12.29.1). That Cicero preferred to leave the city of

Rome, rather than having her involved in an armed conflict, appears in the *argumentum* to the 1748 play and is stated in the short summary in Pighius' *Annales*.<sup>210</sup>

Still, the play's basic idea and moral message may go back to extant utterances of the historical Cicero: he frequently proclaims that he twice saved the republic, once as consul and again when he left Rome amid support of the populace, in both cases avoiding an armed conflict (Cic. *Red. sen.* 34; *Dom.* 99; *Pis.* 78; *Sest.* 45). Different views of Cicero's withdrawal from Rome, including the intention to resort to arms, are reported in Cassius Dio (Cass. Dio 38.17.4). Even in Plutarch there is criticism of the fact that Cicero praised himself too frequently and hence attracted hatred from contemporaries (Plut. *Cic.* 24.1–3). While this background is alluded to in the *argumentum*, it seems to acquire less prominence in the plot. Here Cicero is disappointed that he does not receive the support and gratitude that he feels he deserves on account of what he has done for Rome, and has to confront his political opponents. In this depiction of the conflict Cicero eventually emerges as a hero who values support for the fatherland above all else and thus is ready to save it from ongoing problems and dangers by his self-sacrifice.

#### 4.28 *M. T. Cicero, Amore Reipublicae Exul Spontaneus* (1761)

##### *Context*

The drama was first performed at the local Jesuit school in Innsbruck on 2 and 4 September 1761.<sup>211</sup> In this period Jesuit dramas often addressed political questions and issues of political organization rather than personal or family aspects (cf. ch. 4.19; 4.27). It has been suggested that the focus on themes from the Roman Republic in the final years of Jesuit drama at Innsbruck (see also ch. 4.30) might be a comment on the contemporary conflict between the Jesuits and the government about educational principles.<sup>212</sup>

There is no information on the author of the text or the composer of the music. Again, only the *perioche* survives (cf. ch. 4.19): it provides an *argumentum* in Latin and German (on facing pages), a scene-by-scene summary in Latin and German (on facing pages), the Latin text of the prologue and the choruses as well as the list of characters.<sup>213</sup>



*Bibliographical information*<sup>214</sup>

text (*perioche*):

M. T. CICERO | AMORE REIPUBLICÆ | EXUL SPONTANEUS, | TRAGÆDIA. | Das zum Guten | Des Gemeinen Weefens | Freywillig | Von | MARCUS TULLIUS CICERO | Erwählte Elend | in einem | Trauer-Spiel | Vorgefstellte | Von dem Kayserl. Koenigl. Erz-Herzoglichen | Gymnasio der Gesellschaft JESU | zu Insbrugg | Den 2ten und 4ten Herbft-Monats 1761. | *CUM PERMISSU SUPERIORUM*. | Gedruckt alda bey Michael Anton Wagner / Kayserl. Koenigl. Hof- und Univerfitaets Buchdrucker und Handler.<sup>215</sup>

RHYTHMI MUSICI | PRO | TRAGÆDIA, | CUJUS TITULUS: | M. T. CICERO | AMORE REIPUBLICÆ | EXUL SPONTANEUS. | Æniponti 2. & 4. Septembris 1761. | *Cum Permissu Superiorum*.

[available at: <http://www.neolatin.eu/works/t-cicero-amore-reipublicae-exul-spontaneus-tragoedia-das-zum-guten-des-gemeinen-weesens-freywillig-von-marcus-tullius-cicero-erwahlte-elend.1599>]

characters:

D. D. ACTORES: *Cicero*. | *Piſo Conſul ſeu Duumvir Rom*. | *Hortenſius*. | *Quinctus Ciceronis Frater*. | *Gracchus Ciceronis Nepos natu minor*. | *Tullius Ciceronis Filius*. | *Lucullus*. | *Ælius de Lamia*. | *Curio*. | *Marcus Ciceronis Nepos natu maj*.

*Ex Ordine Equeſtri*: *Tiburtius*. | *Cluentius*. | *Flaccus*. | *Milo*. | *Roscius*. | *Servilius*. | *Trebonius*. | *Lentulus*. | Cum reliquis Equitibus, Fascigeris, Helvetis &c.

PERSONÆ CANENTES: *Artaxerxes*. | *Themistocles*. | *Themistoclis Filius*. | *Fortuna*. | *Asia* | *Armiger Themistoc*. | *Megabazos Ephebus*. | *Providentia*. | *Comites in Choris*.

*Comment*

As for the play of 1755 with a similar title (ch. 4.27), Plutarch's *Life of Cicero* is mentioned as the source in the *argumentum* (Plut. *Cic.* 30–31). The plot, however, does not follow Plutarch's narrative exactly; material from other sources and unhistorical elements have been added. Overall, this drama displays similarities to the 1748 and 1755 Jesuit plays, in particular to the latter (ch. 4.19; 4.27), though it also deviates from their plots.

This play, for instance, introduces a son of Clodius (not included in the list of characters): Cicero's (unhistorical) grandsons (cf. ch. 4.27) plan to

take revenge upon him (III 2). The historical Clodius had a son, also called P. Clodius Pulcher (c. 62/59 – after 31 BCE), but he would have been too young to play any role at the time of Cicero's exile. Moreover, the position of consul L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus (58 BCE) has been enhanced: he is presented as being thrown into a conflict since he first promises to support Cicero, then feels obliged to carry out the senate decree on Cicero's exile and starts to fear for his own safety in view of the backlash; the dilemma is resolved when Cicero decides to leave the city.

The 1755 and the 1761 pieces seem to have had the same parallel action in the choruses; only for the 1761 play the text of the choruses is provided in the *periocbe*. This information suggests that the choruses give a Greek parallel to Cicero's situation: Themistocles, being exiled, takes poison (following advice from the gods) rather than fighting against his fatherland. The difference to Cicero's position is that Themistocles has already been exiled and is asked by the king of another country to take action against his fatherland, which he refuses. Cicero, by contrast, chooses exile to sort out the situation in his fatherland, which has arisen in reaction to his earlier deeds. The metaphorical prologue demonstrating that Providentia is stronger than Fortuna and the fact that both men act in accordance with an oracle show that what they do for their countries has divine sanction.

In this play Cicero appears as a hero who sacrifices himself for the fatherland, though the deed seems less impressive due to Cicero's personal weaknesses: Cicero is greatly affected by the ingratitude of the fatherland and has antagonized others by constant self-praise; he is torn between love for himself and for the republic; in leaving, he follows an oracle. Still, he withdraws, and thus the fatherland is saved since peace and wellbeing for the citizens are ensured. A conflict between Cicero's supporters (family members and the knights) and other public figures is suggested; it is resolved by Cicero's heroic act, which ensures Rome's survival.

#### 4.29 Richard Cumberland, *The Banishment of Cicero* (1761)

##### *Context*

Richard Cumberland (1732–1811) was an English dramatist and civil servant involved in high-profile political negotiations. He was the

grandson of the famous classical scholar Richard Bentley (1662–1742) and was educated at the grammar school in Bury St Edmunds, Westminster School and Trinity College, Cambridge. Cumberland wrote plays, memoirs, essays, an epic, a novel as well as a number of religious pieces, and he acted as a journal editor. He produced about fifty plays; about half of these are comedies.

*The Banishment of Cicero* was Cumberland's first play; it was published in 1761 after David Garrick (1717–1779), the famous actor, producer and theatre manager, had rejected it. In addition to this tragedy, Cumberland adapted Aristophanes' *Clouds* (1798), and his posthumously printed plays include *The Sibyl, or the Elder Brutus* and *Tiberius in Capreae*. Most of his works, however, are not based on stories from the ancient world.

### *Bibliographical information*

text:

THE | BANISHMENT | OF | CICERO. | A | TRAGEDY. | By  
RICHARD CUMBERLAND, Esq; | LONDON: | Printed for  
J. WALTER, at Homer's-Head, | Charing-Crofs. 1761 [also: DUBLIN: |  
Printed by JOHN EXSHAW, at the Bible in Dame-freet, | MDCCXLI;  
DUBLIN: | Printed for G. FAULKNER, in *Effex-freet*, | and J. EXSHAW, in,  
*Dame-freet*, Bookfellers. | M DCCC LXI].<sup>216</sup>

[available on Eighteenth Century Collections Online]

characters:

DRAMATIS PERSONAE: L. CALPHURNIUS PISO, AULUS GABINIUS,  
CONSULS. | P. CLODIUS, TRIBUNE. | M. T. CICERO. | POMP. ATTICUS.  
| CAIUS PISO FRUGI. | TERENTIA. | TULLIA. | CLODIA

Apollodorus, a learned Greek [not listed]

### *Comment*

The slightly adapted quotation from one of Cicero's speeches on the title page (*Te, te, Patria, tefor et vos, penates patriique dii, me vefttrarum fedum templorumque caufa, me propter falutem meorum civium, quae mihi femper fuit mea carior vita, dimicationem caedemque fugiffe*. [Cic. *Sest.* 45]) indicates that, even if the title is neutral and descriptive, this piece, like the Jesuit plays with more explicit titles, will demonstrate that Cicero sacrifices himself for the sake of his fatherland by going into exile. Other than that, the drama does not have any paratexts that might reveal

information about the sources adduced or the intended interpretation of the events.

The drama covers a wide range of events from the late 60s / early 50s BCE, condensed into a single narrative; still, because of the named magistrates, the plot is located in 58 BCE. Since the play devotes space to the description of P. Clodius Pulcher's (tr. pl. 58 BCE) activities and his conversations with other figures, there is an enhanced sense of the tense situation provoking clashes at Rome rather than a focus solely on Cicero. The representation of the historical context is also supported by a reference to an intervention of the tribune L. Ninnius Quadratus (tr. pl. 58 BCE; cf. Cass. Dio 38.14.1; Asc. on Cic. *Pis.*, p. 7 Clark), who does not appear in other Cicero plays.

Of the magistrates of 58 BCE, it is not only the tribune of the People P. Clodius Pulcher who is characterized negatively, but also the consul L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus, presumably influenced by his presentation in Cicero's speeches, especially *In Pisonem* (cf. also Cic. *Red. sen.* 10; 13–18; *Sest.* 19–24). In combination with the fact that Cicero and his supporters frequently mention the degeneration of Rome, this creates the impression that Cicero cannot expect fair treatment and that going into exile for the sake of the country is a particularly noble act. In the final scene Cicero is rewarded when he contrasts his own moral standing and impact with that of Clodius and even Clodius comes to admire virtue and Cicero's conduct (V 3). Virtue thus appears as a key feature of the figure of Cicero, which depends on his character rather than on his descent (since he is a *homo novus*): when Piso boasts of his descent, (C. Piso) Frugi reminds him of his lack of virtue and tells him to learn from Cicero as a consul (II 5), while Clodius speaks of the 'peasant of Arpinum' (I 3).

The politically motivated conflict is made more complex by the addition of a love story: Frugi must be the historical C. Calpurnius Piso Frugi (quaest. 58 BCE), who was the husband of Cicero's daughter Tullia from 63 BCE until his death in 57 BCE. In the play the two of them are apparently not married yet, and both Tullia and Clodia, Clodius' sister, are in love with Frugi. Clodia's enhanced role is presumably based on her depiction in Cicero's speech *Pro Caelio* (56 BCE). In the play Clodia speaks of her incestuous brother (V 2) and is presented as full of hatred of Cicero (II 6). Her love of Frugi (who in turn loves Tullia) is thus directly linked to the political conflict and creates a scenario for the demonstration of moral behaviour: Clodia presents Frugi with the harsh

alternative either to abandon Tullia in order to save Cicero or to accept the destruction of Cicero and his family; Frugi, however, remains true to his love for Tullia (II 6). When Clodia asks her brother to kill Frugi (IV 3), Clodius obeys; but Frugi survives the assassination attempt and cooperates again with Tullia and her father, whereupon he is eventually killed by Clodius (V 3).

Frugi is not only relevant for the play's plot because of his love affair with Tullia, but also for its message; for he explicitly asks Cicero, whom he admires as a model, for advice on how 'I may deserve to die in this great cause, / And leave a name immortal as thy own' (IV 6). Cicero replies: 'By one firm faithful even course of honour; / By standing forth alone, not Cæsar's follower, / Not Pompey's slave, but Rome's and Virtue's friend: / Sworn to no party; 'midst corruption pure; / Scorning all titles, dignities, and wealth, / When weigh'd against Integrity; rememb'ring / That Patriot is the highest name on earth.' Cicero tells the young man to view his own fate as an incident from which he could 'learn the vanity of Human Greatness' (IV 6). When this political and moral doctrine is compared to the historical Cicero's desire for glory, it becomes obvious that the play's Cicero is meant to embody a political attitude characterized by a claim to morally correct behaviour and great patriotism. Cicero thus is made to develop further Atticus' notion of 'Content / Depends not upon place' and to state that he is leaving for exile 'With Freedom and with Virtue for my guides' and that 'Rome shall follow me where'er I go' (IV 6).

A kind of contrast to Cicero's claim that he is entirely guided by virtue is created by his human weakness and vulnerability as presented in the play. Already in the first scene Clodius calls Cicero a 'Weak, shallow coward!', and Clodius and the consul A. Gabinius (58 BCE) comment on the fact that Cicero has put on mourning clothes and thus condemned himself by referring Clodius' law to himself (I 1). Later, Cicero's house is plundered (IV 3) and destroyed (IV 6) while he is still in Rome, which prompts him to take refuge in the Temple of Vesta (IV 6). Cicero is shown in a tender relationship with his wife Terentia and his daughter Tullia (III 3), though he ultimately cannot protect them as they are dragged away by Clodius' men in the final scene (V 3). Previously, Cicero had even knelt down before Clodius to save his daughter's life (V 3). When, however, the play concludes with Clodius impressed by Cicero's attitude, this portrait of Cicero will stick in the minds of audiences.

4.30 *M. T. Cicero ab exilio redux* (1763)*Context*

The drama was first performed at the local Jesuit school in Innsbruck on 2 and 6 September 1763 (see ch. 4.28). As usual in the case of Jesuit dramas, there is no information on the author of the text. The music was provided by Joseph Adam Obermiller (1701–1769): he was a composer and conductor of choirs, and he also produced music for other Jesuit school dramas.

The *perioche* (cf. ch. 4.19) is what survives of the play: it includes an *argumentum* in Latin and German (on facing pages), a scene-by-scene summary in Latin and German (on facing pages) as well as the Latin text of the musical sections and the list of characters.<sup>217</sup>

The Latin *argumentum* is annotated with footnotes providing references to particular works by Cicero as sources for individual details: the speeches *Post reditum ad Quirites*, *De domo sua*, *Pro Sestio*, *Pro Milone*, *Post reditum in senatu*, *De provinciis consularibus*, *In Pisonem*, the treatise *De legibus* 3 and letters 4.1–3 to Atticus; the German version broadly gives ‘Ex operibus Ciceronis’ as the source. Thus, this piece differs from earlier Jesuit dramas not only in the selection of the phase dramatized, Cicero’s return from exile rather than his path into exile, but also in the use of sources since it identifies works of the historical Cicero with precise references and does not rely on later historiographical accounts.<sup>218</sup> The end of the Latin *argumentum* includes an explicit link to the drama: ‘Porro quæ turbæ tum temporis concitatæ sint, contextus Tragœdiæ dabit.’ The details presented in the *argumentum* differ between the Latin and the German versions: the German version mainly focuses on Cicero’s triumphant return whereas the Latin version starts earlier and offers information about the activities of various Romans. Apart from the references that only appear in the Latin version, the German version concludes with defining the moral of the piece: ‘uns zur Lehre / und denen Gehälligten zum Unterricht: daß die Unschuld zwar eine Zeitlang könne gedrückt; doch niemahl unterdrückt werden’.

*Bibliographical information*<sup>219</sup>

text (*perioche*):

M. T. CICERO | AB EXILIO REDUX, | A SENATU, POPULOQUE  
ROMANO | HONORATUS, | TRAGÆDIA. | Der | aus dem Elend

zurück gerufene | Und von dem | fammentlichen Rath und Volk | geehrte | Marcus Tullius Cicero / | In einem | Trauerſpiel | Vorgeſtellet | Von dem Kayſerlich-Kœniglich-Erzherzoglichen | Gymnaſio der Gefellſchaft JESU | zu Inſbruck | Den 2ten und 6ten Herbſtmonats 1763. | PERMISSU SUPERIORUM | Inſbruck / gedruckt bey Michael Anton Wagner / Kayſerl. Kœnigl. Hof- | und Univerſitaets. Buchdruckern und Handlern.<sup>220</sup>

RHYTHMI MUSICI | PRO | TRAGÆDIA, | *CUI TITULUS:* | M. T. CICERO | AB EXILIO REDUX, | A SENATU, POPULOQUE ROMANO | HONORATUS. | *OEniponti 2. & 6. Septembris 1763.* | PERMISSU SUPERIORUM. | Apud Michaelẽm Antonium Wagner, Cæſar. Reg. Apoſt. Majeſtatis Aulæ & | Univerſitatis Typographum ac Bibliopolam.

[available at: <http://www.neolatin.eu/works/m-t-cicero-ab-exilio-redux-a-senatu-populoque-romano-honoratus-tragoedia-der-aus-dem-elend-zuruck-gerufene-und-von-dem-sammentlichen-rath-und-volk-geehrte-marcus-tullius-cicero.1601>]

characters:

D. D. ACTORES: *M. T. Cicero* | *T. Ann. Milo* | *Lycurgus, Ἀρχω, Athenienſis Legatus* | *Plancius, Ciceronis in exilio Mæcenas* | *Quinctus, Ciceronis Frater* | *Fabricius, Mosopius, Tribuni plebis* | *Crassus, Fautor Ciceronis* | *Fadius Ordinis Equeſtris* | *Cimon, Legato Athenienſi adjunctus* | *Præco, a Senatu miſſus* | *Equites, Comitatus, &c.*

PERSONÆ CANENTES: *Mars* | *Apollo* | *Jupiter* | *Luna* | *Mercurius* | *Hora diurna & nocturna.*

### *Comment*

As the *argumentum* indicates, this piece on Cicero's return from exile in 57 BCE has been created on the basis of information in Cicero's own works, supplemented by details in Plutarch (Plut. *Cic.* 33), and is rather faithful to the historical record. Although the plot focuses on Cicero's return from exile, instead of his path into exile, it is not an entirely jubilant play, and the situation is described as similarly precarious as in plays on Cicero leaving for exile, since there is still opposition to and fear of P. Clodius Pulcher among Cicero's supporters, particularly on the part of Cn. Plancius, who, as provincial governor in 58 BCE, hosted Cicero during his exile in contravention of Clodius' instructions (Cic. *Planc.* 26;

74; 98–102; *Red. sen.* 35) and is therefore characterized as Cicero's 'Maecenas' during his exile in the list of characters. Because of the continuing tensions, the fire set to his brother's house and the reaction to the speech upon his return, Cicero considers leaving the city again (III). The situation is resolved when a decree of the senate orders Cicero to be reinstated and those who are causing trouble to be regarded as opponents of the republic (V 7–8); Cicero therefore confirms his intention to stay in Rome (V 9).

Recalling the earlier Innsbruck play (ch. 4.28), Cicero appears as a paradigmatic promoter of state-supporting republican ideals, concerned more for the wellbeing of the city than for his own welfare; he is admired by some and targeted by others. Cicero's brother is shown as concerned about Cicero's fate; since no other members of the family are mentioned, the focus is on the political rather than the personal aspects of the conflict.

The parallel action in the musical sections shows the god Apollo being re-admitted into heaven, after having served as an exile on earth for a long time. While there is no direct correspondence between the fates of Apollo and of Cicero, the situation of exile and recall is similar. Cicero is thus put on a par with gods. In both cases the return is presented as restoring order.

#### 4.31 Johann Jakob Bodmer, *Julius Caesar*. *Ein Trauerspiel* (1763)

##### *Context*

Johann Jakob Bodmer (1698–1783) was a Swiss philologist and poet. He was educated at the Latin grammar school and the Collegium Carolinum in Zurich (Switzerland) for a career in theology, but also read belles-lettres and works of contemporary political and literary theory. Afterwards Bodmer worked as a merchant and a civil servant. From 1725 as acting professor and from 1731 as ordinary professor, Bodmer taught Helvetian history and politics in Zurich. Bodmer rediscovered German-language medieval poetry and also translated the epics of Homer and John Milton into German. He was engaged in a literary controversy with Johann Christoph Gottsched (1700–1766) and presented his own literary principles, including his views on tragedy, in the theoretical work *Critische Abhandlung von dem Wunderbaren in der Poesie und dessen Verbindung mit dem*



*Wahrscheinlichen* (1740) as well as in *Critische Briefe* (1746). In contrast to Gottsched's high regard of the austerity of French literature, Bodmer advocated the freedom of the imagination and preferred the literature of the Middle Ages to that of antiquity. Bodmer co-edited a literary journal; his house became a meeting place of a number of intellectuals; he donated money and books to the public library in Zurich and was involved in running the institution.

Bodmer's poetic works include other items related to the ancient world such as *Karl von Burgund. Ein Trauerspiel (nach Aeschylus)* (1771), *Marcus Tullius Cicero. Ein Trauerspiel* (1764; ch. 4.32), *Marcus Brutus* (1768) and *Brutus und Kaßius Tod* (1782),<sup>221</sup> but also pieces inspired by other periods such as *Proben der alten schwäbischen Poesie des dreyzehnten Jahrhunderts. Aus der Manessischen Sammlung* (1748) and *Fabeln aus den Zeiten der Minnesinger* (1757). Most of his dramas were based on topics from Graeco-Roman antiquity, presenting great characters or their opposites, i.e. particularly heroic or particularly bad men.<sup>222</sup>

*Julius Caesar* was published by an editor, who, on the title page, presents himself as the author of *Anmerkungen zum Gebrauche der Kunstrichter*. The work *Anmerkungen zum Gebrauche deutscher Kunstrichter* (publ. 1762) was composed by Johann Gottfried Gellius (1732–1781); it promoted the progressive side in the *Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes*. In the preface to the play, signed with 'G.', the editor claims that he published *Julius Caesar* with only minor changes<sup>223</sup> and that it may well be compared to Shakespeare's play of the same title (ch. 4.5). As all of Bodmer's dramas, the piece was intended to be read rather than performed.

The play is defined as a 'tragedy' ('Trauerspiel') on the title page and as 'a political drama' ('ein politisches Drama') at the start of the text. The latter definition is followed by a quotation from one of Cicero's letters to Atticus, written in 49 BCE during the conflict between Caesar and Pompey, voicing outrage at Caesar's unconstitutional activities (Cic. *Att.* 7.11.1).

### *Bibliographical information*

text:

Julius Caesar, | ein | Trauerspiel; | herausgegeben | von dem Verfasser der Anmerkungen | zum Gebrauche der Kunstrichter. | Leipzig, | bey M. G. Weidmanns Erben und Reich. | 1763.

[available at: <https://www.e-rara.ch/doi/10.3931/e-rara-15760>; Google Books]

characters:

Personen: Julius Cæsar. | Marcus Antonius. | Cicero. | Marcus Brutus. | Cassius. | Trebonius. | Albinus. | Calpurnia. | Servilia. | Portia. | Statilia.

### *Comment*

This is the first of Bodmer's tragedies on late republican history; it is named after Caesar while the second one featuring Cicero is named after Cicero (ch. 4.32).<sup>224</sup> The plot of the present play is determined by Caesar's actions and reactions to them, culminating in his assassination. Caesar is presented as a person who feels able to do anything, delights in being honoured like a god on earth and aims for a political system in which all are obedient (I 1). Caesar wishes to eliminate any residue of the traditional Roman attitude; ordinary people are to be turned away from thoughts of liberty and a republic by bread and games; as for those senators whom he regards as diehard adherents of liberty and the republic, he plans to test them by his request for royal honours and thus either force them to support him or have them killed (I 3).

Although he is not the title character, Cicero is introduced as the most significant opponent of Caesar, followed by M. Brutus. Cicero is already mentioned in the first act, when Caesar admits that, so far, he has kept up a republican appearance, including flattering Cicero, although he is aware that Cicero is prominent among those who would prefer to see him dead (I 1). Caesar thinks that Cicero and others are obsessed with the fatherland, but he despises them so much that he even gives them warning of his planned test of their attitude (I 3). Cicero is the first person whom Caesar confronts in this way, after he has made him wait outside, which shows the power relations between the two men. In this conversation (I 4) Cicero appears as a staunch supporter of republicanism, who is even willing to die for his beliefs, though he does not go as far as admitting any intentions to kill Caesar. Caesar does not listen to any admonitions to give up power voluntarily or to the reminder of what Cicero did for him in the past.

Later, Cicero and Brutus, who was equally warned by Caesar (I 5), realize that they are both ready to die on the following day. When Cicero regrets that he did not die at the end of his consulship, it is suggested that he regards this occasion as a high point in his life and

that his subsequent behaviour might have been less glamorous. Still, Cicero is not as radical as Brutus, who notes that they now have to die when Caesar wants them to, as they did not make this decision on their own account earlier (II 4). Cassius, however, is keen to take action; he wishes to make an attempt to kill Caesar, and Brutus agrees. As in the historical record, Cicero is more cautious; he wonders whether this intervention will remove tyranny and thus shows historical foresight.<sup>225</sup> Nevertheless, he offers his participation, but Brutus and Cassius do not wish to involve him because of his age. Their rejection does not imply doubt or a lack of respect (in contrast to Shakespeare's version, ch. 4.5); on the contrary, Cassius thinks that Cicero's oratory will be of use after Caesar's assassination (II 5). At any rate, Cicero does not play any role in the report about Caesar's death and its aftermath in the final act.

With the specific nature of his political and moral position, Cicero provides a foil to Caesar as well as to Brutus and Cassius. Because of his unquestioned oratorical talent and through being a representative of a quintessential republican attitude, Cicero is the key opponent who needs to be removed in Caesar's view. The fundamental political discussion of how one should behave towards Caesar takes place in the middle of the play in a conversation between Brutus and his mother (and Cato's sister) Servilia (II 3): Servilia argues for aligning with Caesar because of the advantages gained through him and for regarding the royal crown only as an additional insignificant item, in return for staying alive, and for not following Cato's principles stubbornly. She feels that one could do a greater service to the republic if one stayed alive, and she believes that Caesar does not have any descendants. Yet she too becomes doubtful when she learns from Brutus that Caesar has awarded the right to have as many wives as he likes to himself. When Servilia informs Caesar's wife Calpurnia of this plan, she is ready to grant this right to Caesar because he is an extraordinary man (III 4). Thus, shortly before the news of Caesar's assassination arrives (III 5–6), an extreme position in relation to the republican opponents is shown. Cicero is one of these; he stands out by his political sagacity, but would not have been able to have any lasting effect by his anticipated death.

### 4.32 Johann Jakob Bodmer, *Marcus Tullius Cicero. Ein Trauerspiel* (1764)

#### *Context*

Johann Jakob Bodmer (1698–1783) not only wrote a tragedy on Caesar in which Cicero appears as a character (ch. 4.31), but also another one with Cicero as the title character.

*Marcus Tullius Cicero* was printed by the publishing house co-founded by Bodmer in 1734 (with his nephew Konrad Orell). Bodmer had planned the drama since 1761, when he was the same age as Cicero at his death.<sup>226</sup>

#### *Bibliographical information*

text:

Marcus Tullius | Cicero. | Ein | Trauerspiel. | Zürich, bey Orell, Geßner und Comp. 1764.

{available at: <https://digitale.bibliothek.uni-halle.de/vd18/content/titleinfo/5208190>; <https://www.e-rara.ch/doi/10.3931/e-rara-15674>}

characters:

Personen: Marcus Tullius Cicero. | Quintus Cicero. | Tiro. | Laurea. | Philologus. | Popilius. | Fulvia. | Freygelaffene und Slaven.

#### *Comment*

This play, named after Cicero, focuses on the final stages of Cicero's life, after his last public appearances in 43 BCE.<sup>227</sup> The sequence of events is mainly based on the narrative in Plutarch (Plut. *Cic.* 46.5–49.2), and all characters are historical. From the start Cicero is presented as preparing for life in the afterworld, where he expects to encounter those who ruled the earth in a just manner (I 1). Several times he acknowledges his own guilt (e.g. at the beginning in conversation with his secretary Tiro, I 2), because he misjudged Octavian and because Brutus was right in warning him (sentiments expressed in late letters to Brutus by the historical Cicero, e.g. Cic. *Ad Brut.* 1.18.3–4); yet, he insists that he never acted against the republic and did not commit anything dishonourable in relation to the gods. Cicero acknowledges that he was desperate when he thought that the country could still be saved; now he believes that the gods will provide recompense in the afterworld.

This attitude of Cicero's extends through the entire play. Thus, he is not moved by the treacherous approach of the assassin Popilius (C. Popillius Laenas, tr. mil. 43 BCE) sent by the triumvirs (cf. Liv. *Epit.* 120; Val. Max. 5.3.4; App. *B Civ.* 4.19–20; Cass. Dio 47.11.1–2; Plut. *Cic.* 48.1), when Popilius claims that the triumvirs have reconciled themselves with Cicero and would like him to support them in Rome: Cicero categorically refuses to side with them (II 2). Popilius' first attempt to kill (the sleeping) Cicero is unsuccessful since a crow wakes him up, which can be seen as a divine sign (III 1). In view of the news conveyed by his brother Quintus, that the triumvirs have taken action against Cicero and other prominent men and that a serious threat is emanating from them, Cicero is determined to commit suicide (III 3).

Quintus does not agree with this plan, which triggers a conversation between the two brothers on the right to commit suicide, based on ideas in Plato's *Phaedo*; Quintus eventually prevails with his suggestion to flee (III 3). The brothers are just waiting for Quintus' son; their reactions again illustrate a difference in their value systems since, in contrast to Cicero, his brother Quintus puts the welfare of his son above that of the republic (IV 2). Cicero's freedmen, too, following the example of the crow, wish to defend Cicero's life and to carry him off in a litter (IV 4), but he is betrayed and killed by Philologus, a well-educated freedman of Cicero's brother (Plut. *Cic.* 48.2) (V 1–2). In the last act Fulvia dishonours Cicero's severed head (cf. Cass. Dio 47.8.4) and has Quintus killed, which provides a stark contrast to Cicero's humanity (V 3–5).

The plays closes with Cicero being praised by his secretary Tiro, who laments Cicero's death and simultaneously honours him: 'Der Mann ist nicht mehr, den der Gebieter der Geister und der Menschen dem Erdkreife gab, daß er ihm die Tugend in ihrer goettlichen Schoenheit zeigte; die Tochter Gottes, von welcher die Thaten des Patrioten, die Werke der Freundschaft, entstehn; ohne deren Beystand im Himmel und auf Erden nichts freundschaftliches, nichts guetiges geschieht, keine edle Gabe, kein Ruhm, kein Verdienst ist.' (V 5). This is the context for the statement on the title page, almost to be seen as a general maxim of Cicero's: 'Mögen sie gegen ein Leben, das Ehr und Pflicht von mir fodern, | Was sie können, erfinden, und Anschläg auf Anschläge dichten, | Alles das acht' ich nichts; denn für mich ist die Schönheit der Sache.'

In the preface Bodmer criticizes the expectations of audiences directed towards a theatre characterized by passions and fleeting beauty and instead limits himself to the approval of the few who are able to appreciate heroes of true greatness. For him, Cicero is among these; like the great characters in the Bible, Cicero belongs to the figures of superior character. Bodmer has Cicero say that the just sometimes have to commit smaller mistakes in order to avoid bigger ones (IV 3), which is an excuse for his wrong assessment of Octavian. This appreciation of Cicero is conveyed throughout the play, which also presents important stages of his life retrospectively, such as his exile (IV 3) and his grief at the death of his daughter Tullia (III 3). It thus encompasses a portrayal of Cicero in all his functions, as a former politician, a successful orator and a thoughtful philosopher.

#### 4.33 Karl Benjamin Stieff, *Catilina* (1782)

##### *Context*

Karl Benjamin Stieff (1722–1793) studied in Wrocław (in modern Poland), Leipzig and Halle (in modern Germany). He later worked as a teacher of history and Latin at grammar schools in Wrocław and eventually became deputy headmaster at the Gymnasium Elisabetanum, a well-known Protestant grammar school in Wrocław. Stieff composed dramas, pieces for particular occasions as well as historical and philosophical writings. He wrote *Catilina* when ‘Prorector et Professor’ at the Gymnasium Elisabetanum and a member of literary societies in Wrocław. The play was first performed on 4 April 1782 on the occasion of the award of prizes at the school.<sup>228</sup>

Since the piece is described as a ‘Drama Germanico-Poeticum’, it was presumably performed in German verse<sup>229</sup> although the summary of the plot is given in Latin and in German and the title and the introduction are in Latin. As in the case of many Jesuit dramas, what survives is not the full text, but rather a scene-by-scene summary of the plot.

##### *Bibliographical information*

text:

CATILINA, | OB RECUSATUM | SIBI PATRICIO ROMANO  
CONSULATUM | GRAVITER REBELLANS ET CRUENTO IN

PRAELIO VEL | PROPRIA VEL HOSTIUM MANU INTEREMTUS; |  
 DRAMA GERMANICO-POETICUM, | QUOD | ANTE SOLLEMNEM  
 ATQUE HAC VICE DUPLICEM | PRAEMIORUM | ILLUSTRIS | ET  
 MAGNIFICI SENATUS WRATISLAVIENSIS | DISTRIBUTIONEM |  
 A JUVENTUTE GYMNASICA WRATISLAVIENSIVM | ELISABE-  
 TANA | A. C. MDCCLXXXII. PRID. NONAR. APRILIS | HORA  
 POST SACRA POMERIDIANA TERTIA ET SEQUENTIBUS | IN  
 THEATRO WRATISLAVIENSIVM | GYMNASICO ELISABETANO  
 | REPRÆSENTATUM IRI | PEROFFICIOSE ET HUMANITER  
 SIGNIFICAT | CAROLUS BENJAMIN STIEFF, | PRORECTOR ET  
 PROFESSOR GYMNASII ELISABETANI, NEC NON QUARUMDAM  
 | ACADEMICAR. ET SOCIETT. LITTERAR. MEMBRUM. | WRA-  
 TISLAVIAE, TYPIS GRASSIANIS.<sup>230</sup>

characters:

(no separate list of characters; the following are mentioned as speakers:) Cicero; Torquatus; C. Jul. Caesar; Crassus; Senatores Romani; L. Mucius Orestinus; L. Paulus; Plebis Romanae legati; Catilina; Sempronia; Fulvia; P. Corn. Lentulus; Cethegus; Statilius; Cornelius; Centuriones

### *Comment*

In the preface<sup>231</sup> the author states that he chose the episode of Catilina over other historical topics because the conspiracy provided rich material and there were detailed historical records. He distinguishes his piece from Crébillon's tragedy (ch. 4.20) because the latter includes the unhistorical element of a love affair between Catilina and Cicero's daughter Tullia. Instead, Stieff aims to be faithful to the historical record and lists a number of ancient sources (including Sallust, Plutarch, Florus, Cassius Dio) along with recent editions as well as contemporary and near-contemporary historical surveys he has consulted.<sup>232</sup> Indeed, the outline of the plot follows the historical record fairly closely, and all the characters are historically attested.<sup>233</sup>

Cicero appears as a representative of the good old times and the traditional republican order; he is in possession of detailed information and takes the necessary steps to save Rome. Yet Cicero is not involved in too many scenes and does not become prominent as an individual since, as the title suggests, the focus is on Catilina. At the same time

Catilina's emotional and destructive behaviour provides a contrast to Cicero's approach; as Catilina is unsuccessful and dies at the end, Cicero's side and attitude emerge as victorious. This didactic dimension of the play is supported by the interludes, whose content is not connected to the play's plot; they consist of metaphorical scenes including appearances of Roma, Virtus, Voluptas and Ambitio: these scenes advocate the need for virtue and wisdom, oppose ambition, consider the decline of morals and concern for the public good. Thus, an historical episode involving Cicero is exploited as useful material for a school drama and a moral lesson.

#### 4.34 Vittorio Alfieri, *Bruto secondo* (1789)

##### *Context*

Vittorio Alfieri (1749–1803) was an Italian dramatist and an important figure in the development of Italian tragedy. In his youth he travelled widely and devoted himself to reading literature, including Plutarch's biographies. From the 1770s onwards he turned to writing tragedies; later he studied Greek and also wrote comedies. Moreover, he composed poetry and treatises in prose as well as an autobiography. All of Alfieri's tragedies are based on stories from history or mythology; often the tales had already been dramatized by the Greek tragedians or by Seneca.

Many of the tragedies deal with heroes fighting for freedom; the defence of liberty and the evils of tyranny are frequent themes of his writing. In 1789 he initially welcomed the French Revolution enthusiastically and celebrated the event in an ode (*A Parigi sbastigliata*); later, however, he changed his mind and left France. The dedication to *Bruto secondo* is addressed 'Al popolo italiano futuro' and dated 'Parigi, 17 Gennaio 1789'.

##### *Bibliographical information*

text:

*Bruto secondo. Tragedia del Conte Vittorio Alfieri da Asti*, in: *Tragedie di Vittorio Alfieri di Aste. Volume quinto*, Paris 1789.

{available at: <http://digilander.libero.it/bepi/bruto2/indice.htm>; [http://www.liberliber.it/mediateca/libri/a/alfieri/bruto\\_secondo/pdf/bruto\\_\\_p.pdf](http://www.liberliber.it/mediateca/libri/a/alfieri/bruto_secondo/pdf/bruto__p.pdf); [https://it.wikisource.org/wiki/Bruto\\_Secondo](https://it.wikisource.org/wiki/Bruto_Secondo); Google Books}



characters:

PERSONAGGI: CESARE | ANTONIO | CICERONE | BRUTO | CASSIO |  
CIMBRO | POPOLO | Senatori | Congiurati | Littori

### *Comment*

This is another play with a plot centring on Caesar's death (44 BCE), but it is the only one among the plays of this type in which Cicero appears that is named after (M. Iunius) Brutus. The title *Bruto secondo* distinguishes this Brutus from the eponymous hero of a slightly earlier play by Alfieri, entitled *Bruto primo*: this piece (dedicated to George Washington, the 'liberator' of America) dramatizes the story of the Brutus who was instrumental in expelling the Roman kings and founding the Roman Republic and who was often referred to as a model and inspiration of the Brutus in Caesar's and Cicero's time already in antiquity (Plut. *Brut.* 9.5–9; *Caes.* 62.7–8). The focus of Alfieri's *Bruto secondo* indicated by the choice of title agrees with his tendency to portray freedom fighters.<sup>234</sup>

The historical Cicero, famously, was not involved in Caesar's assassination, and the play's Cicero leaves Rome halfway through the piece before the assassins confront Cesare (IV 2). The drama's Cicero does participate, though, in conversations in acts one and two. There it emerges that he is highly regarded by the assassins, as their references to him indicate (I 1: 'il gran Tullio'; II 2: 'del gran Tullio', 'vero orator di libertà'; II 3: 'del magnanimo Tullio'). At his first appearance in the first act, at a meeting of the senate on Caesar's plans for the war against the Parthians, Cicero is made to highlight that the general welfare, true peace and freedom are important to him, that he has been fighting for the good of Rome all his life and saved the city before and that, once Rome is internally reunited, it will be able to deal with external threats (I 1). Such themes emerge from several speeches of the historical Cicero delivered during his consular year (63 BCE), and the claim to have saved Rome agrees with the historical Cicero's view of himself that he frequently promoted after squashing the Catilinarian Conspiracy. Still, the drama's Cicero is not just keen to advertise his own glory, but is presented as genuinely concerned about Rome's future: in a conversation with Cimbro (L. Tillius Cimber, one of Caesar's assassins) at the start of the second act Cicero expresses concerns about Rome's future since Cesare is only interested in his own power and in

recruiting an army (II 1): this shows Cicero as a supporter of a republican constitution, as the historical Cicero indicated particularly in the speeches and letters composed during the last two years of his life in the context of the struggle against Mark Antony (44–43 BCE). When the conspirators plan action, Cicero laments that he is too old to help physically, but promises to help their cause with his oratory. Cassio (C. Cassius Longinus, one of the leading assassins of Caesar) admires this intention, but wonders who would listen these days (II 2). In fact, the historical Cicero says during the conflict with Mark Antony that he is only able to oppose weapons by the word (Cic. *Fam.* 12.22.1); that he did not have a political office or military position in this period reduced his options for opposition.

The play has hardly any stage directions or descriptions of the setting, and not much ‘happens’ over the course of the plot, except for the fifth act in which Caesar is killed. Thus the protagonists do not emerge as rounded characters; at the same time there is not much embellishment by unattested features to make the story more attractive although obviously any conversations between the historical figures as dramatic characters are not ‘historical’. The figure of Cicero is built on key features recorded for the historical Cicero at that point in his life. This Cicero is not essential for the plot, but his presence as a supporter of the republic adds an important confirmation to the deliberations of the assassins: indeed, he is the ‘vero orator di libertá’. To a certain extent such a description also applies to the author Alfieri with respect to his role for the movement of the Risorgimento in the nineteenth century. In this regard the play’s conclusion, when the People and Brutus set off to re-establish the republican order with the rallying cry ‘A morte, / con Bruto a morte, o a libertá si vada.’ (V 3), may have appeared as a kind of vision for the future.

*Throughout the nineteenth century dramatizations of Cicero’s life continued to be popular: almost all known dramas focus on the Catilinarian Conspiracy and display a contrast between Cicero and Catiline in their political outlook and activities. In the turbulent political developments of that century the situation in ancient Rome was often displayed as an analogy to the present while the assessment of the opponents shifted according to the views and circumstances of the respective playwrights.*

4.35 Karl August Pergler von Perglas, *Catilina* (1808)*Context*

Freiherr Karl August Pergler von Perglas (1783–1843) belonged to a well-established noble family in Germany and had various official positions: he was ‘Königlicher bayerischer Kämmerer’, ‘Ritter der Ehrenlegion’ and ‘Regierungsrat’. As for his literary activity, he translated Jean Racine’s (1639–1699) drama *Andromaque* into German (1833). In how far Pergler von Perglas may have studied ancient sources for *Catilina* is uncertain; at any rate he seems to have been familiar with earlier dramas on Catiline.

*Catilina* is dedicated to ‘Frau Reichsgräfin von Hochberg’, Luise Karoline von Hochberg (1768–1820), the second wife of the Margrave and later Grand Duke Karl Friedrich von Baden (1728–1811). Since the dedication is not elaborated on, it is uncertain whether it implies more than a conventional nod to the current ruler.

*Bibliographical information*

text:

CATILINA. | EIN TRAUERSPIEL | IN FÜNF AUFZÜGEN. |  
VON | K. A. FREIHERRN v. PERGLAS. | Heidelberg, | gedruckt  
durch Gutmann, Universitäts - Buchdrucker, | 1808.

characters:

Personen: *Cicero*, erster Consul. | *Antonius*, zweiter Consul. | *Cornelius*,  
Feldherr. | *Catilina*, Senator. | *Sergia*, seine Mutter. | *Fulvia*, seine Braut. |  
*Romilius*, ihr Vater. | *Allobrogus*, afrikanischer Gesandter. | *Varus*,  
Volkstribun. | *Lentulus*, *Cetbegus*, Verschworene. | *Lucius*, Anführer. |  
Anführer, Verschworene, Soldaten, Volk.

*Comment*

This is another piece about the Catilinarian Conspiracy.<sup>235</sup> When the play opens, the conspiracy is already advanced; the play ends with Catilina’s death on the battlefield (V 2). Accordingly, the drama is presumably set during the last few months of 63 BCE. The plot is roughly based on the historical details as regards the Conspiracy and also Cicero’s role; yet it adds a number of personal complications: it includes Fulvia’s father ‘Romilius’; as he is an opponent of the conspiracy, this

introduces a conflict between her lover Catilina and her father for Fulvia (I 2), who eventually dies in the sea when she flees Catilina on an unsound ship (V 1–2). There is also Catilina's mother Sergia (named after the *gens*), who seems to suggest that the general Cornelius, fighting on the other side, is Catilina's father (IV 1) and that he should remember his responsibility towards his family (which he does not). Finally, the Gallic tribe of the Allobroges has been reduced to a single individual, who bears the name of the tribe as a personal name and is defined as an 'African envoy'; he is in love with Fulvia, just as Catilina, which creates rivalry between two potential allies (I 2; II 2; III 2; III 4).

Cicero features in three scenes (I 3; II 1; III 1) and is described as Catilina's opponent. In the very first scene (I 1), before Cicero appears on stage, the conspirators note that it is unacceptable that Catilina, who had almost been consul, is to obey Cicero, who constantly pursues him and has taken the government of Rome away from him; therefore, they feel that the consul must die as he rules like a tyrant. They recall how Cicero has removed a province from Catilina and mocked him in the senate. They observe (Cethegus): 'So lang ein Cicero in Rom regiert, / Ist nur Verderben unser Loos.' When Cicero first comes on stage (I 3), he is engaged in a conversation with his consular colleague Antonius (C. Antonius Hybrida): Antonius sets all his hopes of the fatherland being saved on Cicero. Cicero comments that Antonius too is a consul and that a country in which all hope rests on a single person is not a republic. Still, Cicero continues to take action and oppose the conspiracy; he does not want any rewards other than fame among posterity. In line with the historical record, such an attitude shows Cicero both as a supporter of the republic and as keen on personal fame. Cicero's next appearance (II 1) is an unattested, direct confrontation with Catilina in a private house; it highlights their contrasting political views: Catilina feels that Cicero behaves like a king, while for Cicero doing good for the fatherland, in whichever way, is most important. This view confirms Cicero as a defender of the republic although he appears isolated in that role and not able to negotiate. Cicero and Catilina clash again in a meeting of the senate (III 1), which seems to correspond roughly with the meeting at which the historical Cicero delivered the *First Catilinarian Oration*: in a speech the drama's Cicero lists Catilina's misdeeds and concludes that the continued presence of this man is unacceptable. In his reply Catilina accuses Cicero of opposing all his

activities and preventing him from obtaining the consulship and confirms that he, the patrician, is keen to save the republic. The senators, however, support Cicero and congratulate the consul when Antonius thanks Cicero for having saved Rome.

At the end of the play Catilina dies, overwhelmed by Roman generals, Cicero does not appear in any further scenes, and the arrangement of the final act places the focus on the impact for Catilina's personal relationships with his mother and his father-in-law. So, finally, Cicero and his concept of the republic win, but this result is not presented as mainly owing to Cicero's efforts. Cicero represents the 'establishment' and is supported by his colleague, a loyal Antonius, who believes that Cicero will preserve the republic; Cicero too is confident of his abilities and likely success, already thinking of his future glory. By contrast, Catilina acts for personal reasons of revenge since he is enraged at his lack of success at the consular elections, but he is also made to put forward political arguments and to claim that he is the person to save the republic. Accordingly, Cicero does not appear as the unquestionable candidate, and his view of himself is problematized.

#### 4.36 George Croly, *Catiline* (1822)

##### *Context*

George Croly (1780–1860) was an Anglican clergyman from Ireland. He was educated at Trinity College Dublin, where he distinguished himself as a classical scholar and an extempore speaker. In 1835 he became rector of St Stephen Walbrook in the City of London. In his literary career, Croly wrote for literary magazines and also as a theatre critic and a foreign correspondent for newspapers; he produced poems, plays, satires, novels, historical pieces and theological works, including hymns.

In the preface to *Catiline* the author indicates that he knows three earlier modern tragedies on the subject, those by Ben Jonson (ch. 4.9), Voltaire (ch. 4.23) and Prosper Jolyot Crébillon (ch. 4.20); moreover, he refers to ancient sources, namely Cicero's speeches *Pro Caelio* and *Pro Murena* as well as Sallust's monograph *De coniuratione Catilinae*. Since the poet quotes extracts in Latin and also provides assessments of the style and the presentation of characters in these works, he is likely to have been familiar with the original texts. Croly does not

consider the existence of earlier plays on the same theme as an obstacle because they were written in a style and manner different from what he intends.<sup>236</sup>

Croly's play was not brought on stage.<sup>237</sup> A few years after its publication Henry M. Milner, a playwright writing for the Coburg Theatre in London (founded in 1818 and later renamed 'The Old Vic') and frequently producing versions of existing plays, adapted the piece. In this format *Catiline* was first performed at the Coburg Theatre on 4 June 1827. The title page says that Croly's play has been reworked 'with alterations and additions from Ben Jonson, Voltaire, and Franklin'. A translation of Voltaire's works (1761–1765) had been published in the names of Thomas Francklin (1721–1784) and Tobias George Smollett (1721–1770), but it is now believed that most of the items are not by Francklin; it included *Catiline; or, Rome Preserved. Tragedy, translated from Voltaire*. As Milner explains in the preface, he regards Croly's drama as an excellent play worth bringing to people's attention. He admits that in his version it is considerably shortened; and he announces that he made use of elements from Ben Jonson and Voltaire and added a few scenes of his own.<sup>238</sup>

### *Bibliographical information*

texts:

CATILINE: | A TRAGEDY, | *In five Acts*. | WITH | OTHER  
POEMS. | BY | THE REV. GEORGE CROLY, A. M. | AUTHOR OF  
"PARIS IN 1815," "THE ANGEL | OF THE WORLD," &c. |  
LONDON: | PRINTED FOR HURST, ROBINSON, AND CO.  
CHEAPSIDE; | AND ARCHIBALD CONSTABLE AND CO.  
EDINBURGH. | 1822.

{available at: [http://access.bl.uk/item/viewer/ark:/81055/vdc\\_100025566860.0x000001](http://access.bl.uk/item/viewer/ark:/81055/vdc_100025566860.0x000001)}

CATILINE; | A DRAMATIC POEM, | IN FIVE ACTS., in: THE |  
POETICAL WORKS | OF THE | REV. GEORGE CROLY, | A.M. H.R.  
S.L. | IN TWO VOLUMES. | VOL. II. | LONDON: | HENRY  
COLBURN AND RICHARD BENTLEY, | NEW BURLINGTON  
STREET. | MDCCCXXX (pp. 1–185).

{available on Google Books}

revised version: [H.M. Milner]<sup>239</sup>, LUCIUS CATILINE, | THE |  
*Roman Traitor*. | A DRAMA, | IN THREE ACTS. | FOUNDED ON A

DRAMATIC POEM OF THE SAME NAME, BY THE | REV:  
 GEORGE CROLY, WITH ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS |  
 FROM BEN JONSON, VOLTAIRE, AND FRANKLIN. | FIRST  
 PERFORMED AT THE | *ROYAL COBURG THEATRE*, | MONDAY,  
 JUNE 4, 1827. | London: | PRINTED FOR JOHN LOWNDES, 9,  
 SOUTH SIDE OF | DRURY LANE THEATRE.

[available on Google Books]

characters:

1822: CHARACTERS: Romans: *Catiline*. | *Cetbegus*. | *Lentulus*. | *Cecina*. | *Valerius*. | *Cicero*. | *Hamilcar*, a Moorish Prince. | *Dumnorix*, a Priest, *Arminius*, a Warrior, *Allobroges*. | *Aurelia*, *Catiline's Wife*. | *Aspasia*, a Greek Priestess, loved by *Hamilcar*. | *Senators*, *Patricians*, *Lictors*, *Priests*, *Soldiery*, *Minstrels*, &c.

1827: DRAMATIS PERSONÆ: *Marcus Tullius Cicero*, Consul, afterwards Dictator, | *Antonius*, his fellow Consul, | *Lucius Sergius Catiline*, | *Cetbegus*, *Lentulus*, *Valerius*, *Cecina*, *Curius*, *Annius*, *Fulvius Nobilior*, *Lucius Scaevola*, *Patricians of Catiline's Party*. | *Dumnorix*, a Priest, *Arminius*, a Warrior, *Deputies from the Allobroges*. | *Hamilcar*, a Numidian Prince, hostage in Rome, | *Golobus*, *Quercus*, *Quartilus*, *Scruvius*, *Plebeians*. | *Aurelia*, *Catiline's wife*, | *Aspasia*, a Greek prophetess, beloved by *Hamilcar*.

### *Comment*

This play displays more interest in the figure of Catiline than that of Cicero. As the writer explains in the preface, he intends to present Catiline from Cicero's point of view as he regards Sallust's portrayal as too negative:<sup>240</sup> 'The following pages look upon Catiline in the point of view suggested by Cicero; that of a man of conscious ability and violent passions, doubly stricken down by poverty and public defeat; lingering for a while in the depression natural to a proud mind, shocked and benumbed by its fall, but gradually lifting himself into resistance, and finally girding up his strength for one grand effort of ambition and despair.' Still, he does not hesitate to introduce anachronisms, as he admits,<sup>241</sup> and fictional additions. Such modifications help to make Catiline's situation more poignant: what is highlighted is not only his disappointment at having been badly treated by the political system, but also his precarious financial position. Besides, there is a report that Catiline's son Sulpicius has died, which moves him greatly (II 1).

The attack against Cicero's house (II 1; III 2) ordered by Catiline accelerates the action.

The play condenses the historical events of more than a year into a single sequence, as it starts with the elections to the consulship of 63 BCE, held in 64 BCE, and ends with Catiline's death, which occurred in early 62 BCE. Since, however, no precise dates are given, the arrangement does not seem incongruous; instead, such a structure creates a fast-moving action covering the main incidents of the period. Cicero appears as the person elected to the consulship; as a result, he becomes the focus of the opposition against Catiline and deals successfully with the threat from the conspirators, but his personal profile is limited. He is described as an 'upstart', a 'peasant', an 'Arpinian', with an unknown grandfather, and as a laughable general (I 4); such reactions from others emphasize the two key obstacles to the career of the historical Cicero, the lack of ancestors and of military successes. In the course of the play Cicero is being proclaimed 'supreme', which is interpreted by some as assuming the position of a dictator; for Catiline this means that there are now only exiles and slaves (II 1).

The historical characters are supplemented by additional figures. These include Hamilcar, who is not the famous Carthaginian general of the Punic Wars, but a prince from North Africa. Hamilcar initially instigates opposition to Cicero in support of Catiline (I 3), but is then brought over to side with Cicero (IV 1). This change occurs mainly because of concern for the Greek priestess Aspasia, whom he loves (another unhistorical figure, perhaps named after the famous lover of Pericles). Aspasia and Hamilcar thus fulfil the roles of Fulvia and Q. Curius in other versions in that they reveal information about the conspirators to Cicero.

Moreover, as in most Cicero / Catiline plays, the historical action is made more exciting by the addition of a love story. Since the love affair between Aspasia and Hamilcar involves two supplementary characters, it does not affect the biography of the historical figures. A personal element is introduced since Catiline is concerned about his wife Aurelia, who is loyal to him, and they both grieve at the death of their son (II 1). By contrast, according to the historical record, Catiline had an (unnamed) son from his first marriage, and he is alleged to have murdered him to clear the way for the marriage with Aurelia Orestilla (Sall. *Cat.* 15.2; Cic. *Cat.* 1.14; Val. Max. 9.1.9; App. *B Civ.* 2.2).



Aurelia's historical wealth (Sall. *Cat.* 35.3) seems to have disappeared or to be ignored, and the couple is short of money (II 1). Historically, Aurelia Orestilla was the daughter of Cn. Aufidius Orestes, an Aurelius Orestes by birth (cos. 71 BCE), and not of Marius as in the play. Her descent here enhances the presentation of the conspirators as Marians (see Preface), presumably derived from the fact that Catiline employed the military sign of an eagle used by Marius in the war with the Germanic tribe of the Cimbri (Sall. *Cat.* 59.3).

Within the development of the conspiracy, the Gallic tribe of the Allobroges is given a more developed profile too, with scenes devoted to them and individuals singled out. One of them, the warrior Arminius, is named after the leader of the Germanic Cherusci in the famous victorious battle against the Roman general P. Quinctilius Varus in the Teutoburg Forest in 9 CE, although this man was not yet alive at the time of the Catilinarian Conspiracy (see ch. 4.18; 4.22). This connection and the presentation of their foreign rites (II 2) make the Allobroges appear more formidable.

The events leading to Cicero's *Catilinarian Speeches* 1 and 2 and those underlying his *Catilinarian Speeches* 3 and 4 are combined in that some conspirators have already been arrested when Cicero's house is targeted. Therefore, when Cicero delivers a speech in the senate, he can both attack Catiline, who is still present in Rome and attends the meeting of the senate, and have weapons and letters brought in, proving the conspirators' plans and their dealings with the Allobroges (III 2). In the end Cicero has the conspirators killed; this is not presented as a problem; instead, people chant 'Hail, Cicero. Father of his Country!' (V 1), thus taking up a title Cicero was awarded for combating the Catilinarian Conspiracy (Cic. *Pis.* 6; *Sest.* 121; Plut. *Cic.* 23.6; Plin. *HN* 7.117). This support from the People contrasts implicitly with their enthusiastic reaction to a speech of Catiline as reported at the beginning of the first act (I 1).

Since this play focuses on Catiline, Cicero, as the consul of the year, is involved in the plot, but there is less emphasis on his character and actions. Croly assumes that 'The story of a public man, after his fall, must be received with caution';<sup>242</sup> therefore Catiline might be judged differently if he had won.<sup>243</sup> Accordingly, Catiline is depicted more positively than in most other plays (though the author stresses that Catiline is not blameless<sup>244</sup>), and the problems of the period are

attributed to the political system and the behaviour of the populace.<sup>245</sup> This perspective of the piece has repercussions for the portrayal of Cicero: although the poet describes Cicero as ‘the first orator of Rome, and perhaps the most illustrious combination of accomplished mind and patriotic heart, in the ancient world’,<sup>246</sup> he has him turn into a kind of ‘dictator’ in the play and thus enhances the impression voiced in the preface that Catiline ‘was driven into open violence only by Cicero’.<sup>247</sup>

The main differences between the original play and its adaptation are, as H.M. Milner outlines, that it is condensed from five into three acts and that scenes featuring plebeians (I 1; II 4; III 1) and a conversation between Hamilcar and the conspirator Cethegus (C. Cornelius Cethegus) have been added at the end (III 3).

The comments by ordinary people on Catiline and Cicero contribute another dimension to the question of how they and their campaigns are perceived: Cicero is described as honest and as a plebeian (‘one of them’), but Catiline promises more material advantages. Patricians, however, see Cicero as a peasant who does not come from Rome (I 4). The dialogue between Hamilcar and Cethegus has been introduced to balance the roles of Hamilcar and Catiline, as the author notes in the preface, but the conversations among the plebeians too serve to articulate and compare the positive and the negative aspects of the opponents Catiline and Cicero. As a result, Cicero’s role too is sketched more clearly than in Croly’s original play.

#### 4.37 Christoph Kuffner, *Catilina* (1825)

##### *Context*

Christoph Kuffner (1780–1846) was born and lived in Vienna (Austria). He worked in the civil service, and, from 1818 onwards, he was the editor of an influential cultural journal. He wrote some oratorios and a great number of literary works, including novels, articles and dramas, and was active as an editor and journalist. Kuffner had received a thorough education; he showed an interest in classical antiquity and authors such as Vergil, Horace and Ovid from an early age. He produced a metrical translation of the comedies of Plautus with an introductory essay on Roman theatre (1806) and wrote an accessible biography of Pericles (1809) as well as an

extensive description of Roman history in *Artemidor. Ein archäologisch-historisches Gemälde aus der alten Römerwelt in ihrem ganzen Umfange* (1822–1833).

The play *Catilina*, included in Kuffner's collected works, was originally published in 1825, but probably never performed.

### *Bibliographical information*

text:

*Catilina*. | Trauerspiel in fünf Akten., in: Ch. Kuffner's | erzählende Schriften, | dramatische und lyrische Dichtungen. | Ausgabe letzter Hand. | Vierzehnter Band. | Wien, 1845. | Verlag von Ignaz Klang, Buchhändler (pp. 217–319).

{available at: <https://haab-digital.klassik-stiftung.de/viewer/epnresolver?id=1111412308>}

characters:

Personen: Marcus Tullius Cicero, Cajus Antonius, Consuln. | Cornelius Lentulus, Prätor. | Marcus Petrejus, Prätor, und Antonius Legat. | Silanus, Senator. | Virdomar, Segovis, Arnus, Gesandte der Allobroger. | Lucius Sergius Catilina. | Cajus, sein Sohn. | Cethegus, Cassius, Varguntejus, Publius Sylla, Quintus Curius, Autronius, Lucius Cornelius, Senatoren und Ritter von Catilina's Partei. | Terentia, Cicero's Gemahlin. | Fulvia, eine edle Römerin. | Mirtis, ihre Slavvin. | Ein Herold. Kriegstribunen und Centurionen. Senatoren und Ritter. Frauen. Bürger. Liktoren. Soldaten. Slaven.

### *Comment*

The plot of this play is presumably set during the last few months of 63 BCE, since it opens when the conspiracy is already in full swing and ends with Catilina's death on the battlefield (historically rather in early 62 BCE, but here, as in other plays, while Cicero is still consul).<sup>248</sup> Although the drama is named after Catiline, Cicero plays an important role: he is mentioned in all acts and appears in a number of scenes. Most of his activities described are based on the historical record though the play's conclusion is fictional.

In the very first scene, in a meeting of the conspirators (I 1–2), Cicero is identified as a major obstacle, especially as the senate is about to endow him with even greater powers; therefore, Catilina decides that Cicero

will have to be removed. Varguntejus and Cornelius volunteer to kill Cicero: they plan to stab him on a visit the following morning (cf. Sall. *Cat.* 28.1). Catilina is delighted at this plan and feels that then everything will be ready for them to conquer Rome; he appears as someone who brutally pursues revolutionary plans and is even ready to kill his own son for that purpose (I 4; I 7). The opposition to Cicero is countered a few scenes later, when the Roman lady Fulvia states that she will convey the information received from her lover Curius to Cicero (I 5) and is then informed of the assassination plans (I 6; cf. Sall. *Cat.* 26.3; 28.2).

When this information is delivered to Cicero via a letter, accepted by his wife Terentia while Cicero is asleep (II 1), a personal touch is added to Cicero's portrayal; this is enhanced since it is in this family setting that Cicero is seen on stage for the first time. Subsequently, Cicero expresses confidence that he will win; he reflects on the best way to proceed so as not to create any bad rumours; he decides not to employ any severity or force, but rather to rely on the word (II 2). In the conflict with Mark Antony towards the end of his life, the historical Cicero commented that he was fighting against weapons with words (Cic. *Fam.* 12.22.1); in the context of the drama this statement creates a contrast to Catilina's violent methods, though Cicero wears body armour to protect himself (cf. Cic. *Mur.* 52; Plut. *Cic.* 14.7–8; Cass. Dio 37.29.4). Cicero easily confronts and wards off the assassins (II 3). Thereupon Cicero proclaims that he is ready to fight and that his life is dedicated to the fatherland and immortality (II 4), which presents him as a supporter of the republic. Cicero is then (II 5) seen bringing his consular colleague Antonius (C. Antonius Hybrida) over to his side by offering him another province (cf. Sall. *Cat.* 26.4). Thereby Cicero continues a successful path, but it is indicated that his measures rely on bribery and information received from Fulvia.

A meeting of the senate, corresponding to the one at which the historical Cicero delivered the *First Catilinarian Oration*, features an oratorical confrontation between Cicero and Catilina (II 7–8). Cicero wins the support of the senate, but Catilina voices strong accusations against Cicero (II 8): 'Und wem glaubt ihr, verehrte Väter? / Eitlem Gerüchte und dem Haß des ersten Consuls, / Dem Neulinge, der nicht einmal ein Haus / In Rom sein eigen nennt, und Jeden stürzen will, / Den er als Nebenbuhler fürchten muß. Glaubt mir! / Erdichtet hat er ein Verschwörungsmärchen, /

Um seinem dunkeln Namen Glanz zu schaffen, / Um sich auf fremden Trümmern aufzuschwingen, / Um sich den Ehrennamen eines Retters / Des Vaterlandes listig zu erschleichen.' Cicero's denunciation as a *homo novus* and of his eagerness to appear as the saviour of the fatherland agrees with aspects important for the historical Cicero.

Still, in the play, Catilina leaves, and Cicero is able to win the Gallic tribe of the Allobroges over to his side (III 1). By this measure he manages to capture some of the conspirators and have them confess at a meeting of the senate (III 4): this scene is a dramatization of what the historical Cicero reports to the People in the *Third Catilinarian Oration*. It is followed by a speech in which Cicero informs the People of what has happened (IV 5–6): the report combines elements from the *Third Catilinarian Oration* and from the meeting of the senate at which the historical Cicero delivered the *Fourth Catilinarian Oration*, when the punishment for the arrested conspirators was decreed. When Cicero is asked to consider his own welfare, he refuses and declares that consideration of himself will never prompt him to deviate from his path. If he should die, they should remember what he intended, Sallust should mention his plans in his annals, and they should take care of his wife and young son.<sup>249</sup> This makes Cicero appear as a committed defender of the ideals of the republic on the one hand, but also concerned about his own fame, as criticized by the play's Catilina and attested for the historical Cicero.<sup>250</sup>

A major deviation from the historical record is that Cicero is present during the fighting shown in the final act (V 1–2): Cicero appears on a rock, in the white garment of peace, just like a god: even the most courageous fighters are affected by fear; thus Catilina is defeated. When Cicero emerges, he is able to tell Catilina before he dies that the latter's son passed away delighted in tune with the gods; Cicero feels that Catilina's death has restored quiet to the fatherland (V 2). This ending gives Cicero's intervention a divine dimension and has Catiline seem like a sacrilegious villain, opposing his family and his country. Appropriately, the play concludes with praise and honours for Cicero conveyed by senators, knights and soldiers.

The final appearance of Cicero as a white angel of peace and his subsequent appreciation illustrate the image of Cicero to be conveyed in this drama: even though it does not ignore less favourable attributes of Cicero, such as his desire for glory, which may overshadow the aspects

leading to his success, still Cicero is presented as the (victorious) representative of the intellect over brute force.

#### 4.38 Pierre Jean-Baptiste Dalban, *Catilina* (1827)

##### *Context*

Pierre Jean-Baptiste Dalban (1784–1864) was a French dramatist who wrote comedies and tragedies. Many of his plays dramatize themes from ancient mythology, but there is another drama on an incident from Roman history, *Le Triumvirat* (1845), featuring Octavian and Mark Antony.

In the Préface to *Catilina* the author claims that the play's topic has contemporary relevance because of constant 'conspiracies' in government; he contrasts this situation with Voltaire's statement in the preface to his drama *Rome sauvée, ou Catilina*, 'tout le monde aime et personne ne conspire' (Préface, p. iii). The playwright goes on to comment on reactions to the plays on Catiline by Voltaire (ch. 4.23) and Prosper Jolyot Crébillon (ch. 4.20). While the title page claims that the tragedy is 'imitated from the English of Ben Jonson' ('imitée de l'anglais de Ben Johnson') (ch. 4.9), the author outlines that, in fact, he owes little to that model; he just wanted to draw attention to this English piece and encourage comparison between British and French theatre. He only feels the need to justify that he dares to write another piece on the same subject as Voltaire's great drama; but he believes that there might be two good dramas on the same subject treated differently (Préface, pp. v–vj).<sup>251</sup>

##### *Bibliographical information*

text:

CATILINA, | TRAGÉDIE EN CINQ ACTES, | IMITÉE DE  
L'ANGLAIS | DE BEN JOHNSON. | A PARIS, | CHEZ LES  
LIBRAIRES DE PIÈCES DE THÉÂTRE, | ET CHEZ LES MAR-  
CHANDS DE NOUVEAUTÉS. | 1827.

[available at: <https://archive.org/details/thseoulesloi00dalb> (pp. 85ff.)]

characters:

PERSONNAGES: CICÉRON, consul. | TULLIE, fille de Cicéron. |  
JUNIE, suivante de Tullie. | CÉTHÉGUS, époux de Tullie. |

CATILINA, CATON, CÉSAR, LENTULUS, LÉPIDE, AFER, SILANUS,  
Sénateurs. | SÉNATEURS. | CONJURÉS. | LICTEURS.

*Comment*

The play covers the period from Catilina aiming to become consul (I 1) to his death (V 6), with all events placed within Cicero's consular year (63 BCE). When the play opens, Cicero is already consul. Catilina tries to become consul by means of a conspiracy (i.e. after his unsuccessful attempts at getting elected) and regards Cicero as an opponent to be removed (I 1; I 2). Accordingly, the plot focuses on the plans of the conspirators led by Catilina and the activities of their opponents, namely Cicero supported by César, Caton and Silanus. The dramatic situation is made more complex by personal links between the two parties because the conspirator Céthégus is in love with Cicero's daughter Tullie; she is therefore torn, and Catilina does not approve of this relationship. Since the Gallic tribe of the Allobroges or other foreigners do not appear as characters or are mentioned as decisive forces, the action focuses on internal conflicts within Rome. Cicero in particular only sees Catilina as an opponent (I 5), just as the historical Cicero tended to single out enemies as political revolutionaries rather than regarding situations as conflicts between different points of views. Vice versa, other characters highlight typical features of the historical Cicero in a negative way: Catilina describes him as a *homo novus* and an annoying orator (I 2: 'Ce consul plébéin'; II 2: 'l'orateur insolent'; II 3: 'De l'obscur Arpinum l'orateur parvenu').

At a meeting of the senate early in the play (II 3) Cicero announces that he is aware of the plotting; this may correspond to one of the meetings in 63 BCE before the one at which the historical Cicero delivered the *First Catilinarian Oration*, for instance the meeting at which the *senatus consultum ultimum* was decreed. A further meeting of the senate (III 6) seems to be based on the one at which Cicero delivered the *First Catilinarian Oration*; but what Cicero says in the play bears little resemblance to the speech of the historical Cicero, and Catilina does not leave Rome afterwards.

This second meeting (just like the historical one) takes place after the unsuccessful assassination attempt on Cicero's life. The would-be assassin here is Afer (II 5), rather than C. Cornelius and L. Vargunteius (Sall. *Cat.* 28.1), and he is unsuccessful because of Tullie's interference

(III 2). Indeed, the fact that Tullie saved her father becomes a major topic (III 2–4), with him being annoyed at being saved by an ‘épouse d’un barbare’.

While Cicero overcomes Catilina politically and militarily, Catilina triumphs on another level since he has Cicero’s daughter Tullie killed, and the conspirators drink her blood to confirm their oath (IV 6). Cicero comes upon the conspirators just afterwards (IV 8), which creates an encounter between Cicero and Catilina outside the formal context of meetings of the senate: in this confrontation the two men utter reproaches against each other, and both claim that they are defending the country.

At the next meeting of the senate Cicero learns from Céthégus that his daughter is dead (V 3). This revelation leads to a discussion about the fate and the appropriate penalty of the conspirators (the context of the *Fourth Catilinarian Oration* by the historical Cicero): Silanus and Caton on the one hand and César on the other argue for and against the death penalty (cf. Cic. *Cat.* 4.7–10; Sall. *Cat.* 50.3–53.1); Cicero agrees with the proposal for the death penalty, which he regards as the view of the senate, and orders the lictors to lead the captives to their punishment (cf. Sall. *Cat.* 55). In the penultimate scene a herald arrives to report that the conspirators are dead (V 6), using the famous words ‘Ils ont vécu’ transmitted for the historical Cicero (Plut. *Cic.* 22.4). In contrast to the historical record, Catilina is killed by César at the same time (V 6; V 7). Thus, at the end, Cicero is victorious, and César, refuting suspicions, has proved himself a supporter of his country.

When Dalban implies in the preface that his play will also be a good drama, like that by Voltaire, which he regards highly, he obviously provokes comparison. With respect to the portrayal of Cicero, the two pieces differ because Voltaire’s Cicero, the noble defender of Rome, wins as the representative of moral principles, while Dalban’s Cicero contributes to the opposition of the two sides, as is most obvious in the scene of direct confrontation between Cicero and the conspirators (IV 8). This Cicero is more plausible than a Catilina who has just drunk Tullie’s blood, yet his oratory is also an element that escalates the situation. Cicero’s historically attested success is put into perspective by César’s active involvement; at the same time this arrangement demonstrates that Cicero’s victory does not mean that he has saved Rome forever.



4.39 Author of 'The Indian Merchant', *Catiline* (1833)*Context*

This piece was published anonymously; on the title page the author is identified by reference to other works, particularly *The Indian Merchant*. The drama is dedicated to 'Charles M. Young, Esq.': this man could be the actor Charles Mayne Young (1777–1856) or one of the founding members of the Shakespeare Society in 1840 (presumably the same person). There are no records of any performances of the drama. In the dedication it is noted that the text has been heavily abbreviated in relation to an original fuller version. This play is also compared with 'that great work on the same subject by one of our most considerable by-gone poets', who is presumably Ben Jonson (ch. 4.9); it is observed that this version differs from the model, for instance in presenting Caesar as unconnected with the conspiracy and changing the character of Curius.<sup>252</sup> The genre of the play is defined as 'an historical tragedy' on the title page and as 'a tragedy' where the text starts (p. 3).

*Bibliographical information*

text:

CATILINE. | AN HISTORICAL TRAGEDY, | IN THREE ACTS. |  
BY THE AUTHOR OF | "THE INDIAN MERCHANT," | &c. &c. &c. |  
LONDON. | PUBLISHED FOR THE AUTHOR BY | MOORE,  
STORE STREET, BEDFORD SQUARE. | 1833. | *Price Three Shillings.*

{available at: British Library Digital content, viewable online}

characters:

Catiline. | Curius. | Vargunteius. | Cornelius. | Manlius. || Cicero. |  
Cato. | Sænius. | Flaccus. | Petreius. || Senators. Soldiers. Conspirators. ||  
Fulvia. Orestilla.

*Comment*

The number of *dramatis personae* in this play about the Catilinarian Conspiracy is fairly limited (for instance, there is not a large number of named or unnamed senators or conspirators), and no fictional characters have been added. This, along with the play's brevity, makes for a concise and coherent plot. Such an arrangement does not mean,

however, that the plot straightforwardly follows the historical record. In particular, as the author notes allusively in the dedication, material from the *Catilinarian Orations* of the historical Cicero has been distributed among several characters, including Catiline and Cato. This may be partly because of the change in literary genre; for when a speech by Cicero is reproduced in the context of a meeting of the senate in a drama, it is necessary to create interaction and have several people speak. Yet, such an arrangement has consequences for the portrayal of Cicero: for instance, in the senate's discussion on the appropriate punishment for the captured conspirators, Cato and Sænius, who support it,<sup>253</sup> and Caesar, who opposes it, present arguments for either side; Cicero assumes the role of a facilitator and chair who orders the realization of the decree (III 1).

The play covers the period from the election for the consulship of 63 BCE in 64 BCE to the killing of the conspirators at the end of 63 BCE and the death of Catiline in battle at the beginning of 62 BCE (Sall. *Cat.* 57–61), although the events are condensed and do not happen exactly in the historical chronological order. For example, in the last act Catiline dies on the battlefield (III 4) before the arrested conspirators are killed in Rome (III 5). This enables the author to end the play with Cicero announcing that justice has had her due (V 5). Although the play is described as an (historical) tragedy, such an ending provides a positive outcome and a feeling of poetic justice; it puts the character Cicero in a prominent position and shows him as a representative of what is right. In this scene too Cicero is not the only one to speak; instead, it is Cato who explains to the People that ambition brought these men to their deserved deaths (V 5). This final analysis corresponds to the angry wish uttered by Catiline at the beginning of the play (I 1): 'It cannot end in more than a defeat, / And to be drench'd in blood were happier fate. / Be thou my God, Ambition! I will have / None other.'

Cicero is characterized negatively by Catiline and his followers at the start of the play, before he is even elected consul: they criticize his background and his empty rhetoric while questioning the seriousness of his aims (I 1). Catiline repeats this criticism after the election result has been announced;<sup>254</sup> such a view is confronted by Cato, which suggests that Catiline's perspective might be biased and one-sided (I 3).<sup>255</sup> The detail that Catiline could not become consul for formal reasons

(by not complying with a new law requiring early announcement of candidature), as Caesar explains at the end of the election procedure, might have been of historical interest, but cannot calm down Catiline's anger and disappointment.

One of the first things the conspirators agree on, once they have decided to take action, is to get rid of the obstacle Cicero: Cornelius and Vargunteius volunteer to kill him in his house (II 1; cf. Sall. *Cat.* 28.1). Subsequently, the events are compressed: the meeting of the senate at which the historical Cicero delivered the *First Catilinarian Oration* in November 63 BCE (II 3) is followed by the meeting after the incident at the Milvian Bridge in December 63 BCE (reported in Cicero's *Third Catilinarian Oration*) only two scenes later, with this meeting and the discussion about the fate of the conspirators a couple of days later (at which Cicero delivered the *Fourth Catilinarian Oration*) combined (III 1).<sup>256</sup> This arrangement not only has the dramatic advantage of indicating a swift movement, but also makes Cicero appear fully in control of the situation as he calls and chairs meetings of the senate in quick succession.

At the same time it becomes clear that Cicero is only able to do so since Fulvia has revealed details of the conspiracy to him (II 2). Yet her motivation is problematic: while she speaks of her responsibility towards the country, she ultimately wishes to take revenge on her lover Curius, who, because of his financial situation, can no longer fulfil every wish of hers and regards his loyalty towards the conspirators as most important (I 2). Therefore, Fulvia requests from Cicero in return that he should not punish Curius (II 2): 'I made him promise not to punish him, / That's left for me to do, which is but fair.' Despite initial strong opposition, Curius, on his part, ultimately agrees with Fulvia's proposal to stay in his house (III 2). This proposal, however, is a means to an end for Fulvia's revenge (III 2: 'So shall I do two offices at once, / For while I save the State, I'll have revenge.').

Evidently, the main focus is on presenting the figure of Catiline and the internal tensions among the group of conspirators and also the reactions of the senators, who have to confront the challenges created by the conspiracy. Cicero assumes a leading role in this situation, simply for historical reasons. This position mainly affects the arrangement of activities; their intellectual and moral basis is shared by other senators.

#### 4.40 John Edmund Reade, *Catiline; or, The Roman Conspiracy* (1839)

##### *Context*

John Edmund Reade (1800–1870) devoted himself to a life as a writer. Born in Gloucestershire, he spent most of his life in Bath and the west of England, except for some longer stays in central and southern Europe. He wrote poems, novels and dramas; he was often criticized for adopting material from earlier authors.

*Catiline* was not meant to be performed on stage; it was merely intended for ‘private circulation’ (title page and p. viii). The piece is dedicated to ‘Sir Edward Lytton Bulwer, Bart.’: Edward George Earle Lytton Bulwer-Lytton, 1st Baron Lytton PC (1803–1873), was an English writer and also a politician. His most famous novel is *The Last Days of Pompeii* of 1834 (turned into the opera *Jone* [1858], set to music by Errico Petrella), while his works *Rienzi, the last of the Roman tribunes* (1835) and *Lucretia* (1846) also demonstrate his interest in Roman history.

In the ‘Advertisement’ the author refers to Cicero’s speeches against Catiline and Sallust’s monograph *De coniuratione Catilinae* as sources for particular elements. Reade also mentions the preceding modern plays by Ben Jonson (ch. 4.9) and George Croly (ch. 4.36). He claims, however, that he was not aware of the latter drama when he wrote his own piece, many years ago and while being abroad: since he finds that his play is different, he believes that publication is still justified.<sup>257</sup>

##### *Bibliographical information*

texts:

CATILINE; | OR, | THE ROMAN CONSPIRACY: | AN HISTORICAL DRAMA, | IN FIVE ACTS. | BY | JOHN EDMUND READE, ESQ., | AUTHOR OF “ITALY,” AND “THE DELUGE.” | PRINTED FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION. | LONDON: | SAUNDERS AND OTLEY, CONDUIT STREET. | M. DCCC. XXXIX.

{available on Google Books}

repr. in: *The Poetical Works of John Edmund Reade. New Edition in Two Volumes. Vol. II*, London 1860 (pp. 167–260).

{available at: <http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/resolve/display/bsb10748505.html>}

characters:

Dramatis Personae: CATILINE, JULIUS CÆSAR, MARCUS CRASSUS, CETHEGUS, LENTULUS, CLODIUS, LONGINUS, CURIUS, *Conspirators*. | CICERO | CATO | FULVIUS, *a noble Roman* | PETREIUS | TITINIUS. | WOMAN, | FULVIA, *the daughter of FULVIUS*. | *Guards, Senators, Soldiers, Messengers, &c.*

Lucilia; Cicero's boy [not listed]

### *Comment*

The play covers events from before the elections to the consulship for 63 BCE (held in 64 BCE) until Catiline's death, which took place in early 62 BCE. Although, therefore, Cicero only becomes consul halfway through the play (II 2; III 1), he is a major figure in the deliberations of the conspirators from the start.

As the playwright says (p. viii), he is the first to introduce an (unhistorical) love affair between Fulvia and the young Caesar, thus transferring the relationship between Fulvia and Q. Curcius mentioned by Sallust (*Sall. Cat.* 23.1–4; 26.3; 28.2). Fulvia still reports details about the conspiracy to Cicero, but now out of concern for her lover and before Cicero becomes consul (II 2), while she also appears among the conspirators (III 1). Since the play additionally introduces her father Fulvius, 'a noble Roman' (not mentioned in the ancient sources), there is a further conflict between politics and personal relationships: Fulvius forces his daughter to separate from Caesar because the latter is aligning himself with the conspirators (IV 4); in response to Caesar having joined Catiline, Fulvia becomes a Vestal Virgin and then kills herself (V 2).<sup>258</sup> As a result of the relationship, which makes Caesar consider his attitude to the conspiracy and the relative importance of duty and love, he acquires greater prominence in this piece than in other Catiline plays: both parties try to persuade him to join their side; even though Caesar feels indebted to Catiline because of his oath of loyalty, he eventually withdraws and decides to hide until the end of this conflict so as to rise and heal Rome's wounds afterwards.

In this play the Catilinarian Conspiracy is a campaign of revenge against Cicero and the senate supporting him because the young noblemen feel deprived of the power they are entitled to by the plebeian Cicero. In line with that, Lentulus is made to say: 'Would that this arm could wield Jove's thunderbolt / To annihilate the senate and their name!

/ Have I stood forth the mockery of Rome? / To be degraded by that talker? – I – / The heir of the Cornелиi! –’ (I 1). Catiline complains that the senators let Cicero insult patrician blood (IV 1). The anger of the conspirators reaches such an extent that Catiline physically attacks Cicero in the senate (IV 1), and they swear to set Rome on fire, to kill all women and children with Catiline asking for Cicero as the victim reserved for him (IV 2). At the same time the conspirators are shown as courageous and steadfast men. This attitude becomes particularly obvious in the scene in which the conspirators arrested in Rome decline Cicero’s offer to cooperate and prefer to die (IV 3).

In the ‘Advertisement’ the author notes that Cicero’s speech in the senate ‘has been drawn . . . from the oration of the consummate orator’. It is true that Cicero’s first speech in the senate in this play (IV 1) is set after the attempt on Cicero’s life and displays reminiscences of the historical Cicero’s *First Catilinarian Oration*, including famous phrases (‘Dar’st though insult / Our patience?’; ‘Oh! age, / And manners!’). In other respects, however, it is quite different: in the section delivered before Catiline arrives, Cicero claims that the senators did not believe his fears, but that he now has proofs, and he plays with the fact that he wears body armour (cf. Cic. *Mur.* 52; Plut. *Cic.* 14.7–8; Cass. Dio 37.29.4) (not in the extant speech); after Catiline’s arrival the speech is directed towards him and challenges Catiline to a response, which he delivers (obviously not in the text of the historical Cicero). Catiline answers with the metaphor of the two bodies of the state, reported as words of Catiline in another speech of the historical Cicero (Cic. *Mur.* 51) and already taken up by Ben Jonson (ch. 4.9). This drama’s Cicero goes on to list misdeeds of Catiline and to ask him to leave Rome (more explicit than in the speech of the historical Cicero). Catiline demonstrates that he is armed and ready to fight.

At the next meeting of the senate in the play Cicero reveals the proofs he has obtained from the Gallic tribe of the Allobroges and confronts the captured conspirators with this evidence (IV 3); in Cicero’s writings there is only a report about this meeting in a speech before the People, in Cicero’s *Third Catilinarian Oration*. In the session of the senate in the drama Cicero proceeds to asking the senators for their views on what to do with the conspirators; historically, this happened at another meeting at which Cicero delivered the *Fourth Catilinarian Oration*. Here Cato and Caesar argue for and against the death penalty, as reported in Sallust, and the senate agrees the death penalty (Sall. *Cat.* 50.3–53.1). Cicero,

‘the father of his country’, is praised and honoured by the senate, which seems to have happened at the earlier meeting (Cic. *Cat.* 3.14–15).

At the end of the play, in contrast to the historical record, Cicero appears on the battlefield. This makes it possible for him to be present when Catiline dies and to show responsibility and restraint when he disapproves of a triumphal march to Rome, as suggested by the general Petreius, because they have not fought against enemies and many Romans have fallen (V 6). The situation has changed in comparison to the discussion of the appropriate punishment for the captured conspirators, when Cicero pushed for the death penalty on account of the enormity of their deeds (IV 3). As a result, Cicero appears as a person who acts tactically and rhetorically against those who question his position and attack his life. Here it is the conspirator Cethegus (C. Cornelius Cethegus) who offers to kill Cicero (III 1), rather than C. Cornelius and L. Vargunteius (Sall. *Cat.* 28.1). As Cicero’s comments at the end (V 6) are of a more general character, since he laments the evils of civil war, which does not have any limits in contrast to famine or pest, the incident of the conspiracy can be read as a paradigm for threats to political systems and ways to deal with them.

#### 4.41 C.E. Guichard, *Catilina romantique* (1844)

##### *Context*

C.E. (or C.-E.) Guichard wrote another play with a topic from the ancient world, entitled *Socrate. En six actes* (1845), as well as historical and political essays.<sup>259</sup> He is probably identical with Claudius Guichard (1826–1895), from Lyon, who was a book printer and politician and also involved in discussions on working conditions for workers and on the separation between church and state. For there is a print from 1873 that is assigned to a printing shop in Lyon run by C.-E. Guichard, and the topics of C.E. Guichard’s political essays match exactly the areas of interest recorded for Claudius Guichard.<sup>260</sup>

The specification in the title *Catilina romantique* presumably indicates that the piece is written in classical style.<sup>261</sup> If the ‘Notes’ at the end of the edition of *Catilina* are his, Guichard was familiar with ancient sources: besides providing factual explanations, these notes discuss differences between the extant narratives. In addition to Cicero, they mention Plutarch, Sallust, Florus, Livy and Tacitus. Moreover, they include references to the recent historical works *Conjuration de Catilina*

(1844) by Prosper Mérimée (1803–1870) and *Les Romains; ou, Tableau des institutions politiques, religieuses et sociales de la République romaine* (1840) by Georges Ozaneaux (1795–1852), which might have influenced the author's view on the historical events.

### *Bibliographical information*

text:

CATILINA | ROMANTIQUE, | PAR C. E. GUICHARD. | PARIS, | J. N. C. VILLET, ÉDITEURS, | MAISON DORÉE, | BOULEVARD DES ITALIENS, 12. | 1844. | TYPOGRAPHIE DE FIRMIN DIDOT FRÈRES, RUE JACOB, 56.

{available on Google Books}

characters:

PERSONNAGES: M. TULLIUS CICÉRON, avocat, puis consul. | M. PORCIUS CATON, censeur. | TÉRENTIA, épouse de Cicéron. | L. SERGIUS CATILINA, ancien gouverneur d'Afrique. | C. ANTONIUS HYDRIDA, collègue de Cicéron pour le consulat. | AURÉLIE ORESTILLA, fille de Sylla, et épouse de Catilina. | FAUSTA, sœur d'Aurélie. | F. CORNÉLIUS LENTULUS SURA, préteur. | L. CALPURNIUS BESTIA, tribun du peuple. | C. MALLIUS, vieux général insurgé. | FÉSULANUS, lieutenant de l'armée insurgée. | C. JULIUS CÉSAR, C. CORNÉLIUS CÉTHÉGUS, PAULLUS, M. LICINIUS CRASSUS, Q. MÉTELLUS SCIPIO, A. FULVIUS, LÉPIDUS, MARCELLUS, gendre de Catilina, sénateurs. | Q. CURIUS, ex-sénateur, chassé par les censeurs, pour ses dérèglements. | FULVIE, courtisane et maîtresse de Curius. | AULUS, fils de Fulvius. | SEMPRONIA, femme voluptueuse et dépravée. | LE CHEF DE LA DÉPUTATION ALLOBROGE. | LE PRÉSIDENT DU SÉNAT. | UN PATRICIEN. | UN CHEF ÉTRUSQUE. | UN TRIUMVIR CAPITAL. | UNE ESCLAVE BRETONNE. | UN HÉRAUT. | UN DÉCURION. | L'ORGUEIL, L'INDIGENCE, LA MORT, personnages allégoriques. | SÉNATEURS, CHEVALIERS, ARTISANS, PLÉBÉIENS, ÉLECTEURS, SOLDATS, INSURGÉS, ALLOBROGES, ÉTRUSQUES, LICTEURS, ESCLAVES, SPECTRES.

### *Comment*

This drama features a large cast, resulting in a plot with several threads and many twists and turns.<sup>262</sup> Most of the characters are historical, but there are some fictional additions or modifications: Aurélie Orestilla is



introduced as a daughter of Sulla (rather than of Cn. Aufidius Orestes [cos. 71 BCE]) and has a sister Fausta (maybe alluding to Faustus Cornelius Sulla, a son of the dictator L. Cornelius Sulla); there is a lieutenant on the side of the conspirators called Fésulanus (presumably derived from the Etruscan town of Faesulae, where Catiline's army was based); and Aulus, Fulvius' son, is among the arrested conspirators, while the conspirator Fulvius was slain by his father (cf. Sall. *Cat.* 39.5; Val. Max. 5.8.5; Cass. Dio 37.36.4); the conspirators Céthégus (C. Cornelius Cethegus) and Lentulus (P. Cornelius Lentulus Sura) plan to kill Cicero (II 3; II 5), rather than C. Cornelius and L. Vargunteius (Sall. *Cat.* 28.1).

The play bears a quotation from Juvenal's satires on the title page (Juv. 8.231–244): according to this passage, Catiline, despite his noble descent, attacked Rome, while the consul, an unknown *homo novus* from Arpinum, worked hard and saved her peacefully; the consul thereby earned as much honour as Octavius (the future emperor Augustus) did on the battlefield and was celebrated as father of his country, while Rome was still free. The drama does demonstrate the contrast between Cicero and Catilina, with their different backgrounds highlighted, but it is their political intentions that turn them into opponents: Cicero regards the liberty of the republic as endangered (II 5); Catilina admits in the senate that he wishes to take the political lead (III 1). The presentation of their personalities is more balanced since there is no extensive praise of Cicero, and some positive features are attributed to Catilina. For instance, when Catilina dies in the final scene, Antoine (C. Antonius Hybrida) comments that Catilina possessed great faculties (acknowledged to a certain extent at Cic. *Cat.* 1.26; 2.9; Sall. *Cat.* 5.1–8), but used these for the wrong aims and only for his own benefit (V 3).

The play covers the period from before the elections for the consulship of 63 BCE, held in 64 BCE, until Catiline's death, which occurred in early 62 BCE. Since the elections are part of the dramatic action, both Cicero and Catilina are presented delivering speeches to the People in advance of these (I 2): Catilina describes Cicero as an 'avocat débile', criticizes his low birth and claims that Cicero confronts the descendants of great families out of envy; he also challenges Cicero to attack his policies rather than his life (a possible reaction to the speeches of the historical Cicero) and reminds his opponent that the conflict is not about personalities and rather about the interests of the People (again the

historical Cicero claimed to act in the interests of the People when attacking individuals). When the conspirators plan Cicero's death, Curius regrets that 'quel grand jurisconsulte' and 'un homme qui parle si bien le grec' will perish (II 3). Most of the well-known characteristics of the historical Cicero are thus covered.

As in the historical record, Fulvie reveals details of the conspiracy to Cicero (II 4; II 5). She realizes that the conspirators are her friends, but in view of their behaviour she does not feel bound thereby (II 4). The introduction of Aulus and his father Fulvius shows another personal reaction to the political tensions: Fulvius proclaims that the fatherland is dearer to him than his family and therefore does not support his son (IV 7); Catilina later comments that the love of the fatherland has gone too far (V 2). Similarly, the addition of her sister Fausta enables a contrast between Aurélie and Fausta with regard to their confidence in Catilina (II 1). Sempronia, who is characterized ambiguously in Sallust (*Sall. Cat.* 25), gains some positive features when she recommends improving the lot of the People to the conspirators, though without success (II 3).

Still, the situation of the People acquires greater prominence than in most other plays or in Cicero's orations. In addition to the speeches by Cicero and Catilina before the election (I 2), Catilina announces later that he confronts the current regime for the sake of the People and is therefore proclaimed 'libérateur'; he presents himself as the leader of the People (III 3). The situation among the People is illustrated paradigmatically by the laments of those joining the conspirators, such as patricians in debt, disappointed soldiers, gladiators and slaves (IV 1). The Gallic tribe of the Allobroges is not only a factor in the political negotiations, but they are also shown to be confronted by problems of money-collectors and debt, as the leader of their delegation explains to the senate (III 1). The People demonstrate their unhappiness at the decision to kill the conspirators and raise a range of other political issues with the consul; the People even demand 'Mort au consul! mort au consul!' (IV 8).

The meeting of the senate in the middle of the play (III 1) seems to cover aspects of two historical sessions, of both the one at which a *senatus consultum ultimum* was decreed and the one at which the historical Cicero delivered the *First Catilinarian Oration*, supplemented by an appearance of the Allobroges and Catiline's search for someone to pledge for him, which is reported in that speech (*Cic. Cat.* 1.19). Accordingly, the

setting is different from the context of Cicero's speeches, and there are only few similarities, though there are reminiscences of famous phrases ('et que tu abuses par trop de notre patience'; cf. Cic. *Cat.* 1.1). When, at a later meeting of the senate (IV 6), the fate of the conspirators is discussed, the occasion on which the historical Cicero delivered the *Fourth Catilinarian Oration*, Caton and César present opposing views (cf. Sall. *Cat.* 50.3–53.1); while Cicero is eager to translate the eventual decision into action quickly, César, supporting the rule of law, is unhappy with the result and wonders who will obey the law in future when the senators violate it.

For Cicero's role in this play it is characteristic that, as a private scene with his wife Terentia reveals, he is concerned about the liberty of the republic (II 5), while in the political events he does not take the lead, but rather dutifully carries out what the senate decrees. Neither at the first nor at the second meeting of the senate (III 1; IV 6) does Cicero assume a decisive role; others influence the discussion. His final appearance in the drama (IV 8) is particularly telling, when the People question his plans for their welfare and his behaviour towards the conspirators, and it becomes evident what they had hoped for from Catilina, namely bread, land and the cancellation of debts, and now also Catilina's recall and the release of the prisoners. Cicero reacts with tears; when forced to speak ('écoutons la *bouche dorée!*'), he replies to the individual requests and has to admit eventually that it is too late to release the prisoners.

Thus, it is made clear that Cicero's political strategy is victorious in the short term, but that there is opposition both in the senate, as César's position shows, and among the People, whose problems remain unresolved. Clearly, this piece on the history of Rome was composed with a view to the contemporary situation: Cicero appears as a social climber who is keen to fulfil his duties, but is not able to resolve the situation for the People; yet Catilina is not able to do so either, as his pride of his status and his personal ambition do not qualify him to be a liberator of the People.

#### 4.42 Henry Bliss, *Cicero, A drama* (1847)

##### *Context*

Henry Bliss (1797–1873) was born in Canada and educated at King's College in Windsor (Nova Scotia). He worked as a clerk in

Canada, as a lawyer in England and again as a provincial agent for provinces of Canada; at the same time he was active as a writer. Bliss published a number of pamphlets on colonial questions, but also worked on topics from history presented in verse; in addition to *Cicero*, his publications include *State trials* (1838), *Philip the second; a tragedy* (1849), *Ideas seldom thought of, for extending knowledge* (1851), *A history of the lives of the most heroic martyrs . . .* (1853), *Robespierre; a tragedy* (1854) and *Thecla; a drama* (1866). Three of these pieces were issued under the pseudonym of Nicholas Thirning Moile. Accordingly, the title page of *Cicero* does not give the name of the author; instead, it refers to the pseudonym and an earlier work published under that name.

The drama *Cicero* consists of an overture and three acts. Each scene has a title and an epigraph with a quotation from a Greek or Roman author, which demonstrates extensive knowledge of Greek and Roman literature. The text of the overture and of each scene is written in English rhyming couplets. The sequence creates a dramatic narrative, presenting situations of different types, including narratives, soliloquies, speeches in public and conversations while there are no dialogues in the usual sense. Since the author defines the work as a ‘drama’ and divides it into acts and scenes, it is included here. Such a play would be almost impossible to put on stage, and there is no evidence of performances of any of Bliss’ plays.

The back flyleaf displays an extract from a letter about the *Aeneid*, sent from Vergil to the emperor Augustus, preserved in the late-antique author Macrobius (Macrob. *Sat.* 1.24.10–11):<sup>263</sup> this quotation suggests that the work in its current state is unfinished and a huge undertaking. In mock modesty these characteristics are implicitly transferred to *Cicero*.

### *Bibliographical information*

text:

CICERO, | A DRAMA. | BY THE AUTHOR OF | “MOILE’S  
STATE TRIALS.” | LONDON: | SIMPKIN, MARSHALL AND CO., |  
STATIONERS’ HALL COURT; | AND | B. KIMPTON, 43, HIGH  
HOLBORN. | MDCCCLXVII.

{available at e.g.: <https://archive.org/details/cicerodrama00blisuoft>  
and as a 2011 reprint}

characters:

no list of characters; only list of titles of acts and scenes

### *Comment*

The title of this drama indicates Cicero as the main protagonist, but does not reveal whether his entire life is presented or which particular phase might be selected. The first scene (I 1) mentions the death of Cicero's daughter Tullia (45 BCE) and Mark Antony's attack on Rome's freedom (44/43 BCE), which indicates that the play focuses on events at the end of Cicero's life. The play does not conclude with Cicero's death, but rather with the delivery of a long '*Philippic*' against Mark Antony in the senate in the opponent's presence: this speech justifies Cicero's biography and accuses Mark Antony of numerous misdeeds. Thus, despite the troubled situation in Rome, the drama closes with Cicero at a high point in his life, showing him as the consummate orator par excellence (and ignoring his imminent death).

The play follows the main historical events from Caesar's death on the Ides of March (15 March) 44 BCE until Cicero's confrontation with Mark Antony in September 44 BCE broadly accurately, apparently with reference to the writings of the historical Cicero, supplemented by scenes for which no historical evidence exists. There are discussions between Cicero and his friend T. Pomponius Atticus, in which Atticus appears as Cicero's adviser and interested in his writings (I 3). Such a role of Atticus is known from Cicero's letters, but it is uncertain to what extent he acted in that way in 44 BCE. Further, M. Iunius Brutus is given a personal profile when he takes leave from his wife and stepson like Hector in Greek myth (I 6; II 1; II 2). Finally, a subplot on the level of servants is added, showing the attitude of this class to Cicero (II 4–6). If Lucius Caesar (II 6) is L. Iulius Caesar (cos. 64 BCE), uncle of the brothers Antonii, his asking Cicero to take counsel for Rome's sake is an unattested twist. There is no evidence for a meeting between Cicero and Vergil in 44 BCE (II 6), but its inclusion juxtaposes Rome's greatest writers of prose and verse according to the general assessment and thus illustrates Cicero's credentials not only as a politician, but also as a literary author.

The fact that Atticus has been away from Rome and requests briefing from Cicero enables the latter to give an overview of events since Caesar's death until Cicero's return to Rome in late summer 44 BCE (I 2) and to

report about his first speech against Mark Antony, probably *Philippic One* of the historical Cicero delivered on 2 September 44 BCE (I 4). Consequently, there is some variety in presentation in relation to other events shown directly later in the play. When Cicero is summoned to a meeting of the senate (II 3), this must allude to the session on 19 September 44 BCE, when Mark Antony delivered the speech to which the historical Cicero reacted with *Philippic Two*: this speech was written up, but never delivered, since Cicero did not attend that meeting of the senate. In the drama, however, he does so; accordingly, the provocative speech by Mark Antony (presumably developed on the basis of the response of the historical Cicero) and Cicero's reply can be juxtaposed directly, and Cicero appears superior despite all criticism (III 4–5). When Mark Antony produces a letter sent to him by Cicero and reads it out in the senate (III 4), he employs the same method with respect to Cicero that the historical Cicero uses with reference to Antony in *Philippic Thirteen* (Cic. *Phil.* 13.22–48). Besides, Mark Antony's speech mentions a number of personal failings that appear in the Ciceronian tradition.

This piece thus gives an overview of the events in the last year of Cicero's life and demonstrates his key characteristics; the portrait is nuanced, as other people's points of view are included. Even though Cicero seems to be superior at the end, the general tenor is rather subdued and melancholic: even at the beginning Cicero regrets in a soliloquy that he did not die at peaks in his life, when Catiline and Clodius had been vanquished, he was courageous and wielded an impressive oratorical art, the public in the theatre rose on his account, and he was called a 'new founder of the state'. Now he only wishes that the 'despot' will fall; he himself is preparing for death. Thus, although the piece does not conclude with Cicero's death, but rather with an impressive speech (III 5), the eventual outcome for Cicero is adumbrated.

#### 4.43 Alexandre Dumas / Auguste Maquet, *Catilina* (1848)

##### *Context*

Alexandre Dumas (père) (1802–1870) was a prolific and successful French writer; he was largely self-taught and wrote plays, novels, essays, travel pieces and articles for magazines. Dumas worked with a number of assistants and collaborators, the most famous of whom is Auguste

Maquet (1813–1888): Maquet was educated at the Lycée Charlemagne (in Paris) and became a professor at the age of eighteen. He got acquainted with Dumas in 1838, and the two started to collaborate on literary works. Maquet tended to outline the plot and the characters, while Dumas added dialogue and details. Maquet often was not named on the publications. Therefore, he took Dumas to court to get recognition, but only achieved an increase in his payment. The two men collaborated on novels and plays, including *Les Trois Mousquetaires* / *The Three Musketeers* (1844) and *Le Comte de Monte-Cristo* / *The Count of Monte Cristo* (1844). Earlier Dumas wrote other dramas on subjects from Roman history, *Les Gracques* (1827; later destroyed) and *Caligula* (1837).

*Catilina* was first performed at the Théâtre Historique in Paris on 14 October 1848. The Théâtre Historique was founded upon the request of Alexandre Dumas in 1846; it opened in 1847 and closed again in 1850. The venue was then used by the Opéra National (1851–1852), which became the Théâtre Lyrique (1852–1862); it reopened again as Théâtre Historique for a short period (1862–1863) and was then demolished. For this performance the music was contributed by Mr. Warney, and the scenery was created by the producer Mr. Caron.

The piece is described as ‘Drame en 5 actes et 7 tableaux’ since in addition to the five acts there are a prologue and an epilogue with separate settings and scenes.

The play was adapted into Spanish (as four acts and in verse) a couple of decades later: Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda (1814–1873) was a Cuban-born Spanish writer, who spent her life partly in Cuba and partly in Spain. She wrote a controversial anti-slavery novel entitled *Sab* (1841) as well as numerous plays and poems, some of which again provoked mixed reactions. The drama *Catilina*, based on the play by Dumas and Maquet, was published in Seville in 1867, but not performed on stage.

### *Bibliographical information*

text:

CATILINA | Drame en 5 actes et 7 tableaux, | PAR | MM. ALEXANDRE DUMAS ET AUGUSTE MAQUET. | Prix: 1 franc. | MICHEL LÉVY FRÈRES, LIBRAIRES-ÉDITEURS | des Œuvres d'Alexandre Dumas, format in-18 anglais, et du théâtre de Victor Hugo | RUE VIVIENNE, 1 | PARIS. – 1848 (BIBLIOTHÈQUE DRAMATIQUE | Théâtre modern.).

{available at: <https://archive.org/details/catilinaadrameen00maqu-goog>; [http://www.mediterranees.net/histoire\\_romaine/catilina/dumas/index.html](http://www.mediterranees.net/histoire_romaine/catilina/dumas/index.html)}

repr. in: THÉÂTRE COMPLET | DE | ALEX. DUMAS | NEUVIÈME SÉRIE | CATILINA | LA JEUNESSE DES MOUSQUETAIRES | LES MOUSQUETAIRES | PARIS | MICHEL LÉVY FRÈRES, LIBRAIRES ÉDITEURS | RUE VIVIENNE, 2 BIS, ET BOULEVARD DES ITALIENS, 15 | A LA LIBRAIRE NOUVELLE | 1864 (pp. 1–172).

{available on Google Books}

Spanish adaptation: CATILINA. | DRAMA EN CUATRO ACTOS Y EN VERSO, | D.' G. G. DE AVELLANEDA. | REFUNDICION DEL ESCRITO EN FRANCÉS Y EN PROSA, CON | IGUAL TÍTULO, | POR LOS SRES. DUMAS Y MAQUET. | SEVILLA: – 1867 | IMPRENTA Y LIBRERIA DE D. ANTONIO IEQUIRDO, | *Impreso de la Real Casa*, | Francos, 45.

{available on Google Books}

repr. in: Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda, CATILINA, | DRAMA | EN CUATRO ACTOS Y EN VERSO. | REFUNDICION Y ARREGLO AL CASTELLANO | DEL ESCRITO EN FRANCÉS Y EN PROSA, CON IGUAL TÍTULO, | POR LOS SEÑORES DUMAS Y MAQUET., in: OBRAS LITERARIAS | DE LA | SEÑORA DOÑA GERTRUDIS GOMEZ | DE AVELLANEDA. | COLECCION COMPLETA. | TOMO SEGUNDO. | MADRID. | 1869 (pp. 391–498).

{available at: <http://www.cervantesvirtual.com/obra/catilina-drama-en-cuatro-actos-y-en-verso-0/>}

characters:

French version (1848): DISTRIBUTION DE LA PIÈCE: CATILINA | CÉSAR | CLINIAS | LUCULLUS | CICÉRON | VOLENS | AUFÉNUM | MARCIUS | SYLLA | GORGO | CICADA | CATON | STORAX | CHARINUS | LE PÉDAGOGUE | CHRYSIPPE | RULLUS | LENTULUS | CÉTHÉGUS | CAPITO | CHARINUS | MARCIA | AURÉLIA ORESTILLA | FULVIE | NIPHÉ | NUBIA

Spanish version (1867): PERSONAJES DEL DRAMA: AURELIA, – muger de Catilina. | FÚLVIA, – querida del mismo. | CARINO, – niño de 10 años, hijo de Catilina y de Aurélia. | ISMENE, – esclava Griega. | LÚCIO SÉRGIO CATILINA, – Senador. | MARCO TULIO



CICERON, – Cónsul. | LÉNTULO SURA, CETHEGO, Senadores. | CURIO, RULLO, tribuno de la plebe, CAPITON, Amigos de Catilina. | LÚCIO SÉNIO, – Senador. | VICTOR, – Veterano de Sila. | PAULO, – Gefe de centuria. | STORAX, – Esclavo de Fúlvia. | CLINIAS, – Liberto de Aurelia. | LETO, – Mozo de la plebe. | El Gefe de los lictores. | Gladiadores 1.º y 2.º. | Un esclavo de Catilina. | Senadores. – Lictores. – Guerreros. – Plebe.

### *Comment*

This French drama interweaves a range of historical and fictional characters as well as several fictional story lines with the main historical events around the consular elections of 64 BCE and the Catilinarian Conspiracy in 63 BCE up to Catiline's death in early 62 BCE.<sup>264</sup>

The prologue is set in the Sullan period and shows Catilina raping the Vestal Virgin Marcia on the occasion of her father's death (two fictional characters); this incident produces a son, of whom Catilina is initially unaware. The story of the rape may have been developed from the facts that Sallust relates that Catiline had illicit sexual intercourse with a Vestal Virgin, a noble young lady, in his youth (Sall. *Cat.* 15.1) and that the Ciceronian commentator Asconius reports that the Vestal Virgin Fabia was unsuccessfully charged with illicit sexual relations with Catiline, presumably in 73 BCE (Asc. on Cic. *Tog. cand.*, p. 91 Clark). In the play's epilogue Catilina dies in Marcia's arms.

A link between the main action and the prologue is made: the first act is set near Sulla's tomb, there is a veteran who fought in the civil war and benefitted from Sulla's proscriptions, another character (Storax) had a role in the Sullan proscriptions (II 7). These experiences of ordinary people illustrate the social conditions in the Sullan period and their consequences.

Because of the narrative thread initiated in the prologue, in the course of the play, Catilina is simultaneously fighting for his political goals and to be reunited with his son, after he has learned of the son's existence. Therefore, his position is complex; and his character, his situation and all his activities are more central than the figure of Cicero. The most significant result of the combination of the historical and the fictional and the personal and the political is that Cicero and Catilina have a conversation about politics and the consular elections in the house of the Vestal Virgin Marcia, where Catilina had gone to find his son,

prioritizing this aim over his political ambitions for the moment (III 7): in this dialogue Cicero asks whether Catilina will stand for the consulship. Catilina affirms and claims that he is ready to be the second consul besides Cicero. Cicero offers cooperation, but Catilina refuses. Thereupon Cicero announces that Catilina will not be consul. For, to be consul, one has to be in Rome on polling day; yet it would be easy, starting from this house, belonging to one of Cicero's friends, to remove Catilina from Rome quickly and hold the elections in the meantime. This leads to a long discussion on their respective roles and political principles; they realize that their views on the current situation of Rome and the measures to be taken are in stark contrast. This is revealed to be a fundamental opposition, when, towards the end, Cicero declares: 'Tu te trompes; car si tu sors d'ici, Catilina, ce n'est plus une lutte entre Sergius et Cicéron . . . c'est une guerre entre le peuple et le sénat.' This statement indicates that Cicero supports the current situation while Catilina wishes to assist ordinary people.

Because of the introduction of a veteran and a small group of fictional young men, the views of the populace are represented when the main action starts, just before the elections for the consulship of 63 BCE. When Cicero is first mentioned, he is called 'pois chiche' and then described as 'ce méchant avocat d'Arpinum, qui dit toujours: sénateurs, la justice; sénateurs, l'ordre' (I 1). Cicero is seen as representing eloquence (I 2). As part of his election campaign, Cicero promises: 'Vous savez ce que je veux, n'est-ce pas? En me nommant, vous aurez l'ordre, la tranquillité, le commerce' (IV 3); this is similar to what the historical Cicero promises in his inaugural speeches as consul (*Cic. Leg. agr.* 1.23; 2.9; 2.102; 3.3). When Rullus is made to give a speech in support of Catilina and announces that the first law will be a law on land distribution (IV 10), this creates a link between the two major events that the historical Cicero confronted in his consular year as the tribune of the People P. Servilius Rullus put forward a bill on land distribution just before Cicero entered office (cf. *Cic. Leg. agr.* 1–3). The focus in the play is that Catilina and his associates are planning initiatives in support of ordinary people while Cicero is not.

Ultimately, the political developments are also influenced by several complex love relationships: not only is there Catilina's affair with Marcia, but, in addition, his wife Orestilla, out of jealousy, interferes with his plan to win the son and has the son killed (V 9–10). Fulvie,

who is loved by Curius, supports Cicero and therefore changes the names on the voting tablets César is preparing for his clients (IV 17–18); César is motivated to participate in modifying the election results because he is in love with Servilie (sister of Cato), who supports Cicero (IV 4; IV 15). In addition to the resulting twists of the plot, these interactions between lovers contribute to portraying a society in which the political conspiracy is not the only project using dubious measures.

In this context Cicero is acknowledged as an orator, but more importantly appears as a representative of the traditional order, whose adherents do not hesitate to employ unacceptable practices to preserve it, just as their opponents do, though for other reasons. Thus, Catilina, although he is the head of a group of conspirators, is characterized as someone who engages with the concerns of the People. Since Dumas participated in the July Revolution of 1830, his presentation of Cicero's personality and achievements is likely to have been influenced by the political views of the time.

The Spanish version by Gertrudis Gómez de Avellaneda claims to be based on the French play, but is in fact rather different:<sup>265</sup> the plot has been shortened and simplified, and the number of characters involved has been reduced. For instance, the piece does not have a prologue, and the action set at an earlier point in time and described in the French prologue has been left out; some of the fictional additional characters, who represent the views of ordinary people, have been eliminated. The political plot has been toned down while the personal conflicts have been enhanced; there is a prominent confrontation between two women in love with Catilina: Aurelia (Orestilla), Catilina's wife (the son now being hers) and Fulvia, his mistress, who eventually gains the upper hand.

Since Catilina, the relationship of the two women to him and their intrigues take centre stage, Cicero is not prominent in all acts. Nevertheless, it becomes clear, particularly by two direct confrontations between Catilina and Cicero (I 9–10; II 9), that the two men have opposite views on how best to serve Rome: Cicero, who wishes to preserve the order in Rome, feels that Catilina should employ his great potential for the benefit of the country and criticizes Catilina for planning to destroy Rome; yet Catilina dismisses Cicero's words and actions. At the same time, Cicero's position is complex since he relies upon evidence provided by Fulvia; but when she is produced in the senate to reveal information, she denies any knowledge because of her

love for Catilina (III 8–9). Cicero then takes it upon himself to accuse Catilina and calls him an enemy of the country; Catilina, though, claims that he is descended from a long line of loyal Romans and would never betray his city (III 11); from the start he presents himself as the person who supports ordinary people in view of the unfairness in society (I 1–2). In the final act, in line with the historical record, Cicero is declared father of his country (IV 10; cf. Cic. *Pis.* 6; *Sest.* 121), while Catilina, having achieved a victory in a short battle, dies (IV 16–17).

Because of the prominence of Catilina and his personal relationships in the plot, Cicero does not emerge as a major protagonist. As a result, he rather fulfils the role suggested by the historical sequence of events and appears as the representative of the traditional Roman system, which contrasts with Catilina's political views.

#### 4.44 Ferdinand Kürnberger, *Catilina* (1855)

##### *Context*

Ferdinand Kürnberger (1821–1879) was born in Vienna (Austria) and came from a working-class environment. He attended the Piaristen- und Schottengymnasium in Vienna and was an auditor at the Philosophical Faculty of the University of Vienna. He worked as a journalist for several Viennese newspapers, as a private tutor and as the secretary of the Schiller foundation. Kürnberger was involved in the Austrian revolution of 1848, whereupon he had to flee to Dresden (Germany); he was arrested the following year, suspected of having been involved in the May Uprising there, and had to spend several months in prison. Kürnberger wrote novellas, often commenting on the circumstances in Austria, especially in Vienna, as well as critical essays and plays.

Kürnberger first published *Catilina* in five acts in 1855. Later he shortened the long play and created a version in three acts, printed in Vienna without a date:<sup>266</sup> the later piece preserves the main action while presenting it in a more concise format.

##### *Bibliographical information*

texts:

*Catilina*. | Drama in fünf Aufzügen | von | Ferdinand Kürnberger. | Hamburg. | Hoffmann und Campe. | 1855.

{available at: [http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10113192\\_00005.html](http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10113192_00005.html)}

Catilina. | Drama in drei Aufzügen. | Von | Ferdinand Kürnberger. | (Bücherei-Handschrift.)

{available at: [http://digital.onb.ac.at/OnbViewer/viewer.faces?doc=ABO\\_%2BZ224897506](http://digital.onb.ac.at/OnbViewer/viewer.faces?doc=ABO_%2BZ224897506)}

characters:

five-act version: Personen: M. T. Cicero, C. Antonius, Consuln des Jahres. | L. Sergius Catilina, ein Patrizier. | Cor. Lentulus Sura, erster Prätor, vorm. Consul; C. Cethegus, Senator; Servilius Rullus, Volkstribun; Gabinius, Statilius, Volkstribunen; Attius Labienus, Volkstribun; Sert. Attilius Serranus, Quästor; C. Manlius, vorm. unter Sulla ein Offizier des Catilina; Glaukus, Zeno, vornehme Griechen aus Heraclea; Umbrenus, Haupt der Gesandtschaft der gallischen Allobroger; Cöparius aus Terracina; M. Porcius Lecca, Senator; Calpurnius Bestia, erwählter Volkstribun des nächsten Jahres; Autronius, Senator; Fulvius, eines Senators Sohn; L. Varguntejus, Senator; C. Cornelius, Ritter; L. C. Longinus, Senator; P. Vatinius, erwählter Volkstribun des nächsten Jahres; Metellus Nepos, desgleichen; C. Julius; Septimius, Mitverschworene des Catilina. | D. Silanus, erwählter Consul des nächsten Jahres. | M. Por. Cato [Ein kräftiger Greis, einen Krückenstock führend.], L. Catulus, L. Paulus, Tiberius Nero, Rabirius [Ein gebrechlicher Greis von achtzig Jahren, auf zwei Krücken gehend.], Senatoren. | C. Julius Cäsar, Pontifex Maximus. | Licinius Crassus, Ritter. | L. Valerius Flaccus, C. Pomptinus, Prätores. | Marcus Rex, ein Feldherr. | Corvus, ein Slave Cicero's. | Gyges, Harpalus, Amyntas, Myron, Midas, Vultur, Kleon, Sklaven in Capua. | Ein Herold des Antonius. | Erster Soldat, Zweiter Soldat, im Lager Catilina's. | Tertilla, vormals Vestalin. | Cornelia, Tochter des Antonius. | Die Abgeordneten der Allobroger – Männer aus Hetrurien – Männer aus Heraclea – Lictoren – Bewaffnete – Sensenschmiede – Soldaten – Sklaven. –

three-act version: Personen: M. T. Cicero, C. Antonius, die Consuln des Jahres. | L. Sergius **Catilina**, ein Patrizier. | Cor. **Lentulus** Sura, erster Prätor; C. **Cethegus**, Senator; Servilius **Rullus**, Volkstribun; C. **Manlius**, ein Veteran; **Metellus**, **Calpurnius**, erwählte Volkstribunen des nächsten Jahres; **Glaukus**, Grieche aus Kleinasien; **Cöparius**, aus Terracina, Mitverschworene des Catilina. | C. J. Cäsar, Pontifex Maximus; M. P. Cato;

D. **Silanus**, erw. Consul d. nächst. Jahres; **Rabirius**, Mitglieder des Senates. | **Marcus Rex**, ein Feldherr. | **Gyges**, **Harpalus**, **Kleon**, Sklaven in Capua. | **Tertilla**, unter dem Namen Claudia vormals Vestalin. | **Allobroger**, Griechen, Senatoren, Ritter, Soldaten, Sklaven.

### *Comment*

This play is evidently influenced by the revolutionary movements at the time of its composition, in which the author was involved.<sup>267</sup> At the start of the piece (five-act version) the motivations for the conspiracy are shown by conversations between the conspirators: an unbearable situation in Rome; tensions between different groups of society; poverty and debt along with their consequences; arbitrary behaviour towards slaves; exploitation of provinces (I 2).<sup>268</sup> Therefore the conspirators unite and express their intentions by the slogan: 'Die Republik der Welt ist unser Ziel! / Freiheit für Alle, das ist unser Bund!' (I 2). Catilina acts as their leader; they and the People respect him; the conspirators convey great powers to him and claim that the republic elects him *dictator* (II 5). Catilina still has gods, as Caesar comments. Caesar denies this for himself; he sees this attitude as part of the reason for Catilina's failure, and he therefore does not wish to participate openly in the enterprise (IV 2). Still, at the end of the piece, the dying Catilina points to Caesar as someone who will continue his plans in future (V 7).

On the other side there is the majority of the senators, whose self-interest is shown particularly when they feel threatened by the conspirators (III 4). Cicero as consul takes the lead; he interprets the consulship as a means of wielding power (though this is not the view of all senators), and he frequently exploits the *senatus consultum ultimum* he provoked in order to justify activities that are illegal strictly speaking: for instance, he takes action against the conspirators without any evidence against them, and he is ready to break the seals of the intercepted letters, which he is not entitled to do, and to have Roman citizens killed (III 4). An interesting tension with regard to Cicero's proclaimed policy goals, the defence of the existing republic, as well as his methods is achieved when Catiline declares that killing people might be a measure appropriate for Cicero, but not for the conspirators (II 5).

Whereas almost the entire play is narrated from the perspective of Catilina and his supporters, energetically fighting for freedom and the rights of the People, the major historical events have been retained,

though partly arranged in a new way. The meeting of the senate at which the *senatus consultum ultimum* was decreed is combined with the meeting at which the historical Cicero delivers the *First Catilinarian Oration* and encourages Catiline to leave Rome (II 1–2). In the drama Catilina turns up for the second half of this meeting; Cicero is taken aback at this development, which creates the option of a confrontation between Cicero and Catilina. Catilina attacks Cicero's weaknesses and inconsistencies. When the meeting of the senate is getting out of control (though Cicero is calming down the senators), Catilina leaves. Cicero is pleased with the success since an uprising in the city has thus been avoided (II 2). Though Cicero may have appeared confident at the meeting of the senate, he reveals to the praetors afterwards that his fighting the conspiracy might result in criticism, though the praetors try to cheer him up (II 3). This uncertainty and ambiguity is inherent in the *Catilinarian Orations* of the historical Cicero and is played out here. Such a feeling is also given as the motivation to ambush the envoys of the Gallic tribe of the Allobroges since getting hold of them would provide evidence and thus counter potential criticism (II 3)

In contrast to the historical record (Cic. *Cat.* 3.5–6; Sall. *Cat.* 45.1–46.2) Cicero is present at the ambush at the Milvian Bridge (over the river Tiber), when the letters from the conspirators are intercepted (III 1): he is not involved in the fighting, but it is him who asks for the letters, and immediately, when he receives the documents, he decides to confront their authors, deceitfully inviting them into his house. Thereby Cicero takes on a more active role and counteracts the impression that he is merely relying on Fulvia; in fact, the conspirators mention that he is trying to gain this evidence since he cannot publicly use the information obtained from Fulvia (III 3) while Cicero highlights that he alone, by his vigilance, has saved Rome (III 4). At the meeting, which combines elements of that meeting of the senate at which the conspirators are identified by their letters (cf. Cic. *Cat.* 3.7–13) and of that at which the fate of the arrested is decided (cf. Cic. *Cat.* 4; Sall. *Cat.* 50.3–53.1), people keep objecting to the unlawfulness of the procedure, but the consul-elect Silanus (D. Iunius Silanus, cos. 62 BCE) reminds them that, because the country is in danger and the *senatus consultum ultimum* is in place, the consul represents the law (III 4): these views exemplify the tension underlying the behaviour of the historical Cicero as demonstrated by the *Catilinarian Orations*, where he seeks confirmation

of his actions from the senate as a substitute for a proper trial, yet in addition to the *senatus consultum ultimum*.

Moreover, the drama's Cicero is shown to be keen to secure approval by the People: when it is reported that they are thanking him, he wishes to speak to them immediately (III 4); this intention mirrors the fact that two of the historical Cicero's extant speeches on the Catilinarian Conspiracy were delivered to the People and corresponds to his eagerness for praise, which transpires from the *Catilinarian Orations* (esp. Cic. *Cat.* 3.15). That the drama's Cicero needs to be reminded by Cato to finish the business first (III 4) shows vividly that obtaining praise has become more important than the service for the country, which goes beyond what the historical Cicero acknowledged.

In the discussion about the fate of the conspirators (III 4) Cicero has a particularly telling role: for, instead of Cato arguing for the death penalty of the arrested conspirators on his own account and thus turning the senate away from Caesar's milder proposal as in the historical record (Sall. *Cat.* 53.1), Cicero makes Cato support the death penalty, allegedly in order to save the republic, when he is afraid that most of the senators will support Caesar's proposal to imprison the conspirators for life. After opinion has changed, Cicero assures Caesar that he too favours mildness, and adds that, if the decision to kill the conspirators would create hatred, Caesar would confirm that Cicero chaired the meeting in an unbiased fashion. Rather ambiguously, Caesar replies that he will not forget anything, and he closes the tumultuous scene by commenting that Cicero's self-assurance will be his reward (III 4). This characterization of Cicero, who is most interested in his own affairs, is confirmed by a letter from Cicero to his consular colleague C. Antonius Hybrida (who had secretly joined the conspirators), in which Cicero suggests an exchange of provinces: he offers Antonius the province of Macedonia promising riches; in turn, he says, he is happy to take the province of poor Gaul; the kudos of having driven Catilina out of Rome by his oratory and then having defeated him in his hiding place by his magnanimity would be more than an adequate reward in exchange (V 1).

Cicero's relationship to the People is illustrated in relation to the activities of the tribune Rullus (V 4); the opposition between him and the historical Cicero, which occurred at the beginning of the year, when the tribune of the People P. Servilius Rullus put forward a proposal



for an agrarian law, is combined with the Catilinarian Conspiracy: in the drama Rullus tries to rouse the People against Cicero and the senate by pointing out that the consul acted unconstitutionally, thus taking up a motif that was alluded to earlier in the play and became a major issue after Cicero's consulship in the historical sequence of events. This endeavour is unsuccessful because the news that the Allobroges have been captured arrives before anything can be achieved; Cicero, using questionable means by basing himself on information received from Fulvia, prevails. At the end of the play Catilina dies; so, to some extent, Cicero is victorious. At the same time Catilina is happy when he hears that Caesar has rescued his beloved Tertilla, a former Vestal Virgin (with a fictional name), who was about to be punished (III 5 – IV 2; cf. Sall. *Cat.* 15.1; Asc. on Cic. *Tog. cand.*, p. 91 Clark), since this makes him hope that eventually Caesar will defeat Cicero (V 7). Thus, while Cicero is successful, he does not look like the winner in the long term, especially as Caesar has stated (though in contrast to Catilina) that he prefers to use legal means.

Cicero's traditional qualities, his oratorical ability and his efforts for the republic, are not denied in this piece, but it paints the picture of a Cicero who is happy to use any means to achieve his goals, ultimately to enhance his personal glory, so that he is not very different from the mass of the senators, who are more interested in their own welfare than in that of the country.

#### 4.45 Karl Schroeder, *Die Verschwörung des Catilina* (1855)

##### *Context*

Karl Schroeder († 1856) was a German poet in the nineteenth century; not much is known about his biography. Schroeder hailed from Mecklenburg (in northeastern Germany) and died in Munich in 1856. He wrote a further piece on the ancient world, though based on Greek myth: *Iphigenia in Delphi. Dramatisches Gedicht* (1854).

Schroeder's play on the Catilinarian Conspiracy features a large number of characters; the scenes involving ordinary people are of epic dimensions; the setting changes frequently between different locations; Cicero's major speeches as well as dramatic events are reported and not shown. Therefore, the play may have been intended to be read rather than performed.

*Bibliographical information*

text:

Die | Verschwörung des Catilina. | Drama | von | Karl Schroeder. | Berlin. | Verlag von Carl Barthol. | 1855.

{available at: [http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10119813\\_00003.html](http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10119813_00003.html)}

characters:

Personen: Marcus Tullius Cicero, Cajus Antonius, Consuln. | Quintus Caecilius Metellus Celer, Lucius Valerius Flaccus, Cajus Pomptinus, Prätores. | Quintus Luctatius Catulus, Marcus Porcius Cato, Favonius, Marcus Licinius Crassus, Quintus Fabius Sanga, Decimus Junius Silanus, Publius Lentulus Spinther, Senatoren. | Lucius Lamia, Ritter. | Marcus Petrejus, Legat des Consul Antonius. | Lucius Sergius Catilina, Lucius Cassius Longinus, Publius Cornelius Lentulus Sura, Cajus Lentulus Cethejus, Publius Autronius Paetus, Publius Cornelius Sulla, Servius Cornelius Sulla, Lucius Varguntejus, Senatoren und Verschworene. | Lucius Calpurnius Bestia, Quintus Curius, Quintus Annius, Marcus Porcius Läca, Senatoren; Lucius Statilius, Publius Gabinius Capito, Cajus Cornelius, Marcus Fulvius Nobilior, Ritter; Cajus Manlius, Volturcius, Verschworene. | Gesandte der Allobrogen. | Aurelia Orestilla, Gemahlin des Catilina. | Fulvia. | Autronia, Amme der Fulvia. | Senatoren. Ritter. Bürger. Soldaten. Slaven.

*Comment*

This play is entitled ‘Catiline’s conspiracy’: that the title is not just Catiline’s name is appropriate since many scenes focus on the situation among the group of conspirators.<sup>269</sup> Accordingly, Cicero is presented as a representative of the hated opponents of the Catilinarians in the context of other senators, particularly in cooperation with Cato. Cicero’s role is enhanced since the drama does not end, like others, with a vivid description of Catiline’s death (often moved to the end of 63 BCE); instead, there is a report about Catilina’s defeat in the battle near Pistoria (modern Pistoia) (Sall. *Cat.* 57–61), and the piece concludes with a demonstration of gratitude to Cicero on the part of the senators and the People (V 8).

The drama covers the period from before the elections for the consulship for 63 BCE (in 64 BCE) until the end of 63 BCE; in its broad outline it

follows the historical record. Apart from ordinary people, such as citizens and workmen, the characters are historical, although some details of their activities have been modified. For instance, the affair of Fulvia and Q. Curius (cf. Sall. *Cat.* 23.1–4; 26.3; 28.2) is turned into a pure love relationship with a tragic ending; it develops between Fulvia, the daughter of a patrician, and Curius, a noble youth, induced by Catilina to join the conspiracy and realizing his error too late. The most important addition to the presentation of the historically attested events are the ordinary workmen: their presence reduplicates the political opposition on another level as they comment on the behaviour and promises of politicians, which shows how the politicians are perceived. At the same time the reactions of ordinary people demonstrate how easily they can be influenced: they are first bribed by Catilina in his favour; then they change their mind in response to the rumours spread by Fulvia on Cicero's instigation (II 4; II 6). Some of the workmen even convey information to Caesar, who secretly supports the conspirators, and also to Cicero. Since the role of people from outside Rome (such as the Gallic tribe of the Allobroges) is almost ignored, the play focuses on confrontations within Rome.

Opposition between the different political sides is highlighted from the start: Cassius thinks that Cicero is not to be feared, rather it is Cato, while Catilina takes the opposite view (I 1). Correspondingly, Cicero believes that Catilina is to be feared while Cato feels that it is Caesar (I 2). Catilina is presented as 'popular': he will offer the People land, money and free meals as he claims that he will become consul on their behalf (I 3). The appearance of a usurer (III 4) illustrates graphically the difficult economic situation in Rome, which indeed facilitated Catiline's rise (cf. Cic. *Cat.* 2.18–19).

Because the plot starts before the elections for the consulship of 63 BCE, the play includes discussion of the candidates and their campaigns (II 1; II 2; cf. Asc. on Cic. *Tog. cand.*, p. 82 Clark): Cicero wants to be consul before Catilina can become king and sends out people to work on different groups of the populace (II 1), which is reminiscent of advice in the historical Cicero's brother's *Commentariolum petitionis*. Similarly, Catilina makes plans and has people go to influence others; he intends, when made consul, to have Rullus propose an agrarian bill (II 2). The tribune of the People P. Servilius Rullus proposed an agrarian bill just before the new consuls of 63 BCE took office (cf. Cic. *Leg. agr.* 1–3), but there is no evidence in the historical record that he did so on

Catiline's instigation. Eventually, according to the play's narrative, Cicero is elected, despite being a *homo novus*, since he seems to be the best candidate in the circumstances (II 4; II 6; cf. Sall. *Cat.* 23.5–6). Even after his election only a section of the People is shown to favour him: they trust that he will sort things out and are enraged at the assassination attempt (IV 2): that Varguntejus and Cornelius volunteer to kill Cicero (III 2) agrees with Sallust's report (Sall. *Cat.* 28.1).

When some of the senators encourage Cicero to forestall Catilina's plans by killing him, while Cicero feels that he first needs a decree of the senate, this exemplifies the unexpressed conflict underlying the historical Cicero's *Catilinarian Speeches*, although in the play this tension is moved to an earlier point in time, just before the senate meets to consider a *senatus consultum ultimum* (III 5), decreed in October 63 BCE (Sall. *Cat.* 29.2–3). Because of the uncertainty of the situation and the lack of universal support, the historical Cicero was keen to obtain evidence in advance of any decisive action. This aim is stressed in the play when Cicero is shown in his study delighted that 'barbarians' (i.e. the Gallic tribe of the Allobroges) will create hard evidence, which will spare him the reproach of having used force and reveal him as the saviour of the country (IV 8). When he receives documents as proofs, Cicero regards them as a piece of world history and rescuers of Rome; he feels that Rome is now being founded a second time (V 2). This view is not expressed so clearly in the extant writings of the historical Cicero from his consular year, but the sentiment comes to the fore in the notorious line from his fragmentary epic about his consulship (F 12 *FPL*<sup>4</sup>: *o fortunatam natam me consule Romam*). With regard to the question of how to deal with the arrested conspirators, members of the public think that these will die, others are wondering about the legal basis (V 4): this conflict is precisely the issue underlying the meeting of the senate at which the historical Cicero delivered the *Fourth Catilinarian Speech* (here reported by the knight L. Aelius Lamia, a supporter of Cicero) and later leading to his exile. That the issue is here considered more widely and the death of the conspirators is shown in a separate scene (V 5) increases its significance.

An equivalent of the historical Cicero's *First Catilinarian Speech* is not included; instead Cassius briefly reports that Cicero delivered a fiery speech in the senate (IV 5). The historical Cicero's subsequent speech to the People (*Second Catilinarian Speech*) is shown on stage, in line with the increased role of ordinary people (IV 6).

C. Antonius Hybrida, the other consul of 63 BCE, is presented in a particularly bad light: as in the historical record, it is shown (III 3) that Cicero exchanges provinces with him to keep him quiet and on his side (Cic. *Pis.* 5; Sall. *Cat.* 26.4; Plut. *Cic.* 12.4; Cass. Dio 37.33.4). Antonius is seen to be happy about this (III 3); in a later scene he declines to fight and rather prefers to enjoy food and drink (V 6). This creates a contrast with Cicero working on behalf of the republic.

Primarily, this play is based on a marked contrast between Catilina and Cicero. In public, Catilina advertises his plans, claiming that he wishes to act in the interests of the country and the People and to restore the citizens to their rightful position. In his soliloquies, however, he declares that he is not concerned about the public welfare; he is only interested in his own advancement and exploits others as a means to an end, though he promises to his fellow conspirators to make them rich after a victory (II 2; III 1; III 2). By contrast, Cicero appears as a consul observing the laws; he does not take any action without a decree of the senate (III 5); he waits until he is in possession of evidence; the exchange of provinces is moved to a time at which it simply serves the tactical purpose of saving the country from the conspirators (III 3). Well-known characteristics of the historical Cicero are alluded to, for instance when he leaves the stage to write to Atticus (I 2) or when there are reports about his speeches and their effect (IV 5; 6); his main achievement, however, is the cautious handling of a crisis situation. A principled Cato and the senator Fulvius, who stabs his own son to death because he was joining the conspiracy (V 8; cf. father (Sall. *Cat.* 39.5; Val. Max. 5.8.5; Cass. Dio 37.36.4), serve as moral guides in a political system whose preservation is Cicero's achievement, though he voices concerns and doubts in soliloquies. Scholars have argued that this play is a drama of restoration in comparison with Ferdinand Kürnberger's revolutionary piece (ch. 4.44):<sup>270</sup> such an assessment may be true within the historical context of the play's composition, but may not describe it fully since the author seems interested in exploring ways to maintain legality.

#### 4.46 José María Díaz, *Catilina* (1856)

##### *Context*

José María Díaz (1813–1888) was born in Caracas (Venezuela) and died in Madrid (Spain). Because of his romantic ideas and liberal political

activities he had to leave Caracas and emigrated to Europe. There he worked as a journalist and playwright, though he encountered problems with censorship for dramas. He wrote a number of comedies and tragedies, including another play on a figure from Roman antiquity: *Julio César* (1841).

### *Bibliographical information*

texts:

CATILINA. | DRAMA HISTORICO EN CUATRO ACTOS Y EN VERSO. | SU AUTOR | DON JOSÉ MARIA DIAZ. | MADRID. | Imprenta de José Rodríguez, calle del Factor, núm. 9. | 1856.

{available at: <http://bdh-rd.bne.es/viewer.vm?id=0000159662&page=1>; Google Books}

characters:

Personajes: SEMPRONIA. | FULVIA. | CATILINA. | CICERON. | PORCIA LECCA. | CETHEGO. | CATON. | LENTULO SURA. | MARCIO. | CALPURNIO. | LAMPRIDIO. | CURIO. | ANTONIO (No habla.) | CASIO (Id.) | PLEBEYO 1.º | PLEBEYO 2.º | TREBACIO, mercader. | Patricios, Senadores, Soldados, Veteranos de Sila, Pueblo, Mercaderes, Esclavos, Esclavas, Lictores, Gladiadores.

### *Comment*

This drama is set in 63 BCE; it combines Catilina's fight for the consulship (of 62 BCE), supported by his followers, and a love affair with the Roman lady Sempronia, the wife of D. Iunius Brutus (cos. 77 BCE) and the aunt of Fulvia (wife of Clodius Pulcher, C. Sempronius Curio and M. Antonius), involved in the conspiracy (Sall. *Cat.* 25). By his own utterances as well as by comments of others, Catilina is characterized as an opponent of Cicero, as a person who aspires to the consulship in place of Cicero and as someone keen to support the poor against the rich (I 2; I 4; I 6); a clash with Cicero in the senate occurred before the start of the dramatic action (I 4).

Catilina's political strategy is affected by a personal conflict since he is attracted to Sempronia. When Porcio Lecca (P. Porcius Laeca) requests possession of her in exchange for his vote in the election, Catilina is initially reluctant, which turns Porcio Lecca into an enemy (I 9). After Catilina has lost the election, he agrees to the deal to win Porcio Lecca for

the conspiracy (II 10). Sempronia is unhappy about this development and kills Porcio Lecca when he tries to get hold of her (III 12; III 13; IV 7). When she hears the (incorrect) news that Catilina has died in battle (IV 8), she withdraws into her house to commit suicide (IV 9–13). The different political views among the leaders are mirrored on the level of ordinary voters in the reactions of merchants, veterans and other groups of the Roman People (II 1–2). Some of these groups initially favour Catilina; later Cicero alerts the merchants, the magistrates, the People and the soldiers to Catilina's plans (which he seems to have learned from Fulvia, III 11) and asks them to arm themselves for combat (IV 6).

The final confrontation takes place in the city of Rome, with fighting in the streets and some houses on fire. Cicero is present; he and his followers question the fates of their opponents and assume that Catilina has fled like a coward (IV 12). When Catilina hears Cicero's insults, he makes a move to defend his name and, eventually, seeing Sempronia's house on fire, kills himself in an act of desperation. Thus, the developed love affair with Sempronia, which had immediate repercussions on the political proceedings, is also relevant for the conclusion. Catilina's last words include a warning addressed to Cicero to be on his guard since Caesar intends to enslave Rome (IV 13).

Though, as the title suggests, Catilina is more prominent in this play than Cicero, the latter's characterization displays an interesting variation in relation to the historical tradition and previous dramas including a contrast between Cicero and Catilina. The piece includes a scene in which Cicero visits Catilina at night, which greatly surprises Catilina (III 8–9). In a long dialogue between the two men, Cicero announces that he would like to agree a peace deal with Catilina ('Vengo de paz; ...') and tries to dissuade Catilina from his revolutionary plans. This approach leads to a discussion of principles: Catilina argues for breaking up the old orders of Rome; he is keen on creating justice in exchange for disadvantages the People have suffered as they are not responsible for their misfortune ('Y yo le dare justicia, / justicia grande, iracunda, / igual á la inmensidad / de su larga desventura. / No da virtud la riqueza; / la plebe no tiene culpa / de ser pobre; abajo caignan / diferencias tan absurdas. / Iguales, todos iguales, / ya que al nacer, por fortuna, / un mismo aire nos da vida / y un mismo sol nos alumbra'). Cicero, by contrast, feels that the preservation of law and order in Rome

is endangered. This opinion is answered by Catilina's defiant statement: 'Roma soy yo!' Evidently their views are irreconcilable. Ultimately, the power of the established system, on which Cicero relies, emerges victorious for the time being, while Catilina's efforts at reform remain largely unsuccessful because of personal rivalries on his side and personal deficits.

#### 4.47 Vítězslav Hálek, *Sergius Catilina* (1862)

##### *Context*

Vítězslav Hálek (1835–1874) was a Czech poet, journalist, dramatist and theatre critic. He was educated at a grammar school and the university in Prague; then he devoted himself to literature and journalism. He was involved in editing and publishing several Czech newspapers, and he composed poems and realistic novels as well as historical dramas.

*Sergius Catilina* was written in 1861/62, first performed on 8 March 1863 and first published in 1881.

##### *Bibliographical information*

texts:

SERGIUS CATILINA. | TRAGEDIE v PĚTI JEDNÁNÍCH. | OD | VÍTĚZSLAVA HÁLKA., in: SPISY | HÁLKOVY. | POŘÁDÁ | FERDINAND SCHULZ. | DÍL IV. | V PRAZE. | TISKEM A NÁKLADEM Dra. EDV. GRÉGRA. | 1881 (pp. 137–268).

repr. in: *Sebrané spisy Vítězslava Hálka. Svazek VI. Sergius Catilina, Amnon a Tamar, Král Jiří z Poděbrad. K vydání upravil Jaroslav Vlček, Praha 1908 (Čeští spisovatelé 19) (pp. 373–501).*

{available at: [http://kramerius4.nkp.cz/search/i.jsp?pid=uuid:46ceb7f0-5435-11e4-bc71-005056827e52#monograph-page\\_uuid:41992750-6bbb-11e4-8c6e-001018b5eb5c](http://kramerius4.nkp.cz/search/i.jsp?pid=uuid:46ceb7f0-5435-11e4-bc71-005056827e52#monograph-page_uuid:41992750-6bbb-11e4-8c6e-001018b5eb5c)}

characters:

OSOBY: *Lucius Sergius Catilina*. | *Julius Caesar*. | *C. Cethegus*, *P. Lentulus Sura*, *M. Licinius Crassus*, *Quintus Curius*, *L. Statilius*, *P. Gabinius Capito*, *Cnejus Piso*, *C. Cornelius*, *A. Fulvius*, syn senátora *Clodia*, *P. Turius*, *Catilinovci* | *C. Manlius*, náčelník etruských povstalců ve *Faesule*. | *Marcus Porcius Cato*. | *Marcus Tullius Cicero*. | *G. Metellus Celer*. | *Q. Catullus*. | *Flaccus*. | *Clodius*. | *Ventidius*, mladík z *Picenska*. | *Filosof*. |



*Servius, Poccius, auguři. | Umbrenus, Laeca, Bestia, náčelníci otroků v Etrurii. | První, Druhý bandita. | První, Druhý tulák. | Petrius, římský měšťan. | První, Druhý měšťan římský. | První, Druhý strážce. | Apuleja, manželka Manliova. | Fulvia, milenka Curiova. | Porcia, její družka. | Virginia, kněžka Vestina. | Senátoři. Tribunové. Praetoři. Tuláci. Bandité. Otroci. Měšťané. Poslové. Vojsko. Lid všebo drubu.*

### *Comment*

This play presents the events around the Catilinarian Conspiracy in 63 BCE as a conflict between different views on political systems and as a study of human behaviour with no clear winner emerging.<sup>271</sup> The aristocrats appear degenerated, and Cicero, although coming from a non-noble background, is depicted as siding with them; the leading men organize festivals to please the People and ensure Cicero's election to the consulship. Catilina carries out a more realistic and accurate assessment of the difficult political and social situation, but the fact that he aims for a powerful position for himself, resorts to violence, surrounds himself with criminals and villains and is not willing to accept any of the current structures, results in him not appearing in an entirely positive light.

Interestingly, the opposition between Catilina and Cicero extends to their oratorical impact: when Catilina promises justice and wealth to the People in the Forum, he is received with support, while Cicero does not even get the chance to speak; once Fulvia, Curius' mistress, has revealed Catilina's plans against Cicero (cf. Sall. *Cat.* 26.3; 28.2), he delivers a clever speech, putting himself in the hands of the People. Thereupon Cicero wins support, and two citizens even consider voting for both candidates (Cicero and Catilina). The senate selects Cicero (II). A vehement speech of Cicero's against Catilina in the senate wins him the permission of the senators for special powers to confront Catilina (III). In the end Catilina dies, and the senatorial party wins, though Catilina announces that the senate is already condemned to death (V).

Cicero emerges as an element and a representative of the corrupt social class and the problematic political system; he tries to benefit from the peculiarities of the structure and the inherent manipulation of the People, while he has no intention to improve matters. Such an analysis of political and social tensions was presumably meant as an analogy to the contemporary situation at the time of writing.

#### 4.48 Hermann Lingg, *Catilina* (1864)

##### *Context*

Hermann Lingg (1820–1905) was a Bavarian (German) poet, well known in his time; he was given a knighthood in 1890 ('Ritter von Lingg'). Lingg initially studied medicine and became a doctor in the Bavarian army. When he had to act against revolutionaries in Baden (in south Germany), he became depressed. After some time in hospital he therefore left the army and turned to poetic and literary studies, financially supported by king Maximilian II of Bavaria, friends and foundations. He mainly wrote poetry and was a member of the poetic circle 'The crocodiles' based in Munich; he also produced novels and dramas. *Clytia. Eine Szene aus Pompeji* (1883) is another piece set in the ancient world.

An early version of *Catilina* was allegedly finished a few years before its first publication (1864) and first performance (1866); since Lingg had no training as a dramatist, he claims that he needed to get used to the demands of the theatre.<sup>272</sup> A revised (shortened) version entitled *Die Catilinarier. Trauerspiel in fünf Aufzügen* was published in 1897. According to Lingg's notes in his autobiography and the information given with the 1897 version, the drama was first performed in the Kgl. Hof- und Nationaltheater in Munich on 19 December 1866.<sup>273</sup>

The 1864 edition of *Catilina* bears an epigraph from one of Cicero's speeches from 56 BCE (Cic. *Cael.* 12), where Cicero comments that Catilina possessed many hidden virtues. This quotation illustrates how Lingg, as he explains elsewhere, wanted to present the play's Catilina as someone who combined good and bad characteristics.<sup>274</sup>

##### *Bibliographical information*

texts:

Catilina. | Trauerspiel in fünf Acten | von | Hermann Lingg. | München, 1864. | Verlag der J. J. Lentner'schen Buchhandlung | (E. Stahl.)

{available at: [http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10125217\\_00005.html](http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10125217_00005.html)}

Die Catilinarier. | Trauerspiel in fünf Aufzügen., in: Dramatische Dichtungen | von | Hermann Lingg. | Gesamtausgabe. | Stuttgart 1897. | Verlag der J. G. Cotta'schen Buchhandlung | Nachfolger (pp. 1–68).

characters:

Personen (1864): Lucius Sergius Catilina. | Marcus Tullius Cicero. | M. Porcius Cato. | Licinius Crassus. | Cajus Julius Cäsar. | Petrejus, Feldherr. | Publius Lentulus, C. Mallius, C. Cethegus, F. Varguntejus, P. Gabinius, Cöparius, Q. Curius, Freunde Catilina's und mit ihm Verschworne. | Metellus, Volkstribun. | Valerius Flaccus, C. Pomptinus, Prätores. | Volturius. | Tatius, Albilas, Arduar, Catignar, Gesandte der Allobroger. | Sempronia, vornehme Römerin. | Orestilla. | Aurelia, Vestalin. | Chremis, Dienerin der Sempronia. | Catilina's Hausverwalter. Der Lar, die Parzen, Senatoren, Bürger, Plebejer, Gladiatoren, Diener, Weiber u. s. w.

Personen (1897): Lucius Sergius Catilina. | Marcus Tullius Cicero. | M. Portius Cato. | Publius Lentulus. | Julius Cäsar. | C. Cethegus, L. Varguntejus, Q. Curius, C. Manlius, Freunde Catilinas und mit ihm Verschworene. | Metellus, Volkstribun. | Tatius, Albilas, Arduar, Gesandte der Allobroger. | Sempronia, vornehme Römerin. | Aurelia, Vestalin. | Orestilla, Freigelassene. | Chremis, Dienerin der Sempronia. | Cr. Balbus, Senator. | Erster, Zweiter Senator. | Cajus. | Ein Kriegstribun. | Ein Centurio. | Der Hausverwalter des Catilina. | Der Lar. | Ein Weib. | Erster, Zweiter Gladiator | Senatoren. Anhänger des Catilina. Bürger Roms. Liktores. Gladiatoren. Diener. Der Henker. Soldaten. Volk. Ein Tempeldiener.

### *Comment*

This play's plot (in the original version) covers the period from before the elections for the consulship of 63 BCE (in 64 BCE) until Catilina's death, presumably envisaged at the end of 63 BCE, though the consequences for Rome and the exact timing of his death are left open. The reason for this arrangement is that there is an additional twist since the envoys of the Gallic tribe of the Allobroges have been individualized: one of them, Arduar, is deceived by Catilina, who wishes to bring the Allobroges over to his side by means of a love intrigue carried out by his beloved Orestilla (I 7–9; I 13). When the conspirator Cethegus (C. Cornelius Cethegus) kills Arduar (against Catilina's wishes) in Catilina's gardens (I 14), Catignar, another envoy, is eager for revenge, in the belief that Catilina is the assassin; Catignar manages to be allowed to fight on the other side against Catilina (V 2) and then kills Catilina during the final battle (V 7).<sup>275</sup>

The elections for the consulship of 63 BCE are part of the dramatic action (II 4–6). The respective supporters of Cicero and Catilina are presented, and there are men encouraging the People to vote for either of them; yet there is no suggestion that Cicero is involved in influencing the People or in telling others to do so. That Cethegus is asked by Catilina to kill Cicero (II 13) agrees broadly with Sallust's report, though there he offers this deed in response to a general call; later in the play Varguntejus is reported as unsuccessful in the assassination attempt (III 10): this adds the second person involved according to Sallust (Sall. *Cat.* 28.1).

As in the historical record, the assassination attempt is unsuccessful; it is followed by a meeting of the senate, which Catilina is determined to attend (III 3). At the meeting Cicero is described as doubtful about the support of the senators (III 4); this feeling underlies the historical Cicero's *First Catilinarian Speech*, delivered at that point. The drama does not have a speech by Cicero matched by silence on Catiline's part, but instead a long exchange between the two men, enabled by the different literary medium (III 4). The question implicit in the *First Catilinarian Speech*, namely whether Catiline should go into exile or just leave Rome, is made explicit, when Catilina senses that they would like him to go into exile, yet notes that they cannot force him to (III 5). The situation is more poignant in the play as it turns out that Catilina's men have surrounded the senate, and the meeting descends into preparations for battle (III 5). Catilina does not even hesitate to attack the Capitol, which demonstrates his disregard for Roman traditions (III 7).

The next meeting of the senate, after evidence of the conspirators' plans has been obtained, is a combination of the meeting about which the historical Cicero reported in the *Third Catilinarian Speech* and the one at which he gave the *Fourth Catilinarian Speech*, since the conspirators are revealed as guilty and their fate is being discussed (IV 6).<sup>276</sup> Thus the action becomes more dramatic, and Cicero acquires a more prominent role in the decision for the death penalty. This impression is enhanced since Cicero is shown leading the prisoners to death (IV 10). In the meantime Cicero is said to have Catilina and Manlius declared public enemies (IV 2); this step is not attested in the historical record, but increases the confrontation and again presents Cicero in a more powerful position in opposing Catilina and the conspirators.

The background to the conspiracy is illustrated by the views of ordinary citizens, who feel that the plebeians are treated unfairly and have to pay anyway and who hope for agrarian laws (III 8). This aspect might have been developed from the fact that a proposal for an agrarian law was brought forward by the tribune of the People P. Servilius Rullus in December 64 BCE, but was opposed by Cicero, after he had come into office as consul (Cic. *Leg. agr.* 1–3), and never became law. The opinions of ordinary people demonstrate the level of support that Catilina's promises have been able to win among the populace. At the same time Cethegus and Catilina envisage the manipulation of others as part of their strategy (I 3; I 5).

Catilina presents himself as a supporter of the country even though he does not act in line with Roman traditions; for example, he confirms that he and his men will not raise weapons against the country and will only do so against those who are appropriating all wealth for themselves (I 14). By contrast, Cicero is concerned about maintaining law and order in Rome, though he is forced by the circumstances to make difficult decisions, for instance, when he opens the intercepted letters from the conspirators to the Allobroges in the senate (IV 6). That Cicero is aware of the problematic nature of some of his actions and feels weighed down thereby is illustrated by the contrast with Cato: while Cicero is afraid of turning guilty ('Die That, und selbst die beste, / Ist niemals frei von böser Folge; Schuld / Klebt Allem an, was Menschenthun sich nennt, / Und Strafe züchtigt oft den besten Willen.'), Cato advocates trust in the gods (IV 4); later, he is unwilling to show any kind of pardon towards the conspirators when Sempronia pleads for them (IV 8). Cicero, by contrast, is presented as beset by doubts when he leads Lentulus to his death; Cicero asks himself whether he might have judged too harshly, and he is unsure whether the uncertain favour of the People is stronger than his doubts (IV 10). At the same time the play shows how Cicero pursues a clever tactical approach, for instance, when he exchanges provinces with his consular colleague C. Antonius Hybrida to keep him on his side (II 7; cf. Cic. *Pis.* 5; Sall. *Cat.* 26.4; Plut. *Cic.* 12.4; Cass. Dio 37.33.4). Ultimately, Cicero is successful only because Curius (here instigated not by Fulvia, but rather by Chremis, Sempronia's servant) reveals details of the conspiracy to him (II 8; II 11; II 15). What is characteristic of this play's Cicero is that he repeatedly voices his uncertainty in soliloquies (e.g. IV 5). Thus Cicero, who appears as

Catilina's opponent, as the representative of the traditional system and as the defender of the constitution (in modern terminology), is presented as someone who again and again has to ascertain his position.

In the later, shortened version of the drama Lingg reduced the thread relating to the Allobroges. Instead, Cäsar, who is shown speaking against the death penalty for the conspirators in the senate in the original (IV 6), is identified by the dying Catilina as the person who will complete successfully what he intended (V 6: 'Ich höre Schwingen eines Adlers, – Cäsar! – / Du bist es, Julius Cäsar; werde größer, / Sei glücklicher als ich!'). As Catilina says at the beginning of the play's original version, his motto is 'Gleichheit des Glückes, aller Güter Theilung / In Allem Freiheit und für Alle Freiheit!' (I 12). Yet, with his deceitful and violent procedures Catilina does not meet his own requirements, and whether Cäsar might do so in future is left open at the end. Thus, Lingg showcases Catilina's activities as a prompt to reconsider Rome's political procedures, but, in line with his balanced depiction of the main characters, the outcome remains ambiguous.

#### 4.49 Parmenio Bettòli, *Catilina* (1872/75)

##### *Context*

Parmenio Bettòli (1835–1907), from Parma (Italy), had a disorderly education and was soon attracted to journalism and theatre. Bettòli worked for a number of Italian newspapers, often being responsible for the musical and literary sections, and even founded his own newspapers. He also produced overviews of the history of Italian drama and theatre. Bettòli's first play was shown in 1852; over the next few decades he was active as a prolific dramatist. To get his plays performed, Bettòli wrote a piece in the style of the famous playwright and librettist Carlo Goldoni (1707–1793) under the pseudonym Pier Taddeo Barti, creating the impression that it might date from the time of Goldoni.

*Catilina* was first performed on the evenings of 9 and 10 October 1872 in the Teatro Gerbino in Turin (by the acting company of Luigi Bellotti-Bon [1820–1883]); it was first published in 1875. Bettòli is said to have been inspired to write this play by the success of the drama *Nerone* (1871) by Pietro Cossa (1830–1881).<sup>277</sup> *Catilina* seems to be the only play by Bettòli dramatizing a story from the ancient world.

*Bibliographical information*

text:

CATILINA | DRAMMA | IN CINQUE ATTI IN VERSI | DI |  
 PARMENIO BETTÒLI | CON | NOTE ILLUSTRATIVE | MILANO  
 1875. | PRESSO L'EDITORE CARLO BARBINI | *Via Chiaracalle, N. 9.*

characters:

PERSONAGGI: CATILINA | CICERONE | CURIO | CATONE |  
 CESARE | CETEGO | LENTULO | FIBULA | PANZA | BEBRICE |  
 TERMONIDE | SCROFA | VOLARIO | MEONE | VELENO | PRISCA  
 | FULVIA | ORESTILLA | SOSTRATA | ELODIA | TIMARCA. |  
 Patrizi – Cavalieri – Popolani – Liberti – Littori – Gladiatori –  
 Schiavi.

*Comment*

While the plot of this play is described as set in 63 BCE, it seems to portray the situation at the time of the elections for the consulship of 63 BCE in 64 BCE, while featuring characters important in 63 BCE.<sup>278</sup> The text of the drama is commented on in a total of almost 300 notes (attached to each act), which explain details of Roman life, illustrate dramatic decisions and refer to ancient sources as well as to recent scholarship on the ancient world (including Theodor Mommsen [1817–1903] as well as Prosper Mérimée [1803–1870]). Yet, even though the piece is evidently linked to the sources and based on the historical sequence of events, the historical incidents and characters (along with some fictional personages) are presented within a novel story.<sup>279</sup>

The opening already displays an unusual setting and an historically improbable combination of characters (I 1–5): a group of unhistorical ordinary people are drinking in a tavern. In their conversation Catilina and Cicero are introduced for the first time: while one person implies that Catilina is a thief, another describes him as the worthiest citizen in Rome, in contrast, for instance, to Cicero, who deceives with his words; they envision that Cicero will claim that order and peace are required to save the republic (I 2). Catilina, who, like Cicero (I 3), arrives in this tavern (I 5), later reveals that he is aiming for the consulship and that he fears Cicero most among all candidates (II 9), which sets the two men up as rivals.

Cicero is first seen when entering the tavern, where he starts a conversation with Bebrice, a slave of Catilina (I 3). By interacting with these ordinary people and with the Roman lady Fulvia, whom he visits in her house (II 1–2; III 1–7), Cicero obtains vital information (cf. Sall. *Cat.* 26.3; 28.2); this puts him in a superior position, but also shows him relying on others.

A particular role in the various inter-relationships is played by Prisca, the younger sister of Cicero's wife Terenzia; she is a Vestal Virgin whom Catilina loved and then saved from death when she was about to be punished by being buried alive (III 4); she apparently now uses the pseudonym 'Cornelia' (I 3). The basis for this story is the historical detail that Catilina is said to have had an illicit sexual relationship with a Vestal Virgin named Fabia in his youth (Asc. on Cic. *Tog. cand.*, p. 91 Clark; Sall. *Cat.* 15.1). The choice of the name Prisca, a Roman woman allegedly tortured and executed for her Christian faith in the third century CE and later turned into a saint and martyr, gives the story added poignancy. In the play Cicero meets Prisca in the simple dwelling of Sostrata (whose name is perhaps inspired by characters in Terence's comedies [*Ad.*; *Heaut.*; *Hec.*]), where she lives; he is astonished to see Prisca when he recognizes her. She confesses that she still loves Catilina and that Catilina wishes to restore the country to its former glory; thereupon Cicero promises that he will support Catilina's candidacy as soon as he is convinced of the honesty of his goals (III 4). When Catilina arrives during their conversation (III 5), he attacks Cicero and asks whether he was seeking Prisca. Cicero claims that he was looking for Catilina to learn his intentions regarding the consulship; he promises that he will let Catilina form an alliance with him and drag him to power under certain circumstances, but Catilina will remain subordinate to him. This leads to a long discussion of the situation of Rome and of their respective political ideas: Cicero wishes to maintain the traditional order, is convinced of Rome's powerful position and is confident in his relationship with the other bodies in the state. Catilina feels that Cicero has not realized the true role of Rome in the world, the irresponsible attitude of some of the current magistrates and the situation of a large proportion of the People, who live in appalling conditions and need support. In the end the two men do not become friends and remain rivals (III 7).



Later, in a conversation with Catone and Fulvia, Cicero outlines the risks of having Catilina as consul (IV 3) while Catone regards Cicero as the only one able to re-establish the republic (IV 5). Catilina expects to win the consulship (IV 10), but because of deceit and various manipulations of the elections this does not happen (V 2). At the end, when the planned influence on the elections to the consulship has been revealed and Catilina's supporters have been caught, Cicero offers Catilina to leave Rome or face death; eventually Catilina rushes off (V 8).<sup>280</sup> When Cicero sees the dying Prisca and realizes that Catilina has stabbed Prisca, he is taken aback. This incident confirms to him that he has saved the republic (V 8). It turns out to have been a mistake that Catilina and his supporters looked down upon men such as the orator from Arpino (I 5), showing contempt for Cicero ('Non è la gonfia e sterile loquela / Di villanzon' piovutoci d'Arpino, / Che, da' rétori greci, imparò l'arte / Di mostrar vero il falso e falso il vero; / . . .'). When the learned Sempronia is described as Cicero's eager emulator in oratory (II 2), it is implied that Cicero is an outstanding orator, while others may aspire to this standard.

The play presents a complex plot including a large number of unhistorical characters, various relationships with women and several intrigues. This arrangement turns it into effective drama and at the same time reduces its historical accuracy. Cicero appears as a politician keen to save the republic and employing all tactical measures to achieve this aim; the recourse to doubtful procedures and informers as well as the slight appreciation voiced by others detracts from his standing. Thus, this play's Cicero is neither an admirable orator nor a faultless saviour of the country, but rather an intellectually superior figure in a political environment dominated by intrigues and a complex social situation.

#### 4.50 Johann Pöhl, *Catilina* (1877)

##### *Context*

Johann / Hans Pöhl (1849 – after 1913) was an Austrian writer. He originally worked as an actor, but had to abandon this career due to health issues. Pöhl then embarked on the study of German literature, particularly of earlier periods. In 1884 he worked as director and producer for the Carltheater in Vienna; later he moved into sheltered

accommodation because of mental health issues. Pöhl wrote a number of plays, especially on topics from German legend ('Volksbühnenspiele'), trying not only to entertain, but also to educate; moreover, he produced literary critical studies.

Pöhl reports that on the intervention of Franz von Dingelstedt (1814–1881), in charge of the opera and theatre in Vienna at the time, *Catilina* was performed in Brünn / Brno (now a town in the Czech Republic) by Viennese actors.<sup>281</sup>

### *Bibliographical information*

text:

Catilina. | Tragödie in fünf Acten | von | Johann Pöhl. | Wien, 1877. | Druck und Verlag von Ludwig Schönberger.

{available at: <http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/~db/0010/bsb00105895/images/index.html?id=00105895&groesser=&fip=193.174.98.30&no=&seite=1>}

characters:

Personen: M. T. Cicero, C. Antonius, Consuln des römischen Staates. | M. P. Cato, Crassus, Julius Cäsar, Lentulus, Sergius Catinila [sic], Senatoren. | Caeparius, Laeca, Curius, Cethegus, Patrizier. | Statilius, ein Philosoph. | Pretejus, Befehlshaber des Heeres der Senatspartei. | Manlius, Befehlshaber der Truppen Catilina's. | Cinna, Plino, Claudius, Mucius, seine Krieger. | Aurelia Orestilia. | Fulvia. | Flavia, vormals Vestalin. | Nerinna, Aurelia's Dienerin. | Traso, Dromo, Purbo, Sclaven. | Senatoren, Bürger, Sclaven, Krieger.

### *Comment*

Although the play is relatively long, it still covers the events of 63 BCE in condensed fashion.<sup>282</sup>

The drama opens with a scene featuring slaves, reminiscent of Plautus' comedies: slaves discuss their reactions to the elections for the consulship. One of them is disappointed that Cicero, a man of low birth, who maltreats the poor and is subservient to the senators, has been elected rather than Catilina, the 'friend of slaves' (I 1); he also believes that Cicero, a clever advocate and player with words, has obtained the consulship by lies and by vilifying Catilina (I 3). Such an opening establishes a negative view of Cicero. This perspective corroborates the

context of a pool of dissatisfied people in Rome with many in debt (I 6, I 9; I 10; II 9), and it shows that ordinary people are a significant entity: later it turns out that it is not that easy for Catilina's side to recruit supporters from this milieu; it is reported that Cato and Cicero are extremely friendly towards their household slaves (I 17). While the other consul C. Antonius (Hybrida) offers his support to Catilina at the beginning (I 8), it is mentioned later that Cicero has left rich Macedonia to bankrupt Antonius and thereby brought him over to his side (I 18). Thereby the financial situation is identified as a motivation for actions on all levels. The same reason prompts the betrayal of the conspiracy to Cicero; for Fulvia encourages her lover Curius and the young Laeca (presumably P. Porcius Laeca) to assist her in doing so since she is keen to obtain the advertised reward and does not expect anything similar from Catilina (III 1–2). Laeca had joined the conspirators since he had fallen in love with Catilina's wife Aurelia to such an extent that he was spending the night in front of her closed door (I 5). Catilina had ordered Aurelia to raise his hopes, in order to win him over to his side (I 12).

Since Catilina's general voices the expectation that Catilina will not bear the defeat in the election and remove Cicero from his position (I 3), a conflict between the two men is sketched early on. This is confirmed when Catilina announces that his sword will confront Cicero's pen (I 10). This sets Cicero up as a feeble, bookish person; indeed, the historical Cicero never won a major military victory. This impression is strengthened as Cicero first appears on stage on his way to visit the former Vestal Virgin Flavia, now a priestess of Hecate (II 1). Because of her affair with Catilina (cf. Sall. *Cat.* 15.1; Asc. on Cic. *Tog. cand.*, p. 91 Clark [with the name Fabia]) Cicero had turned away from her; he now offers reconciliation and support: he tells her that, in the interest of the country, she should not engage with Catilina again. Flavia, however, asks whether Cicero might be confusing the advantages for the consul with those for the country. Cicero rejects this suspicion and reminds her of the duty of every honest person to force Catilina to recognize the power of the law (II 1). Flavia, who unsuccessfully tries to make Catilina understand the unjust and criminal nature of his earlier deeds (II 3), first can be persuaded to help him to win the senator Lentulus for him, as he sees this as a means to win the consulship, which he regards as rightfully his (II 3–4). Later, however, Flavia rejects Catilina, full of

contempt for his behaviour, when he appeals to their love and envisages a joint future (IV 8).

After Cicero has obtained evidence about Catilina's plans as well as information from Fulvia (III 2), he is unsure as to whether to proceed with the meeting of the senate because there are supporters of Catilina among the People and in the senate. Cato, however, trusts in the power of the law. The support of the virtuous Cato makes Cicero feel empowered: 'Nur die Macht der Tugendhaften gibt dem Gesetze Kraft, Ordnungsfeinde, Lasterhafte und Böse zu zerschmettern' (III 3). Cicero's uncertainty is not voiced so clearly in the historical record, but from the historical Cicero's *Catilinarian Orations* it transpires that he was unsure about taking forceful action and how to handle potential opposition in the senate. Having this doubt displayed in the drama and showing Cicero dependent on Cato's advice make him appear less decisive. Although the meeting of the senate takes place while Catilina is still in Rome and therefore matches the meeting at which the historical Cicero delivered the *First Catilinarian Oration*, the topic of the meeting in the play (which Catilina initially attends) is the potential punishment of the conspirators (III 13–14); it therefore rather corresponds to the later meeting at which the historical Cicero delivered the *Fourth Catilinarian Oration*. Accordingly, Cato moves punishment while Caesar asks for fair justice and suggests banishment instead of the death penalty, with Cato's view winning a majority (III 14; cf. Sall. *Cat.* 50.3–53.1). Although Cato was instrumental in bringing about the result, he still asks for Cicero to be honoured as 'father of the country' (III 14), which the historical Cicero attributes to Q. Catulus (Cic. *Pis.* 6; *Sest.* 121).

The drama continues until Catilina's death in battle (V 9), but Cicero does not appear in acts four and five (or in act one). Throughout the play Cicero is characterized as Catilina's opponent, as determined by his historical and political position, but there is less emphasis on providing a portrait of him. Instead, the focus is on characterizing Catilina as a villain with charismatic behaviour: his activities as presented in the play reveal him as a murderer, as someone who exploits women in love with him and who manipulates people believing in him with well-chosen words (II 9); at the end he voices some self-doubt, but remains a courageous fighter. By contrast, Cicero is presented as a cautious and prudent tactician; even his oratory thereby receives a problematic

dimension. Consequently, it is the morally strict Cato who offers a contrast to the group led by Catilina, whose motto is expressed by shouts such as 'Heil dem Chaos, dem uralt heiligen Wirrsal der Elemente, aus dessen finster verworrener Nacht das Licht erstand und mit dem Lichte die Ordnung aller Dinge. – Wir wollen die Scheinordnung dieses Staates in ein zweites Chaos zerschlagen!' (II 9) as they do not accept the current political structure as valid.

#### 4.51 Vincenzo Molinari, *Lucio Sergio Catilina* (1878)

##### *Context*

About the life of Vincenzo Molinari only a few details can be established. Six tragedies seem to have been published individually as parts of *Teatro di Vincenzo Molinari* within a few years (including *Francesco Ferrucci, capitano generale della repubblica di Firenze*, 1878; *Caio Mario*, 1880). According to the advertisement on the final pages of the tragedy editions, the author also wrote philosophical and pedagogic works; this interest matches the fact that he is described as 'Prof. V. Molinari' in the advertisement of *Francesco Ferrucci*.<sup>283</sup>

The text of the tragedy *Lucio Sergio Catilina* is preceded by a long essay on 'La Congiura di Catilina', which provides an historical overview and the author's assessment of the events (pp. 5–38), and an 'Argomento della Tragedia' (pp. 39–40). In the introductory essay the writer explains that he was prompted to dramatize this incident from history because of its inherent importance and the impression that the ancient writers narrating it, Sallust and Cicero, had made upon him.<sup>284</sup> He goes on to apologize for such a topic for a tragedy as these dramas typically feature great falls caused by error or passions of gods; he explains that the Catilinarian Conspiracy, though a major crime, will lead to a salutary impression on the minds (p. 3). In the rest of the essay the author provides an overview of the historical events of the Catilinarian Conspiracy and the situation of the Roman Republic at the time; he then conducts a detailed examination of the characters of Catilina and Cicero, aiming for fair and objective assessment: for Cicero he notes that he was a good person and a talented writer and orator, but also a weak and timid individual and not a real statesman, driven by ambition and personal resentment. The quotation from Vergil's *Aeneid* on the title page (Verg. *Aen.* 8.668–669) suggests that, nevertheless, Catilina is seen as the person to be punished.

*Bibliographical information*

text:

TEATRO | DI | VINCENZO MOLINARI | LE TRAGEDIE || LUCIO SERGIO CATILINA. | TRAGEDIA | PARMA | TIPOGRAFIA EDITRICE DI PIETRO GRAZIOLI | *Via all' Università n. 13.* | 1878.

characters:

PERSONAGGI DELLA TRAGEDIA: L. S. CATILINA, senatore romano, capo de' congiurati e marito di | AURELIA ORESTILLA. | SEMPRONIA, nobil donna romana amante di | AULO FULVIO giovinetto, figlio di | MARCO FULVIO senatore, padre austero e fanatico. | VARGONTEO, CETEGO e altri congiurati. | MANLIO Prefetto del Campo de' congiurati a Fiesole. | M. TULLIO Cicerone Consolo, | C. CESARE, L. CRASSO, M. CATONE Senatori Romani. | Altri Senatori e cavalieri romani. | Ninfe di seduzione. Gruppi di schiave e di schiavi, che poi formano Coro. Soldati, che combattono. Ancella con paniere pieno di teschi. Littori e guardie.

*Comment*

This play is set during the last few months of 63 BCE, when Catilina and his fellow conspirators are taking action (until their final defeat) against what they see as the 'establishment' in Rome, consisting of rich tyrants who distribute power among themselves. The conspirators win support and approval especially from the lower social classes of Roman society (IV 3–4), but Cesare and Crasso also offer some reassurance (I 5). One of the conspirators' main opponents, especially of Catilina, is Cicero (who appears in two sequences of scenes: II 6–7; III 1–6); his assassination is planned at the start of the play (I 1), but fails as a result of Fulvia's betrayal (II 2), as in the historical record (cf. Sall. *Cat.* 28.1–3): Catilina is annoyed that Cicero obtained the consulship of 63 BCE instead of him, especially since Catilina and other characters regard Cicero as a weak, learned and loquacious person, coming from outside Rome (e.g. I 1, Catilina: 'L'onor supremo / Mi fu disdetto, e trapassò a decoro / D'un vile greco scolarretto, un roco / Mormorator di Curia, il Tullio imbelles / Municipal d' Arpiano.'; I 3, Sempronia: 'Il solo Tullio, / Lingua loquace, tremorosa e imbelles / Con una man di Cavalieri ingordi / Contro ci sta; ...'; I 5, Catilina: 'Mi fu prescelto / Un greco scolarretto, un inquilino / Vile di Roma, il linguaccinto Tullio'). This opposition comes mainly to the fore during a confrontation at a meeting of the senate: the drama's

Cicero delivers a long speech against Catilina, inspired by the *First Catilinarian Oration* of the historical Cicero; the senators side with Cicero, and Catilina eventually leaves the senate (III 1). Thereupon Cicero is relieved and believes that the republic, the senators and himself have been saved (III 2).

The conflict is made more complex and presented in a more nuanced way since the opposition between Catilina and Cicero is not the only one: the plot includes a confrontation between the conservative father M. Fulvio and his son A. Fulvio, who supports the conspirators, and a low-level rivalry between Catilina's wife Aurelia Orestilla (cf. Sall. *Cat.* 15.2) and the Roman lady Sempronia (cf. Sall. *Cat.* 25), who fully supports Catilina and is loved by A. Fulvio (I 3–4; II 3). Cesare's role is ambiguous since he sympathizes with the conspirators (I 5), but appears as the defender of law and order in the senate (III 2). After Catilina has left the senate, to continue the fight from outside Rome, Cicero moves that thanks be rendered to the immortal gods, Catilina and his followers be declared public enemies and armies be sent against them: Cesare questions whether this is the correct response; he argues that reacting with force does not agree with the ideals of the Roman republic; he would only accept the perpetrators being brought to trial (III 2). Cicero voiced a similar view in private earlier (II 7), but does not promote it in the senate. Eventually, with Catone's support, Cicero's proposal wins in the senate (III 2); yet his political methods have been shown to be problematic. At the same time, however, Cicero seems to be more in tune with the current mood than Cesare: Cesare is attacked as a supporter of Catilina because people do not distinguish between his upholding principles and defending particular individuals (III 3–5). Historically, a similar conflict arose concerning the action to be taken with regard to the arrested conspirators (Cic. *Cat.* 4; Sall. *Cat.* 50.3–53.1); since in the drama the controversy is moved forward to an earlier point in time, when there would be more options for alternative ways forward, Cicero's stance might seem more single-minded and less statesman-like. Yet, within the drama it is Cicero who rescues Cesare by his power of office though the father Fulvio remains critical of this measure (III 5).

M. Fulvio is described as 'padre austero e fanatico' in the list of characters and as a lunatic by other figures in the play; still, he has strong traditional values (II 5–6; III 3; IV 7) in that he regards support for the state and the country as more important than family loyalty. Fulvio

eventually kills his own son, who had left Rome with the conspirators and had been followed by his father (in the tradition of the founder of the Roman republic L. Brutus, who ordered the death of his sons, who were involved in attacking the newly found republic). Cicero does not agree with this extreme form of loyalty to the country; when, still in Rome, the father intended to kill the son, he prevented it (II 6; III 3). This conflict (only alluded to in a few other plays) has apparently been developed from notes in the ancient sources that a Fulvius, a son of a senator, was killed by his father (Sall. *Cat.* 39.5; Val. Max. 5.8.5; Cass. Dio 37.36.4). When, at the end of the play, M. Fulvio rejoices (V 5), rather than Cicero (who has disappeared from the plot by that stage) or the senators, and proclaims that Rome has been saved and crime has found its due sad outcome (M. Fulvio: 'Esulta o Roma! Alfine / Tu salva sei! Comprendete o mortali, / Che il delitto non mai mena al trionfo, / Ma di sè lascia con ruina orrenda / Un fin lugubre e una memoria infame. / Vindici Numi, alfin placate siete!'), the impact is ambiguous since by killing his son he himself has committed what could be called a crime.

Ultimately, what wins is tradition and a particular view of what is a crime and what is not (as shared by Cicero). Yet, for the political issues no solution is found: Catilina has been stopped, but the consul Cicero has not taken any action to resolve tensions in the republic. On the contrary, he has increased them by prematurely declaring the conspirators as public enemies. As a whole, the drama provides an analysis of the historical situation when it is difficult for the individuals to find clear shared moral standpoints. Although the author shows himself in command of detailed knowledge of Roman history, he combines historical facts with unhistorical developments in order to convey the intended message more vividly.

#### 4.52 Francesco Paolo de Chiara, *Catilina* (1882)

##### *Context*

Precise details about the life of Francesco Paolo de Chiara cannot be established. He wrote other plays about characters from ancient Roman history in the same period (*Tiberio*, 1882; *Agrippina*, 1883), which were equally published in Foggia.<sup>285</sup> He is described as 'Dottor . . . da Foggia' on the title page of all these dramas.



*Bibliographical information*

text:

CATILINA | TRAGEDIA | DEL | DOTTOR FRANCESCO PAOLO DE CHIARA | DA FOGGIA | FOGGIA | TIP. DOMENICA PASCARELLI | 1882.

[available at: <http://www.internetculturale.it/opencms/opencms/it/viewItemMag.jsp?id=oai%3Awww.internetculturale.sbn.it%2FTeca%3A20%3ANT0000%3AFOG0215361&mode=all&teca=MagTeca+-+ICCU>]

characters:

*INTERLOCUTORI*: CICERONE | CATILINA | ANTONIO | CETEGO | CRASSO | LENTULO | Volturcio | Lucio Tarquinio | Umbreno | *Patrizii* | *Cavalieri romani* | *Un senatore*, congiurati | *Un tribuno* | *Senatori* | *Popolo* | *Littori* | *Congiurati plebei* | *Congiurati popolani* | *Due Legati Allobrogi* | *Un Littore* | *Un cittadino*

*Comment*

This play dramatizes the Catilinarian Conspiracy in 63 BCE, covering the period from soon after the elections for the consulship of 63 BCE until the end of 63 BCE, when – in line with the historical record (Cic. *Cat.* 4; Sall. *Cat.* 55) – the arrested conspirators are killed and – in contrast to the historical record (Sall. *Cat.* 60.7) – Catilina kills himself in Rome in front of Cicero, senators and the People (V 5).<sup>286</sup>

Unlike other pieces on the Catilinarian Conspiracy, this play has more emphasis on the political interaction between Cicero and his fellow consul Antonio (C. Antonius Hybrida), who is presented as a negative character: he first promises to support Catilina (just as Crasso does [II 3]) by prompting the tribune Rullo (P. Servilius Rullus, tr. pl. 63 BCE) to put forward an agrarian law (cf. Cic. *Leg. agr.* 1–3) to place the new consul Cicero in an awkward position (II 2). When Cicero offers Antonio a better province (cf. Sall. *Cat.* 26.4), he secures the promise that he will support Cicero and oppose Rullo's bill (II 4). In a conversation with Catilina, Antonio then acts dishonestly and does not reveal his decision and his true view of the situation (II 5).

As Antonio realizes (II 6), Catilina is driven by feelings of revenge towards Cicero. The assembly of the conspirators in the first scene confirms a sense of community by oaths of loyalty and victory (I 1). At the meeting

of the senate called by Cicero, after he has learned of the conspiracy, Catilina understands that the majority of the senate and the People support Cicero: when Catilina tells his men to attack Cicero and the senators, the People stop them; then Cicero sends Catilina out of the senate (III 3–5). As a result, Catilina decides to resort to armed fighting (IV 1).

By contrast, Cicero is presented as the superior statesman; he saves the republic from a group of people, whose aims are shown to be problematic and who eventually choose force to confront others and push through their goals. What distinguishes Cicero positively from his opponents is that the details of the conspiracy are revealed to him by a tribune (rather than by Q. Curius' mistress Fulvia acting as a traitor as elsewhere), who assures him that all the hope of the republic is placed in Cicero (III 1). By means of the documents that Cicero can produce with the help of the ambassadors of the Gallic tribe of the Allobroges (cf. Cic. *Cat.* 3.4–6; Sall. *Cat.* 40–41; 44–45), he is able to make the conspirators in Rome admit their guilt and arrest them (V 2). The scene, in which a lictor brings another conspirator, Lucio Tarquinio (cf. Sall. *Cat.* 48.3–9), who reveals further plans of the conspirators to kill senators, has Cicero's suggestion of the death penalty appear as a logical consequence and less arbitrary; the senators agree, although they become terrified when Cicero gives the order (V 3). In the end Catilina kills himself without accepting any guilt, just to avoid Cicero's revenge. Cicero thus emerges as the saviour of the republic and is acclaimed as father of Rome (V 5). This ending confirms the presentation of the figure of Cicero throughout this drama.

#### 4.53 Karl (August) Bleibtreu, *Größenwahn: Catilina* (1888)

##### *Context*

Karl (August) Bleibtreu (1859–1928), a son of the painter Georg Bleibtreu (1828–1892), is known as the main representative of naturalism in German literature. After some years serving as a journal editor, he started to work as a freelance writer and wrote dramas, novels and theoretical pieces about literature. He had an aggressive and dogmatic style and thus made a lot of enemies.

In 1888 Bleibtreu published a novel in three volumes, entitled *Größenwahn. Pathologischer Roman* ('*Megalomania. Pathological Novel*'). It includes a fragment of a drama on Catiline in the third volume (book

10, chapter 3), allegedly as a spontaneous composition of one of the characters (Leonhart), when he is invited by another character to accompany him to visit socialist circles. On that occasion Catilina and his fellow conspirators come to his mind; he regards them as debauched criminals, intent on revenge and pleasure, who conspire against the community of happy people; there are also noble women, who support the conspiracy financially in order to make a profit when the state goes bust.<sup>287</sup>

### *Bibliographical information*

text:

Karl Bleibtreu, *Größenwahn. Pathologischer Roman*, Band 3, Leipzig 1888 (reprints) (pp. 87–111).

{available e.g. at: <http://www.zeno.org/Literatur/M/Bleibtreu,+Karl/Roman/Größenwahn/Dritter+Band/Zehntes+Buch/3.>}

characters:

(no separate list of characters; the following are mentioned in scene headings and as speakers:) Antonius junior; Antonius maior; Caesar; Catilina; Cato; Cethegus; Cicero; Clodius Pulcher; Crassus junior; Crassus maior; Faustus Sulla junior; Fulvia; Lentulus; Lucull; Metellus; Pompeia; Sempronius; Sulla minor; Terentia

### *Comment*

This dramatic fragment is set just before the consular elections for 63 BCE, yet with the Catilinarian Conspiracy in full swing. The series of locations (soiree at Crassus' place; atrium in Caesar's house; Fulvia's boudoir) as well as the interactions among the characters do not follow the historically attested sequence of events. The fragment ends with a scene in which Catilina, along with some of the other conspirators, hears the signal for the final round of voting, and the others acclaim Catilina, who had already called himself master of the world, as emperor who will win (pp. 110–111).

There are no clear distinctions between those conspirators who wish to obtain power for themselves (because they have no money or, like Catilina, feel rejected by society) and those who have money (like Crassus) or power (like Caesar); all of them speak and act in the same way without any moral orientation. Thus, Caesar exploits P. Clodius

Pulcher's attempted advances to Caesar's wife Pompeia and blackmails him (pp. 103–104); he promises Catilina to support him under certain conditions, including that Catilina will arrange for Caesar to win the next consulship, although he had already decided for himself that Catilina was an obstacle to his career (pp. 104–107). The female figures too are morally problematic: Pompeia feels that she is out of step with the times in her reluctance to yield to Clodius; Cicero's wife Terentia, however, who is in favour of freedom of speech and the right to vote for women, openly admits that she is committing adultery (p. 102).

In contrast to Caesar's rational calculations and Catilina's mad claims, Cicero's motives are not presented in detail. It is obvious, though, that he is keen to become consul; only Cato clearly supports this aim. Both men appear just twice, together in both cases (pp. 91; 98): to indicate the link between the two, a famous quote from the historical Cicero's *First Catilinarian Oration* (Cic. *Cat.* 1.2) is put (in German) into Cato's mouth: *o tempora, o mores* (pp. 92; 103). With respect to the critical situation of the republic lamented by him, Cicero voices abuse against the Catilinarians in front of Caesar, which the latter soon qualifies derisively as 'rhetoric' (p. 99). Lucull (presumably L. Licinius Lucullus, known as a wealthy gourmet) had called Cicero 'Ein Unmann! Dieser eunuchische Wortekrämer –' (p. 92); others feel that it is Terentia, his manly half, who is writing Cicero's speeches (pp. 89–90). Cethegus had addressed Cicero ironically as 'Retter des Vaterlandes' (p. 91). This title is used in an unattested context; it contributes to characterizing Cicero as a juggler of words and a helpless representative of old morals, who is merely able to lament and to produce empty rhetoric, in contrast to those taking action. Thus, Cicero's role as the opponent of Catilina has been retained, just as an allusion to the conflict with Clodius and to interaction with Fulvia (who elsewhere reveals information about the conspiracy to Cicero), but his significance as a politician and orator can only be seen in ironic reversal; his appearances are too ineffective to create a contrast to the widespread immorality.

The dramatic fragment may function as a comment on contemporary circumstances and an indirect critical portrait of 'socialist circles'; yet an explicit connection to the situation described in the introduction to the piece is not established.

4.54 Adolf Bartels, *Catilina* (1892)*Context*

Adolf Bartels (1862–1945), the German poet, journalist and writer, is known for his nationalistic views and anti-Semitism. He attended the grammar school in Meldorf (in Schleswig-Holstein, Germany), but left before the final exam since his father could no longer afford the fees. Bartels then worked as a tutor and writer to earn money; this enabled him to attend the universities of Leipzig and then Berlin. There he enrolled for law and politics, but mainly focused on literature, history and philosophy; he never formally graduated. He wrote novels, dramas, articles for magazines and newspapers and pieces of literary history and literary criticism.

For his historical drama *Catilina* (as for *Die Päpstin Johanna*) Bartels could not find a publisher. Because of his deteriorating health he felt that he might die soon; therefore, in 1904/05, he published his complete works, which include *Catilina*. Bartels recovered and continued to write until his death in 1945. He became a supporter of nationalistic ideology and argued against 'bad' and 'Jewish' literature, which was not necessarily identical for him. On the occasion of Bartels' eightieth birthday in 1942, his friend and pupil Hans Severus Ziegler (1893–1978), director of the Deutsches Nationaltheater und Staatskapelle in Weimar from 1936 and also a supporter of nationalistic ideology, had Bartels' early drama *Catilina* performed for the first time.

*Catilina* is printed in a volume of 'Roman tragedies'; the others deal with events taking place in Rome after classical antiquity (*Die Päpstin Johanna*; *Der Sacco*). According to the preface (p. VII) *Catilina* was written in the south German town of Lahr between 15 March and 11 June 1892 and only shown to friends until it was published in the edition of the complete works; allegedly, it was merely lightly revised before publication (p. VIII). The sources for the plot are identified as Cicero's speeches, Sallust's monograph *De coniuratione Catilinae*, Plutarch's *Lives* as well as the *History of Rome* (first published in German, in three volumes, in 1854, 1855, 1856) by the German classicist Theodor Mommsen (1817–1903; see ch. 2.2). Bartels claims that he had the initial idea for this piece during his school days, but that he felt encouraged by the novel *Nirwana. Drei Bücher aus der Geschichte Frankreichs* (1877) by Wilhelm Herman Jensen (1837–1911) and by a comment of

Christian Friedrich Hebbel (1813–1863), who disdained Cicero and was more interested in Catilina. Bartels also mentions as a possibility that familiarity with Friedrich Nietzsche's (1844–1900) *Jenseits von Gut und Böse* (1886) might have influenced the drama.<sup>288</sup>

According to the author, the play is meant to address social questions (p. VIII). He praises its historical perspective, dramatic structure and characterization of the figures, but acknowledges less success in details. He apologizes that he had to present the times as they were, somewhat morally degenerate, but he claims to be satisfied with the piece, which he describes as his own original work while the famous 'most modern' writers take such material from the 'old Greeks and Englishmen'; he expresses confidence that the play is released at a timely moment to enhance the role of historical drama (pp. VIII–X).

### *Bibliographical information*

text:

Adolf Bartels, *Catilina*. | Tragödie in fünf Akten, in: *Gesammelte Dichtungen* | von | Adolf Bartels | Fünfter Band: | *Römische Tragödien* | München | Verlag von Georg D. W. Callwey | 1905 (pp. 157–325).

{available at: <https://archive.org/details/AdolfBartelsGesammelteDichtungen5Bd1905>}

characters:

Personen: Lucius Sergius Catilina. | Aurelia Orestilla, seine Gemahlin. | Cajus, sein Sohn erster Ehe. | Cajus Julius Caesar. | Marcus Crassus. | Publius Cornelius Lentulus Sura, Senator; Publius Autronius, Senator; Lucius Cassius Longinus, Senator; Quintus Curius, Senator; Cajus Cethegus, Ritter; Lucius Statilius, Ritter; Publius Gabinius Capito, Ritter; Cajus Manlius, Centurio, Verschworene. | Marcus Tullius Cicero, Consul. | Terentia, seine Gemahlin. | Quintus Metellus Scipio, Quintus Lutatius Catulus, Marcus Porcius Cato, Optimaten. | Sempronia. | Fulvia. | Römische Senatoren und Ritter. | Bürger. | Proletarier. | Sklaven Catilinas, darunter ein Aufseher, ein Kellermeister, ein Gallier, ein Cimber, ein Grieche (Eumolpos).

### *Comment*

For this play the time of the action is given as 62 BCE though most of the plot (apart perhaps from the fighting at the end) takes places in 63 BCE:

Cicero and C. Antonius Hybrida are consuls; Catilina is standing as a candidate for the consulship for a third time (II 4; III 2);<sup>289</sup> elections for the consulship of 62 BCE are held, with D. Iunius Silanus and L. Licinius Murena being elected (II 5). In some scenes Cicero looks back on the success of his consulship so far (II 1). Thus, in fact, a vague date towards the end of 63 into the beginning of 62 BCE appears to be envisaged for the plot.<sup>290</sup>

Clearly, Bartels made use of the sources indicated in the preface. The historical facts are mostly retained, even though some details are merely mentioned in reports. Catilina's death too is described indirectly, and the play does not end with his death, but with the Roman lady Sempronia killing herself (V 10), as she has been given an enhanced role in comparison with the historical record (cf. Sall. *Cat.* 25) and has followed Catilina to his army (V 7–10). Throughout the play, scenes developed beyond or added to the historical record dominate the plot. For instance, as Sallust reports, Catilina kills his son from a previous marriage for the sake of his new wife Orestilla (Sall. *Cat.* 15.2); here there is a preceding confrontation between father and son (I 3–6): the son sees no sense in life for him; he, trying to uphold morals and a true family tradition, suffers from being virtually abandoned in the house of his criminal father and is appalled at the debauched situation there and in Rome. He almost asks to be killed; the trigger for the eventual murder is the son's claim that Orestilla is betraying Catilina, including an affair with the son (I 5). Orestilla denies a relationship with the son, but approves of his death (I 6). Later Catilina regrets having killed his son for Orestilla, but immediately afterwards he believes that with this deed he has removed any residual feeling of conscience and is now ready to attack Rome (I 6). Catilina had admitted to being a robber, murderer, lecher and guilty of high treason in conversation with his son (I 5). His ultimate aim is the complete destruction of Rome since he regards the city as weak, degenerate and run down (I 6; III 4; IV 5).

This Catilina, who lives according to his own moral values, is complemented by two figures representing alternatives, the conspirator Cethegus (C. Cornelius Cethegus) and Caesar. At the meeting of the conspirators, which ends with the oath for Catilina, Catilina has Cethegus deliver the motivating speech: Cethegus sketches a vision that the conspirators could free Rome from the claim to power of the

long-standing nobility, distributing influence and wealth among themselves by inheritance and ‘clever trade’, that they, being young and strong heroes, could achieve freedom, wealth and honour for themselves (I 8). Cethegus would like to achieve justice and win the power to rule in Rome; Catilina has difficulties motivating him to participate in the destruction of Rome, by outlining that a hero and a criminal are essentially the same, merely defined by the respective circumstances (III 4). Caesar, who, along with Crassus, initially supports the conspiracy in the background (I 7), agrees with Catilina in the analysis of the situation: the traditional system of *optimates* and *populares* is no longer fit for purpose; yet he would prefer winning power in Rome to destroying it. He is thinking of ruling as ‘*primus inter pares*’ with power, though without a crown (foreshadowing his later path to dictatorship). Caesar regards Catilina’s plan to kill the senators and to put Rome on fire as the wrong method; in his view Rome is much more, namely an idea, a political concept. Since Caesar believes that Catilina does not have enough support among the populace and an army is required, he turns away from Catilina (IV 5).

The true political opponent of Catilina is the consul Cicero, as a result of his position; in this play, however, Cicero appears as weak and focused on himself. This becomes particularly obvious in the scenes in which he interacts with his wife Terentia. She remarks critically that a consul should not offer beautiful orations, but should rather accomplish deeds (II 1), and calls his intervention in the senate that of a ‘half man’ (V 3). This role of Terentia, who is not impressed by Cicero’s references to his orations on the proposal of an agrarian law (Cic. *Leg. agr.* 1–3) and the tactical move of exchanging provinces with his consular colleague (II 1), develops a remark by Plutarch on Terentia’s ambition (Plut. *Cic.* 20.1–3). Terentia prompts Cicero to decisive actions, suggesting, for instance, that he should listen to Fulvia, who betrays the conspiracy out of greed (II 1–2), and that he should support the death penalty for the conspirators (V 3). After Fulvia’s revelations Q. Lutatius Catulus asks Cicero to call the senate immediately (II 3). Cicero’s reaction to these decisions is the thought of his own reputation (II 3; V 3). That Cicero arrives for the elections in body armour and with a group of knights protecting him (II 6; cf. Cic. *Mur.* 52; Plut. *Cic.* 14.7–8; Cass. Dio 37.29.4) agrees with the portrait of a fearful consul, as some ordinary people see him; one of them says in view of the deliberations about the captured conspirators: ‘Cato und Catulus sind obenauf, / Selbst Cicero



hat Mut.' (V 1). Still, when Cicero has announced that the conspirators are dead, he is praised by Cato as 'Vater des Vaterlands' for having saved Rome (V 5; cf. Plut. *Cic.* 22.5–7); Caesar comments ironically: 'Siehst du, der große Cicero ist fertig.'

As a result, Cicero does not appear as an impressive figure although he is given a great speech, inspired by the historical Cicero's *First Catilinarian Oration* (III 8). This negative attitude to Cicero is even voiced in a remark by Sempronia, which transcends the play: 'Wär' nur die allerunaustehlichste / Schulmeisterseele Roms, der Cicero, / Den man mit Unrecht uns als Redner preist, / Der er doch bloß ein großer Schwätzer ist, / Nicht so davongekommen!' and 'Doch mir gefällt die Musterhaftigkeit / Der Sprache nicht, ich will vor allem Leben. / Allein ich seh' das Elend kommen: Cicero / Wird Herr und Meister werden, alle, alle / Schulmeister künfft'ger Tage seine Schüler, / Und jeder starke Geist von ihm geknechtet. / O töte ihn! Du tötest nicht bloß ihn, / Auch noch ein Dutzend ungeschrieb'ner Werke, / Unzähliger Geschlechter grause Qual!' (III 2).

'Social questions' (preface, p. VIII) are brought to the fore in scenes in which ordinary people talk about their situation and their attitude towards the various politicians; there are obvious divisions between the social classes of the senators and the People. At any rate the figure of the great criminal Catilina takes centre stage; his activities are not guided by laws and morals, but rather by his abilities and opportunities (Catilina in III 4: 'Der Mensch darf alles tun, was er vermag. '; 'Der Held und der Verbrecher stehn sich gleich, / Die Zeit alleine macht den Unterschied, / In die sie fallen.'). This view is probably influenced by ideas from Nietzsche's *Jenseits von Gut und Böse*.

#### 4.55 Carl Theodor Curti, *Catilina* (1892)

##### *Context*

Carl Theodor Curti (1848–1914) was a Swiss politician and journalist. Curti studied first medicine and later law and philosophy in Geneva, Zurich and Würzburg (in Germany). Curti started his career as a journalist in Germany at the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, then worked for the liberal *Sankt Galler Zeitung* in Switzerland and later returned to the *Frankfurter Zeitung* (1873–1879); yet he experienced political difficulties because of his support for democracy and the freedom of the press. Therefore, he went back to Switzerland; there he was one of the

founders of the *Zürcher Post* and became one of its main editors until 1894. From 1881 to 1902 Curti was a member of the Swiss National Council and also served in other political offices: Curti campaigned for the expansion of the welfare state and elements of direct democracy; he supported better protection for workers, and he argued for the nationalization of key industries. From 1902 until 1914 he returned to Germany as editor of the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, after he had adopted German citizenship.

Curti wrote political treatises as well as a novel (*Johann Elmer*, 1876, published under the pseudonym Carl Schoenburg)<sup>291</sup> and dramatic poetry. His works include another drama about a 'conspiracy' in the past (set in Zurich): *Hans Waldmann oder die Verschwörung von 1489* (1883/89).

There is no evidence that *Catilina* was ever performed. The play has an unusual shape since there is alternation between prose and verse (for the long speeches), and the acts are not divided into scenes.

### *Bibliographical information*

text:

Catilina. | Ein Trauerspiel | von | Theodor Curti. | Zürich, | Th. Schröter. | 1892.

{available at: <http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/~db/0010/bsb00105897/images/>}

characters:

Personen: Lucius Sergius Catilina, Publius Cornelius Lentulus Sura, Gajus Cethegus, Lucius Varguntejus, Publius Gabinius Capito, Lucius Statilius, Quintus Caepacius, Verschworene, wovon Catilina, Cethegus und Varguntejus Senatoren sind. | Gajus Manlius, ein Kriegshauptmann, Mitverschworener. | Marcus Tullius Cicero, Consul. | Quintus Lutatius Catulus, Vorsitzender des Senats. | Marcus Porcius Cato der Jüngere, Gajus Julius Caesar, Gajus Scribonius Curio, Senatoren. | Marcus Petrejus, Quintus Metellus Celer, Kriegsobersten. | Erster, Zweiter Gesandter der Allobroger. | Orestilla, Geliebte Catilina's. | Tertullia, Gemahlin des Lentulus. | Fulvia, eine römische Dame. | Titus, ein Bote. | Tiro, Cicero's Schnellschreiber. | Quintus, ein Senatsdiener. | Mavors, ein Krieger. | Erster, Zweiter, Dritter Bürger. | Erster, Zweiter Sklave. | Erster, Zweiter Krieger. | Senatoren. Bürger. Sklaven. Krieger. Volk.

*Comment*

The time of this play's plot is given as 'around 5 December 63 BCE', when the Catilinarian Conspiracy was in full swing and about to be suppressed.<sup>292</sup> The plot follows the historical sequence vaguely, since it includes a meeting of the senate in the Temple of Jupiter (II), a meeting of the conspirators in the house of P. Cornelius Lentulus Sura and the alliance with the Gallic tribe of the Allobroges, who are reported as having been caught with the conspirators' letters immediately afterwards (III), Catilina's flight and the sentencing of the captured conspirators (IV) as well as activity in the military camp near Pistoria (modern Pistoia), the final battle and Catilina's death (V). This course of events is mainly presented from the perspective of the conspirators, of the populace, of the women Orestilla (here a prostitute, whom Catilina wants to marry), Fulvia (here the beloved of C. Scribonius Curio, with confusion of two Roman Fulviae) and Tertullia (here the unattested wife of Lentulus) and also of Cicero's scribe Tiro. The play is apparently meant less to provide an accurate historical portrait rather than to convey a political message.

Soon after the appearance of *Catilina*, the genre of historical drama and two examples composed by Carl Theodor Curti were discussed in the social democratic journal *Die Neue Zeit* by the political theorist and politician Eduard Bernstein (1850–1932).<sup>293</sup> According to Bernstein, the reason why historical dramas were not too popular in his time was that playwrights were no longer able to use their imagination freely for the necessary adaptation of the historical subject matter and that neither veneration of heroes nor glorification of villains was accepted without qualification. He felt that Curti had overcome these difficulties since he did not follow the biased reporting of Cicero or Sallust (like other intellectuals of the period attracted by socialist ideas, Bernstein was critical of Cicero), while, at the same time, he did not idealize Catilina or the People. Bernstein praised Curti for presenting social and political conflicts by dramatizing the situation in ancient Rome as a parallel to the present situation.

Indeed, Curti exploits historical events to illustrate political mechanisms. Thus, he introduces the fictional character of Titus, who acts as the messenger of the conspirators and explains to Catilina why he and others have joined the conspiracy: Titus was motivated by cheap grain imports from Africa and the expansion of huge landed estates,

which have destroyed his livelihood as a small subsistence farmer and got him into debt (I, pp. 10–11). Moreover, the historical C. Cornelius Cethegus here is a young man, who, during the meeting of the senate in the Temple of Jupiter (II), is informed by Catilina about how the individual senators are enriching themselves and manipulating public procedures. In this context Catilina speaks negatively about Sallust, who supports Caesar, but hides his intention in his historical writings (II, p. 17). Catilina further explains to Cethegus that the great speeches delivered are not decisive, rather the arrangements made in advance and the conversations at the fringes (II, p. 15). The manipulation of public opinion is also shown by means of the figure of Cicero's scribe Tiro, who is a character in the play: as Tiro took down Cato's speech arguing for the death penalty of the captured conspirators in the senate, Cicero has Tiro recite this oration in public; Tiro regards this as a clever idea of Cicero (IV, p. 44). Moreover, the senatorial party is shown as not even respecting the dead: the play ends with the general Petrejus granting Tertullia the burial of the rest of Catilina's body, but claiming the head (V, p. 65).

In contrast to many other dramas about him, this play's Catilina is not depicted as an arch-villain, even if his misdeeds are not denied; for Catilina regrets that what he did in his youth was due to the 'Wirrungen des Zeitalters und seine Versuchungen', but claims that he is now changed (I, p. 8). This development is already shown in the first act by Catilina's interest in the social situation of his followers and by his plan to marry Orestilla despite her background (cf. Sall. *Cat.* 15.2). By contrast, he rejects the noble and lascivious Fulvia, who wishes to rekindle his interest in her for expediency (I, pp. 5–6); this reaction by Catilina provokes her betrayal of the conspiracy to Cicero (I, p. 14; IV, pp. 38–39).

Since the meeting of the senate at which a *senatus consultum ultimum* was decreed and the one a few weeks later at which the historical Cicero delivered the *First Catilinarian Oration*, asking Catilina to leave the city of Rome, have been combined (II), Catilina, present in the senate, is not only the experienced commentator for Cethegus, while the senators' bad behaviour confirms his negative views of their moral attitude and he reveals Cicero's unlawful procedure (II, p. 24), but he also ultimately triumphs over the senators: he leaves Rome for Etruria, as he had decided previously (I; III). At the meeting in Lentulus' house Catilina involves

the other conspirators in planning the next steps; his main personal concern is for Orestilla, whom he hands over into the care of Lentulus' wife Tertullia (III).

Catilina does not appear in the fourth act, but the reactions among the People demonstrate that he is more popular than other politicians, especially since the killing of the captured conspirators is against Roman laws in their views. At the same time the People behave in an opportunistic manner: they accept the sponsored torches distributed for a torch procession to honour Cicero (with the secret intention to use them for setting the houses of the noblemen on fire in the event of Catilina's victory), and many of them shout 'Heil Cicero! Heil dem Consul! Heil dem Vater des Vaterlandes!' (IV, p. 52).

In the final act Catilina delivers an encouraging speech to his men before the battle: he regrets that the state has become the prey of a few, who live comfortable lives, while they have lost their citizen rights and are not respected; but they will oppose this situation; once consul, he will turn them into masters (V, pp. 56–58). In response, just before the battle, an old soldier called Mavors (Mars) confronts Catilina in order to kill him, since he claims that Catilina has appropriated power like the senators; he asserts that only the People should lead an army or the country and that only a poor man (not a nobleman like Catilina) is able to help the poor (V, pp. 61–62). Eventually Catilina kills this man, though he is affected by his words. Catilina believes that one may only rule the masses if they regard the leader as selfless; he still believes that he has chosen an honourable task and merely expects death in the decisive battle. Even their military opponents admire the courageous fighting of the conspirators. Cicero's consular colleague Antonius (C. Antonius Hybrida), who had withdrawn from the battle due to illness and thus appears as a representative of the old system, now plans to enter Rome as imperator.

In comparison with the portrayal of the drama's Catilina, Cicero's presentation is more negative, and he only appears in a few scenes. Cicero is seen delivering a speech at the meeting of the senate in the Temple of Jupiter (II, pp. 20–22), but, unhistorically, the chair of the meeting is Q. Lutatius Catulus (consul 78, censor 65 BCE) rather than the consul. It is also Catulus who announces to the People that the killing of the conspirators saved Rome. This deed is ascribed to the senate; Cicero is singled out for his vigilance. In response, Cicero first wishes special praise to be given to Cato; but when, on Catulus' suggestion, Cicero is declared

'father of the country', he starts to praise himself, even suggesting that the gods have directed his actions (IV, pp. 50–52), as the historical Cicero is thought to have done in his epic on his consulship. The self-praise of the drama's Cicero is put into perspective when C. Scribonius Curio, the lover to whom Fulvia has returned, publicly highlights her share in uncovering the conspiracy ('Fulvia, die Freundin der Guten!'), whereupon she is praised by many (IV, pp. 52–53).

Even Cicero's qualities as an orator are questioned: Catilina acknowledges that Cicero is able to express every ordinary thought well, yet he regards his speeches rather as hollow words and feels that the speech in the senate was full of fear and cowardice (II, p. 23; III, p. 30). By contrast, he claims that his own speeches focus on matters at issue (II, p. 23), and Tertullia calls Catilina a great speaker (III, p. 29). Only Tiro praises Cicero as the greatest orator, whereupon others comment that Tiro is Cicero's slave (IV, p. 41). That Tiro regards Cicero's measure to have Cato's speech read out (cf. also Cic. *Att.* 12.21.1) as a clever tactic also indirectly characterizes Cicero (IV, p. 44). Such a procedure agrees with the situation that at the meeting of the senate the historical Cicero apparently did not directly support the death penalty, but commented on the positions of Silanus (maximum penalty) and of Caesar (detention) (IV, p. 41), as indicated by the historical Cicero's *Fourth Catilinarian Oration*. This behaviour of the play's Cicero contrasts with the strict adherence to principles on the part of Cato, who represents traditional Romanness: he believes that their ancestors achieved their successes by 'eifrige Arbeit daheim, gerechte Verwaltung in den Provinzen, Unparteilichkeit und ein Sinn, der weder der Bosheit noch der Leidenschaft fröhnt' (IV, p. 43). With this view Cato is isolated; even his sister participates in the corrupt life of the nobility, as is confirmed by a love letter from Servilia delivered to Caesar during the meeting of the senate (IV, p. 47). Cicero is regarded as an 'Emporkömmling' by Catilina (II, p. 18), but he shows himself as congenial to the nobility in his behaviour.

#### 4.56 Mariano Vittori, *Lucio Sergio Catilina* (1894)

##### *Context*

About the Italian writer Mariano Vittori hardly anything can be established. His drama *Lucio Sergio Catilina* was published in 1894; a drama entitled *Caio Caligola* appeared in 1909.

*Bibliographical information*

text:

MARIANO VITTORI | LUCIO SERGIO CATILINA | DRAMMA  
IN TRE ATTI ED EPILOGO | CON NOTE STORICHE | BOLOGNA  
| DITTA NICOLA ZANICHELLI | (CESARE E GIACOMO ZANI-  
CHELLI) | MXCGCXIV.

characters:

PERSONAGGI: L. SERGIO CATILINA. | VALERIA ORESTILLA  
[\* Storicamente Aurelia Orestilla]. | FABIA, Vestale. | MEGAREA, liberta  
greca. | FULVIA, druda di | CURIO. | IL GOBBO ERCOLE, schiavo nano  
greco. | C. SALLUSTIO CRISPO. | M. TULLIO CICERONE, Console. |  
CORNELIO, veterano di Mario. | CESARE – CRASSO – CETEGO –  
LENTULO – STATILIO – CASSIO LONGINO. | Congiurati. Matrone. Sicari.  
Militi. Littori. Uno schiavo cubiculario.

*Comment*

This play, named after Catiline, is set around the Catilinarian Conspiracy in 63 BCE: the three acts cover the last two months of this year while the epilogue is set in January 62 BCE. The action thus concentrates on the final stages of the Conspiracy, but does not focus on the political situation only. Since the play includes fictional (ordinary) characters and features love affairs between different individuals (Catilina / Valeria; Crispo / Valeria; Curio / Fulvia), personal relationships are highlighted and linked to the political action. This is enhanced by the fact that the conflict between Cicero and Catilina is connected with Catilina's youthful illicit sexual relationship with the Vestal Virgin Fabia, a (half-) sister of Cicero's wife Terenzia (I 3; cf. Sall. *Cat.* 15.1; Asc. on Cic. *Tog. cand.*, p. 91 Clark). Thus, the piece ends in the third act with a heated confrontation between Valeria Orestilla (cf. Sall. *Cat.* 15.2) and Catilina concluded by Valeria's suicide (III 8). In the subsequent epilogue, set on the battlefield at Pistoria (modern Pistoia), Catilina meets Fabia carrying out a sacrifice; after confessing both his love and his guilt, Catilina dies in Fabia's arms. The addition of the hunchback Gobbo, who mocks and ridicules the action and other characters and even philosophizes on the situation and his fate (II 4–6; III 3), adds entertaining elements.

Cicero only appears in a single scene, when Catilina and Cicero have a long conversation about their political ideals and plans (III 7). Cicero had

requested a meeting by letter, which surprised Catilina since he assumed that Cicero believed the rumour that Catilina had fled Rome in fear (II 4, Catilina, when receiving the letter: 'Di Cicerone! [*Legge*]. "Marco Tullio a Lucio Sergio salute. Chiedo a te un colloquio sta notte." Strano! Dunque a lui è noto che sono in Roma e, insolito costume, à del coraggio!'). Catilina's reaction brings the political opposition directly to the fore, and it is implied that the conspiracy is at least partly directed against Cicero. In the dialogue between the two men Catilina cannot be convinced to abandon his rebellious plans; in conversation with Valeria he had already stated that in theory he could still step back from the conspiracy to save the degenerate city of Rome, but that would not agree with his character (I 3). When talking to Cicero, Catilina claims that he wants to support the people oppressed by the wealthy nobility, but Cicero regards his activities as rebellious and demagogic and wishes to preserve Rome in its traditional greatness. They cannot reach an agreement, and Cicero eventually leaves (III 7).

Catilina's supporters describe Cicero as a new man, and thus no match for the noble Catilina (I 3, Valeria: 'Un uomo nuovo, / inquilino di Roma, a te, romano, / illustre sangue di Sergesto, pose / il plebeo piede su la testa.'). and as an impressive orator who voices harangues and thereby has an impact on the People (II 2, Lentulo to Catilina: 'La fama di tua fuga corre Roma, / penetra ovunque, e Cicerone crede / fermamente che tu, sotto l'incubo / della paura, sia fuggito. Certo / così opina di te. Così s'espresse, / oggi, dinanzi al Popolo e al Senato. / Il popolo ascoltò le contumelie / che rabbiose dal labbro suo, si come / fiamme da una fucina, uscìro e, quando / con fiorita arte e con studiate / pompose frasi te dipinse tale, / qual Silla fu ne' luttuosi giorni, / il popol trascinato si rivolse, / maledicente a l'opre tue.'). Cicero's offer for conversation and his plans remain the only corrective of this rather stereotypical negative portrait. A more detailed impression of the character of Cicero does not emerge.

In the end the conspiracy has been stopped without having had any political effect; no prospects for the future are indicated. Nevertheless, the structure of the plot has shown that there is also a human dimension to the activities of the conspirators, especially since Catilina is aware of both his love and his guilt towards Fabia and they are eventually reunited as it were.

*While throughout the nineteenth century the large number of dramas produced demonstrates that playwrights were interested in the Catilinarian Conspiracy*



*and the role of the consul Cicero in this context, the twentieth century saw only a few more historical dramas on Cicero, in which the Catilinarian Conspiracy continues to be put on stage; in the second half of the century other aspects were also selected.*

#### 4.57 Samuel Lublinski, *Der Imperator* (1901)

##### *Context*

Samuel Lublinski (1868–1910) came from a secular German Jewish family. Since he had to leave school at an early age, he studied literature, history and philosophy extensively later by himself. He first worked as an antiquarian bookseller in Italy; after he had returned to Germany, he soon started to be active as a journalist, writer and literary critic (sometimes publishing under a pseudonym). Lublinski wrote essays, reviews, dramas and a literary history. His literary history in four volumes *Litteratur und Gesellschaft* (1899/1900) is regarded as one of the first socio-historical approaches to the material in the German-speaking world.

Lublinski's dramas were written in neoclassical style. Of his six plays, merely the last (*Kaiser and Kanzler*, 1910) was ever produced, though only after his death (1913). One of his other plays is also a dramatic presentation of figures from the ancient world: *Hannibal* (1902). *Der Imperator* was written between December 1897 and May 1900 and was published in 1901.

##### *Bibliographical information*

text:

Der Imperator. | Trauerspiel in fünf Aufzügen | von | S. Lublinski. | Begonnen Dezember 1897, vollendet Mai 1900. | Dresden und Leipzig | E. Pierson's Verlag | (R. Lincke, k. k. Hofbuchhändler) | 1901.

[available partly (with limited access) on HathiTrust Digital Library, Google Books]

characters:

Cajus Julius Cäsar, Diktator und Imperator in Rom | Calpurnia, seine Gemahlin | Servilia, Schwester Catos | Tertia, ihre Tochter, sechzehn Jahre alt | Pharnaces, König von Pontus | Gregorius von Milet | Curius, ein römischer Bürger | Cassius Scäva, ein Soldat | Philippus, Baumeister

| Artemidorus, Wahrsager | Balbus, Antonius, Anhänger Cäsars |  
 Dezimus Brutus, Kommandant von Cäsars Leibwache | Cicero | Markus  
 Brutus, Cassius, Casca, Metellus Cimber, Trebatius, Aquila Pontius,  
 Verschworene gegen Cäsar | Senatoren (darunter: der alte Senator,  
 zweiter Senator, Sallustius, Aulus Hirtius) | Sklaven

### *Comment*

The 'Imperator' of the play's title is C. Iulius Caesar.<sup>294</sup> In contrast to other dramas focusing on Caesar and involving Cicero, here the assassination is not the main feature of the plot (Cäsar survives until the end, though he foresees his impending assassination); the focus rather is on the political views and actions as prompted by Cäsar assuming an almost monarchical position, i.e. the conflict between an individual who intends to initiate something novel and the surroundings whose traditional system he will eventually destroy.<sup>295</sup>

The play is set in the 40s BCE shortly before Caesar's assassination on the Ides of March (15 March) 44 BCE. The drama thus comments on the development from the Roman republic to the principate as well as on the ambiguous character of each system: some figures are described as 'republicans' or 'the last republican' (e.g. II 9); Cäsar considers his position in relation to the senate in the sense of what kind of subservience and (almost) divine honours he can expect; there are supporters and opponents of Cäsar; at the same time Cäsar displays sensible policies, mildness and responsibility, which goes too far in the eyes of some of his supporters. The depiction of the political discussions of Cäsar's advisers and of his future assassins as well as the relationship to his wife Calpurnia and to Cato's sister Servilia, with whom he had an affair in the past (V 6–7), are therefore more prominent than the figure of Cicero. Naturally, because of the historical circumstances, in a play set in the 40s BCE Cicero does not have a leading political role in the same way as he had in his consular year when fighting Catiline.

Since the play opens after a first failed assassination attempt on Cäsar, the precariousness of his position is illustrated from the start and also his tyrannical behaviour, when the men responsible are condemned to death without trial (I 2–3). Later, however, Cäsar has second thoughts (I 7), and he sends his guards away because he is unhappy about how they treated his visitors and Roman citizens (II 1; II 4). Cäsar does not want divine honours, but wishes to be regarded as the eighth king of Rome

(II 3); he does not want to put on the diadem and the purple robe, but will demonstrate his power to the senators (II 10). He has created an empire to be passed on to Oktavianus (Octavian) (V 1); he takes steps to ensure his succession while he does not care whether he gets killed (V 8–12).

The most important controversial political issue in the play is that Cäsar is planning to settle Roman citizens all over the Roman empire and to give the citizenship to people in the provinces. This plan meets with opposition both from ordinary citizens as prospective settlers (I 6) and from magistrates (II 9); there are different views on what constitutes a Roman citizen and on the best way for the empire to survive. While Markus Brutus is shown as opposed to some of Cäsar's policies and aghast at Cäsar acting against the law, the appearance of (the fictional character) Gregorius of Miletus shows that Brutus extorted money in the provinces (II 8). Pharnaces, 'king of Pontus', complains about the pressure from Roman slave dealers (III 9). This Pharnaces must be the king of the *Regnum Bosporanum*, who was defeated by Caesar in 47 BCE; historically, a subsequent visit to Rome is not attested. Its introduction contributes to illustrating vividly the plight of the provinces.

As Cäsar admires Catilina among Romans of the past (I 5), and the fate of the Catilinarian conspirators informs his current behaviour (I 7), while some ordinary people compare him to Catilina (I 6; I 7), there is a link to one of Cicero's major enemies. Cicero appears in several scenes as an authoritative figure on both political and literary questions, to whom both sides attach significance, although they feel that he, as an old man, is becoming less important. Before Cicero enters for the first time, others mention that he had been left waiting in the antechamber for hours when he came to see Cäsar, which could create enmity (II 2–3). When Cicero appears, he is presented in a confrontational conversation with (Marcus) Antonius and Balbus, introduced as followers of Cäsar, where they reveal different attitudes to Cäsar and his policies (III 5). So, although the play is set before Caesar's assassination and Cicero's speeches delivered against Mark Antony, such a scene presumably alludes to their opposition. Cäsar himself is not involved in the conversation, and Cicero cannot be made to subscribe to the view that Cäsar caused the republic's death; even though Cicero does not agree with Cäsar's policy of extending Roman citizenship to all the provinces, he claims that he admires Cäsar. When Cicero

comments playfully on stories about the ancestors (III 6), the *princeps senatus* Cassius sees this as a sign of his old age and increasing unreliability; yet it is also a nod to the important role of the Roman ancestors in the historical Cicero's speeches and his awareness of his own lack of noble ancestors. Later, in response to a question from Brutus, Cicero confirms that he was left waiting; he explains that he interpreted this as a measure by which Cäsar educated them to be slaves and bore that for the sake of the country (III 7). This attitude might be an allusion to the fact that the historical Cicero remained quiet during Caesar's dictatorship and praised him (at least ostensibly) in the *Caesarean Orations*.

When Cicero describes the setting for the meeting of the senate as a theatre and the actions of the senators as a play (III 7), this is a metadramatic comment; it also demonstrates that the old republican conventions are being retained, albeit without real meaning. This impression is confirmed when, against opposition of the senators, Cäsar removes the speaker Trebatius and appoints Cicero instead (III 8). Trebatius could be the lawyer Trebatius Testa, who corresponded with Cicero and was said to be a friend of Caesar (Cic. *Fam.* 7.14). Cicero praises Cäsar as a god (while other senators laugh); this detail may again be a reflection of the historical *Caesarean Orations*. Under Cicero's lead they all swear an oath to protect Cäsar. Later, when Cicero meets Brutus and Cassius, Cicero recommends letting Cäsar live, but influencing his mind, and using the time to grow proper Romans. When the others do not agree, Cicero is aghast and fears for the republic, which will suffer under Cäsar or under Brutus and Cassius. He realizes that his warning is in vain and leaves, but he assures them that he will be there when it is time to lose one's blood for Rome. Brutus and Cassius feel that Cicero does not understand the situation and does not realize that assassination is the way to go (IV 4–5).

The relationship between Cicero and Cäsar is illustrated particularly in a direct confrontation (V 2): while Cicero thinks that Cäsar destroyed the republic, Cäsar claims that he saved the republic. There is an odd power relationship between them since Cicero saved Cäsar during the Catilinarian Conspiracy, but Cäsar is now all-powerful; he therefore decrees that Cicero should die at the same time as him. Initially Cicero hoped that Cäsar would be good for the republic, but he now is disappointed. At the same time Cicero's positive verdict on his commentaries, which Cäsar elicits, is crucial for him. The reference to Cäsar's literary works adds another dimension to

his portrayal beyond that of a ruthless politician and indicates that, while Cäsar is more powerful politically than Cicero, in the area of literature Cicero is still seen as more important. When Cäsar considers whether he should kill Cicero or force him to serve the empire, he comes to the view that there is no danger from the old man as long as he himself is alive (V 3). This view presumably alludes to the fact that the historical Cicero only adopted a leading position in the senate again after Caesar's assassination; this is here combined with Cäsar's own plans.

In this play Cicero appears as an authority in literary questions and a staunch republican, who therefore appears suspicious to Cäsar creating an empire. Yet Cicero is not radical enough to join the conspirators; he rather thinks that Cäsar should be influenced and makes allowances to him, allegedly for the sake of the republic. Thus, Cicero ends up positioned between both parties and closely watched by both of them. This position exemplifies the ambiguity of the play: both sides, Cäsar and his supporters as well as his future assassins, have political ideals; equally they are governed by negative personal ambitions to the disadvantage of the population. Cäsar will fall, but he has already made arrangements for Oktavianus as his successor to continue, while the traditional system cannot cope with the situation.

#### 4.58 Alwyn Markolf, *Catilina* (1907)

##### *Context*

The name Alwyn Markolf is generally regarded as a pseudonym for Arthur Huellessem. There is another drama under the same pseudonym (*Ein Silvestertraum. Lustspiel in 3 Bildern*, Berlin 1908). This author might be Arthur Victor Wilhelm von Meerscheidt-Hüllessem (1878–1927), who completed a PhD at the University of Freiburg (Germany) in 1906 and was a lawyer and a member of a family of generals.

##### *Bibliographical information*

text:

CATILINA | TRAGÖDIE IN 5 AKTEN | VON | ALWYN  
MARKOLF | BERLIN-LEIPZIG | MODERNES VERLAGSBUREAU |  
CURT WIGAND | 1907.

{available partly (with limited access) on HathiTrust Digital Library}

characters:

Personen: Catilina, Senator, bewirbt sich um die Konsulwürde | Lentulus, Prator und Senator, im Bunde mit Catilina | Cethegus, Gabinius, Statilius, Cassius, Curius, römische Senatoren von Catilinas Partei | Manlius, ein römischer Ritter, verbündet mit Catilina | Cicero, Antonius, römische Konsuln | Aurelia, Catilinas Gattin | Fulvia, eine römische Dame | Tiberius, römischer Ritter | Lysippos, ein Athener | Sävius, ein Späher im Dienste Catilinas | Mallius, ein Söldnerführer | Eine Tänzerin | Eine unbekannt verschleierte Dame | Senatoren, Ritter, Krieger, Sklaven

### *Comment*

The play covers the period from the elections for the consulship of 63 BCE (in 64 BCE) until the decisive battles at the end of 63 and in early 62 BCE, when Catilina eventually dies. The events presented, however, are condensed and selective and are interspersed with various love affairs between the main characters, including fictional ones and involving particularly Catilina's current and former beloved. There is, however, a political undercurrent running through the entire play, which demonstrates the unsatisfactory state of the political circumstances at Rome, though not an obvious solution. The scenes presenting incidents not historically attested, such as the meeting of Cicero and Catilina (II), contribute particularly to illustrating the political and moral deficits of the leading social classes in the late Roman Republic as presented in the piece.

Already in the first act, taking place before the election result is announced, the future conspirators express their unhappiness at the current political conditions at Rome (I). When it becomes known that Cicero and Antonius (C. Antonius Hybrida) have been elected consuls, there is no attempt on Catilina's part to continue pursuing his aims by ordinary means: Catilina immediately plans military action; he tells the envoys of the Gallic tribe of the Allobroges that he is willing to help them, as they suffer from the demand of large payments, and encourages them to fight with him, while Cicero will not listen to them and will take profit away from them; he describes Cicero as merely a talker, not a fighter (II). Cicero, as the new consul, then comes to visit Catilina (II). This unattested encounter introduces Cicero and shows the views of the two men in their confrontation. In Cicero's presentation it is Catilina

who has refused an alliance even before the elections, and Catilina has been defeated because of his aim to change the traditional organization of Rome; Cicero therefore tries to dissuade him from his plans against the country. When Cicero reminds Catilina of the bad fate of the Gracchi, the other praises them as men who tried to give ordinary people a proper role and revealed abuse of power. Cicero, however, links the plans to the days of Sulla and warns Catilina that Antonius will no longer support him if his activities become illegal. Cicero tries to make Catilina side with him by offering him the richest of the provinces for next year (presumably an allusion to the historical exchange of provinces between Cicero and his consular colleague). This dubious offer shows that Catilina's criticism of how the 'establishment' works is not entirely unfounded. Catilina also criticizes Cicero's personality as only focused on his career, claiming that he views Rome merely as a stage to show off his rhetorical skill and to make himself stand out from the members of the lower social classes, from where he originated (II).

The problematic nature of Cicero's rule and the fragility of his support among the populace are made apparent when it is reported that the atmosphere in Rome has changed and the People have become critical of the senators, the knights and the consul Cicero (III), when it is shown that Cicero receives vital information to subdue the plot from the Roman lady Fulvia and her lover Curius through bribing the latter (III; cf. Sall. *Cat.* 26.3; 28.2) and when it is reported that the senators had a secret meeting in Cicero's house (IV).<sup>296</sup> On receipt of this piece of news, Catilina shows himself determined to attend a meeting of the senate and reject allegations. He tells his fellow conspirators that they should keep a distance in the senate, to show that they are not allied with Catilina (IV). What here appears as a planned deceit is what the historical Cicero interprets as a sign of opposition to Catilina (Cic. *Cat.* 1.16). Nevertheless, in the play the conspirators are found out. The consuls (attended by lictors) discover them at a meeting in Lentulus' house (P. Cornelius Lentulus Sura, praet. 63 BCE): Cicero confronts the men with weapons found in Cethegus' home (C. Cornelius Cethegus), the letters and the envoys of the Allobroges and thus proves their involvement in the conspiracy (V). Since Cicero rushes into the senate afterwards and does not arrange for this confrontation to happen in the senate, as in the historical record (Cic. *Cat.* 3.7–13), he is not seen as a person following proper procedure.

When the play ends with Catilina walking off into the battle in which he will die, Cicero has won, taking a leading role in defending the political system from revolutionary activities, but because of the criticism that others have voiced and the recourse to questionable procedures, he does not emerge as entirely convincing, achieving a justified victory. Catilina is presented as a clever politician and as pursuing great aims, but appears as a negative personality due to his unfaithfulness in love affairs of the past and his quick recourse to fighting. Still, since Cicero is the featured opponent of Catilina and is not supported by other senators taking his side, he comes across as a representative of the failures of the traditional political system.

#### 4.59 André Lebey, *Catilina* (1922)

##### *Context*

André Lebey (1877–1938), a friend of the poet Paul Valéry (1871–1945), was a French socialist politician, editor of the journal *La revue socialiste* (1910–1914) and writer. He produced socialist treatises, historical writings, novels and poems; *Catilina* seems to be his main dramatic work.

##### *Bibliographical information*

text:

CATILINA | Drame en 3 actes, en verse | par | ANDRÉ LEBEY | 1922 || LIBRAIRIE DELESALLE | 16, Rue Monsieur-le-Prince – PARIS

{available at: <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k9627859c>}

characters:

Personnages: Aurélia ORESTILLA, 30 ans. | DOMITILLA, 25 ans. | CATILINA, 37 ans. | CICÉRON, 39 ans. | CÉSAR, 24 ans. | LENTULUS, 40 ans. | CURIUS, 23 ans. | CRASSUS, 40 ans. | CICADA, 25 ans. | TULLIE, 21 ans. | STORAX, 30 ans. | CLINIUS, 38 ans. | AURÉLIUS, vieillard à barbe blanche, 80 ans. | LE DENDROPHORE, 50 ans | MARCUS, 30 ans.

##### *Comment*

While the author has evidently consulted historical sources (with extracts from Cicero and Sallust quoted in French translation at the



beginning of acts I and III), the plot is only vaguely historical.<sup>297</sup> It is clear that the action is meant to take place in 63 BCE: the play includes the important senate meetings and the decisive battles at the end of that year and early the following year; the elections to the consulship have obviously taken place. The historical events, however, are not all presented in sequence; some are only alluded to by the reactions of the People, for instance, when César and Curius overhear passers-by talking about the decisive meeting of the senate in which Cicero confronted Catilina (II 1).

The extract heading the second act, taken from Prosper Mérimée's (1803–1870) *Conjuration de Catilina* (1844) and describing César's ambiguous and extraordinary features, opens up another dimension for the events concerning Catilina. The drama's César regards Catilina's fight as too early and likely to be unsuccessful (II 1); he, on the other hand, is called 'divine' by La Pythie, when she passes by, accompanied by Vestal Virgins (II 1: 'Divin Jules, les Dieux t'ont désigné déjà!'). The importance of the gods for Catilina's success or lack of success is also highlighted by mystical scenes in connection with the battle, involving three priests (Aurélius, Le Dendrophore, Marcus) (III 1–2; 8).

Moreover, Catilina is not only presented as the leader of the conspiracy, but also as the lover of Cicero's daughter Tullie, who responds to his advances. This delicate situation is introduced right at the start by the worries of Catilina's wife Orestilla (I 1–2). Such an additional element does not mean that the political dimension is reduced; on the contrary, political aspects are played out in different ways. For instance, when Catilina is shown in love with Cicero's daughter Tullie, who is torn between love and duty, the opposing views of the two men, her lover and her father, come to the fore (II 6–11).

Cicero's first appearance is in confrontation with Lentulus, one of Catilina's supporters (Publius Cornelius Lentulus Sura), when Cicero unexpectedly comes to Catilina's house and Catilina initially withdraws (I 3). Therefore, it falls to Lentulus to explain Catilina's position (I 4). This first encounter is followed by a confrontation and a long exchange between Cicero and Catilina (I 5). Both men claim that they are working for Rome, but they have different, irreconcilable views on what this means. Cicero acknowledges positive abilities in Catilina and regrets that he uses them for the wrong purposes (cf. Sall. *Cat.* 5.1–8; Cic. *Cat.* 1.26; 2.9). Catilina feels that Cicero speaks well, but does not do what is

required for Rome's sake. He, on his part, wants to ensure equality and liberty and to support the People, while Cicero questions whether Catilina knows what the People want. Cicero is convinced that he supports the Good and Catilina the Evil, but Catilina doubts his definitions of these two items (I 5). When Catilina reports the conversation to Lentulus afterwards, the impression is reiterated that Cicero has his own views of what is right for Rome and does not accept other views (I 6). Following on from this encounter, Catilina reflects on his situation; he feels pushed into a difficult position and not even able to enjoy an easy relationship with women he loves (I 7).

At the meeting of the senate on the following day Cicero accuses Catilina (as anticipated: I 5). As this meeting is not shown on stage and Cicero's speech is not given, a notion of Cicero's rhetorical brilliance is not conveyed; on the contrary, the divided opinions are illustrated again, since people reporting and commenting on the session take different sides and do not give neutral accounts (II 1). A negative interpretation of Cicero's procedure is indicated when Catilina reports to his followers that Cicero and the senate confronted him unjustly, while the differing views of the People heard in the background illustrate the tension between the two sides. Catilina does not give up; instead, he announces his plan to oppose Cicero, who is thus singled out as the representative of the existing system (II 2). Accordingly, a subsequent meeting of Tullie and Catilina is initially marked by the latter's suspicions, but Tullie can convince him of her love (II 3–4). When she is asked by some to inform her father of Catilina's plans, she takes Catilina's side and can only trust in the gods since he cannot be dissuaded from his plans for his own sake (II 6–11). Cicero's portrayal is eroded further when, after the assassination of some of the conspirators in Rome, Catilina tells the old Aurélius that Cicero on his own would not have been able to do so, but that Terentia, his wife, has power over him, while, after this crime, Cicero appeared like a victorious dictator (III 3).

In the drama's final scene (III 8), when the battle has been concluded and Catilina's body is brought on stage, Cicero appears; previously, one of the fighters told Aurélius that Cicero had not joined in the fighting, but was preparing a speech to claim the success achieved in dubious ways (III 8, Cicada: 'Cicéron est infâme. / Il n'a pas combattu. Il a suivi le drame, / Expert à la parole, incapable à l'épée, / Trop lourde et

dangereuse à sa peau distinguée. / Il prépare sans doute à loisir sa harangue / Habile à récolter, pour remuer la langue / Sur la moisson des autres et pour célébrer / La trahison de ceux qu'il aura bien payés . . .'). Indeed, when Cicero enters, he asserts that the heavens have granted his wishes and that he is opening the saved Rome to a better future, based on what is right, glory and justice. When Aurélius doubts the value of justice and asks Cicero to swear by the souls of his dead ancestors that everything was all right, Cicero has him arrested. Without fear, Aurélius declares that the old Rome and its values have perished ('Rome mourra d'avoir renié l'Humanité') and admonishes Cicero not to be disrespectful to a dead person who was bequeathing César to him. Almost like a confirmation of this assessment, just before the curtain comes down, Cicero orders Catilina to be beheaded and the head be brought to Rome.

While Catilina ultimately is unsuccessful, he and his supporters appear as more genuinely concerned for a just society and to be willing to risk their lives for their ideals while Cicero emerges as a representative of the 'establishment', talking of values, but not acting accordingly for the benefit of society. Even though the plot's structure provides little opportunity for Cicero's personality to be developed, what is said about him and the actions shown make him appear in a rather negative light; even his oratorical ability is described as an instrument of his problematic policies.

#### 4.60 Upton Sinclair, *Cicero. A Tragedy of Ancient Rome* (1960)

##### *Context*

Upton Sinclair (1878–1968) was an American writer who won the Pulitzer Prize for Fiction in 1943. Sinclair read voraciously from an early age and started writing in his teens. Over the course of his life Sinclair produced a large number of fictional and non-fictional works with a particular focus on documenting and criticizing the socio-economic conditions of the early twentieth century. His political interests led Sinclair to stand for Congress representing the Socialist Party and as the Democratic Party's candidate for Governor of California (unsuccessfully).

*Cicero* seems to be Sinclair's only drama set in the ancient world. The motivation for it was, according to one of his letters (18 April 1960): 'What interests me in my eighty-second year is the idea of showing

students how it came about that a great republic evolved into a depraved empire. There is no preaching in the play, but no one can fail to note the resemblances to manners and morals he sees about him today.' Sinclair also explains that he had sent a copy of the recently finished play to Albert Camus (1913–1960), who had won the Nobel Prize in Literature in 1957: Camus liked the drama so much that he planned to have it performed at the Théâtre Français, of which he was to become director; this plan never materialized since Camus died in a car accident on 4 January 1960 (which means that the script of *Cicero* must have been completed in 1959). Sinclair then submitted the play to John Ben Tarver, Head of the Department of Dramatic Arts at New York University. Tarver was also very impressed, and New York University then 'acquired the amateur rights to "Cicero" for the New York City area during the 1960–61 season'; the play was to open 'in the early Fall of 1960 in an off-Broadway theatre' (legal document for the formation of 'The Cicero Company').<sup>298</sup>

### *Bibliographical information*

text:

Upton Sinclair, *Cicero. A Tragedy of Ancient Rome*, 1960.

characters:

(no list of characters with typescript; in a letter of 18 April 1960 Sinclair gives the following list:)

'The "name" characters in the play are: Cicero, lawyer, orator, and consul of Rome; Terentia, his severe wife; Tiro, his secretary, a Greek slave; Atticus, his friend and publisher; Caelius, his sporting ex-pupil; Clodius, corrupt young aristocrat who became Cicero's fierce enemy; Clodia, sister of Clodius, the "vamp" of two thousand years ago; and Catullus, young poet from the provinces whom she seduced and ruined.' [play includes also: Xanthus, a Greek slave; Herennius, a centurion]

### *Comment*

This play covers the last twenty years of Cicero's life, from his consulship (63 BCE) until his death (43 BCE). This does not mean that the historical events are unhistorically condensed; by contrast, there is an explicit chronological progression, and it is indicated in the stage directions when subsequent acts and scenes take place in different

locations and at considerable chronological distances. Moreover, apart from a Greek slave called Xanthus, the play does not feature any unhistorical characters; the incidents structuring the action (Catilinarian Conspiracy, Bona Dea scandal, Clodius' trial, Cicero's exile, Caelius' trial, opposition to Mark Antony, proscription and death) are all historical (according to Sinclair the play is 'historically exact'). Moreover, there are references and extended 'quotations' of literary works of the historical Cicero and also of the Roman poet Catullus (who appears as a character).

The play charts major events in the life of the historical Cicero that have determined his public appearances and his private reactions, focusing on his responses to them. The presentation of the figure of Cicero is complemented by his interactions with other Romans, his comments about them as well as the reactions and activities of Clodius (ultimately his enemy), Clodius' attractive sister Clodia (admired by the poet Catullus, whose poems are presented as referring to her) and Caelius (also enticed by Clodia, but equally admiring Cicero and in need of his support): this framework helps to create a picture of the contemporary political and social situation.

Because the play's Cicero mainly appears in conversation with his secretary Tiro, his wife Terentia and / or his friend Atticus, but never in public, and since the works of the historical Cicero are represented when the play's character dictates them to his secretary Tiro or privately practises speeches to be delivered, the piece appears as 'historical' and 'personal', and Cicero's character and biography take centre stage. In the first scene, even before he appears on stage, Cicero is introduced positively in all his roles by Tiro in conversation with the newly arrived slave Xanthus (I 1): 'Your master, besides being the consul of the republic for this present year, is a true scholar.' and 'It is a great name, and known all over the world. He is statesman, orator, and scholar.'

As the play's Cicero is shown in intimate conversations, his feelings and concerns can be made explicit: he is eager to win appreciation both for his political career and for his literary works (with their later reception anticipated); at the same time he tends to be worried and uncertain, and he therefore relies on the encouragement of others, especially Atticus' advice on his writings; he is preoccupied with his status as a 'new man' and the resentment this might cause among the senate. At the same time Cicero is disappointed at the political and

moral development of Rome; he remarks to Atticus (III 3): ‘We have become an empire – or soon will be one. The word is like a knell of doom to me, who all these years have been trying to save a republic. I speak to some tired old men in the senate; those greedy old men who are thinking, how much can I get out of this decree or that? I know their secret thought, every man of them, and I can count on my fingers those who are thinking about Rome, its glory, its honor, and its future. They don’t even know about it – for when they were young, they too were seeking pleasure – and money to buy more. I tell them, there can be no liberty without virtue.’ Even in the final scene, just before his death, Cicero is concerned that ‘My precious, wonderful words will go ringing down the ages!’, but also laments the fate and decline of Rome, where those in power destroy those with whom they disagree. When Cicero is killed after his ultimately unsuccessful campaign against Mark Antony, the centurion comments: ‘His golden tongue, as he calls it, will wag no more.’ (III 5).

Thus, the expectation is created that Cicero’s works (published by Atticus) will survive through the ages and even schoolboys will read them. At the same time it is indicated that the political and philosophical ideas Cicero supports will not outlive him because the Romans of his day have become interested in their personal advantages, money and pleasure: the loss of virtue leads to a loss of liberty, and there will be a change to a monarchical society as Cicero predicts.

#### 4.61 Guido Ammirata, *Quattro assassini per una cerva* (1972/73)

##### *Context*

Guido Ammirata (1911–1991) was an Italian poet, playwright, critic and journalist. Since he lost his father at an early age, he had to start working while still very young and gained his qualifications at evening school. Later, Ammirata became a productive playwright and journalist. He received a number of literary prizes for his work, and he was nominated as Cittadino Benemerito del Comune di Milano in 1979 as a result of his campaigning concerning drugs.

Ammirata also composed dramas about other historical figures, such as Alexander Pushkin, Sigmund Freud or Ambrogio Vescovo. The play *Quattro assassini per una cerva* was first performed on 17 November 1972

in the Teatro di Via delle Erbe in Milan, directed by Mario Barillà, and published in 1973.

### *Bibliographical information*

text:

GUIDO AMMIRATA | QUATTRO ASSASSINI PER UNA CERVA | momento multiplo giallo fra il 64 e il 62 a.C. in un prologo e due tempi | TODARIANA EDITRICE – MILANO | 1973 (Luoghi Teatrali).

characters:

Personaggi: Terenzia, *moglie di Marco Tullio Cicerone*. | Fabia, *sorella di Terenzia e promessa vestale*. | Una danzatrice. | Un suonatore di flauto. | Marco Tullio Cicerone. | Lucio Sergio Catilina. | Fulvio Nobiliore, *giovane contestatore*. | Aurelia, *usuraia*. | Aulo Quinto Flacco, *magistrato*. | Faustina, *madre di Fulvio Nobiliore*. | Tito Pomponio Attico, *editore*. | Quinto Cicerone, *fratello di Marco Tullio e suo propagandista elettorale*. | Licinia, *schiaiva di Terenzia*. | Irfis, *schiaiva di Fabia*. | Gallo, *schiaivo di Aulo Quinto Flacco*. | Popolani, folla e comparse.

### *Comment*

This play is not named after an historical character or incident; only the date in the subtitle reveals that the plot is set in ancient Rome in the years around Cicero's consulship (63 BCE). Accordingly, while Cicero, his campaign for the consulship and his combatting the Catilinarian Conspiracy are important elements, the plot is not explicitly determined by key political events and experiences in Cicero's life. Instead, as the title ('four assassins for one hind') suggests, the play is set up as a criminal investigation into the death of Fabia, Cicero's sister-in-law, destined to be a Vestal Virgin and apparently in relationships with various men; the inquest into her death takes up the entire second act, and it is implied that all four people suspected of having killed her have contributed to her death in one way or another. The basis for this story is probably the fact that Sallust relates that Catiline had an illicit sexual relationship with a Vestal Virgin, a noble young lady, in his youth (Sall. *Cat.* 15.1) and that Asconius reports that the Vestal Virgin Fabia, a (half-)sister of Cicero's wife Terentia, was unsuccessfully charged with illicit sexual relations with Catiline, presumably in 73 BCE (Asc. on Cic. *Tog. cand.*, p. 91 Clark).

The setting means that the investigations concerning Fabia involve key historical characters of the period, focusing on Catilina, Cicero and his wife Terenzia. This personal affair affects their respective public standing; thus the enquiries and the resulting discussions demonstrate their political views, moral attitudes and public behaviour, with preparations for the conspiracy running in the background. As the playwright indicates in the introduction, he regards Cicero and Catilina as two antagonists; he highlights that Cicero, despite coming from a non-noble background, became a defender of the privileges of the nobility while Catilina, though an aristocrat, was active for social improvements of ordinary people; thus Catilina could be re-evaluated today while Cicero was not the glorious 'father of the country' he claims to be (cf. Cic. *Pis.* 6; *Sest.* 121).<sup>299</sup> This description matches Cicero's introduction in the play's prologue by the dancer, before he even comes on stage: there he is presented as someone who has turned away from his roots and became a conservative defender of institutions and traditions.<sup>300</sup>

The resulting contrast between Cicero's and Catilina's political views, adumbrated by these introductions, is brought out most strongly in a discussion between the two men towards the end of the first act. What is telling, for instance, is Cicero's reaction to Catilina's announcement that he intends to empower and improve men: Cicero replies that one will have to improve the laws first since only better laws will lead to better men and that not all men are equal; Catilina bursts out by stating vehemently that all men are equal and accusing the unjust system supported by Cicero.<sup>301</sup>

Moreover, this play includes the figures of Cicero's brother Quinto (Quintus) and Cicero's friend Tito Pomponio Attico (T. Pomponius Atticus). Quinto is described as Cicero's election manager, a role developed from the historical Quintus' pamphlet *Commentariolum petitionis*, written on the occasion of Cicero's candidacy for the consulship in 64 BCE. The existence of this supporting role, the fact that Cicero defers the decision of whether or not to accept a loan from the usurer Aurelia as well as Terenzia's comment that everything always is too dangerous for Cicero and he delegates matters to others affect Cicero's portrayal and convey the impression of a weak character depending on others (not completely unfounded in view of some of the private letters of the historical Cicero). Additionally, it is emphasized that Cicero's



family lives in the house of the Terentian family and the Terentian sisters therefore claim a say in household matters. That not only Catilina, but also Cicero is attracted by Fabia gives his portrait a human element, but reduces his moral standing.

Tito Pomponio Attico, described as 'editore', appears as a man of letters, who is more concerned about books than about human lives in a tumult; that Cicero is friends with such a person suggests that he too is detached from the concerns of ordinary people. At the same time Cicero's literary interests are indicated. In contrast to many other plays, Cicero is not shown making a speech; instead he is seen practising a speech at home, and during the investigation into Fabia's death there is the question of whether she ever heard any speeches of his. Moving Cicero's speeches to a private setting and to the preparation stage makes them less immediately effective, in particular because Terenzia, overhearing her husband, criticizes that he uses the same image in his speeches again and again and states that actions are better than words.<sup>302</sup> In contrast to Terenzia, the drama's Cicero believes that he must deliver speeches, initiate laws and defend the institutions and traditions of the republic. The speech Cicero is rehearsing is directed against idlers who are arriving in Rome, increasing the mass of people without employment and funds, and are therefore at risk of becoming seditious. This speech illustrates Cicero's attitude to ordinary people and indicates that he does not make an effort to identify the reasons for the situation and thus to resolve it. Moreover, Cicero is critical of Caesar's 'democrats'. In his personal tactics, though, he does not hesitate to use bribery to save his reputation, when, along with his wife, he thereby settles the criminal investigation. Accordingly, Cicero comes out victorious in the end, with Catilina defeated and Cicero cleared from any suspicion of being involved in Fabia's death; yet it is adumbrated that this might not be the full truth.

Since there is more emphasis on inter-human relationships and political beliefs rather than on a description of Cicero's career, the timing of the action can be vague. Indeed, the entire plot is set between 64 and 62 BCE, as indicated in the subtitle, but within that timeframe events develop without a clear chronology: the early scenes of the play happen in 64 BCE during the election campaign for the consulship of 63 BCE; towards the end of the play Cicero is apparently consul, Catilina has left Rome and some of the conspirators have been arrested, which, historically, happened in late 63 BCE.

The play thus builds on historical figures and historical incidents, yet combines them in a novel way to make a statement on the role and behaviour of members of different social classes in political and private matters and the consequences for society and the political system. Accordingly, Cicero is presented as a representative of the traditional aristocratic structure, eager to maintain its formal conventions, though also focused on his own standing and ready to have recourse to more dubious behaviour in private. Cicero plays a more important role in the investigative thread than one might have expected, but his role is explained by the setting. The playwright, however, indicates that in the present time a re-assessment might be due and Catilina's aims and virtues should be valued appropriately.

#### 4.62 Helmut Böttiger, *Cicero oder Ein Volk gibt sich auf* (1990)

##### *Context*

The German writer Helmut Böttiger (b. 1940) studied theology and pedagogy and completed a PhD in sociology. After teaching at a variety of German schools, he founded a publishing house and produced a number of controversial writings on political topics.

*Cicero* was published by Helmut Böttiger's own publishing house (Dr. Böttiger Verlags-GmbH; now E.I.R. GmbH) in 1990, when the author turned 50.

##### *Bibliographical information*

text:

CICERO | oder | Ein Volk gibt sich auf | Tragödie von Helmut Böttiger | Jubiläumsausgabe zum 50. Geburtstag des Autors am 2. März 1990 | Dr. Böttiger Verlags-GmbH.

characters:

Personen: Marcus Tullius CICERO, Konsular und römischer Redner | Mark ANTONIUS, Konsular und Triumvir des Jahres 43 vor Chr. | Gaius Cäsar OCTAVIANUS, Großneffe Cäsars, der spätere Augustus (Octavius), ein Triumvir | Marcus LEPIDUS, Konsular und Triumvir | FULVIA, Antonius' Frau | CLODIA, Tochter des Bandenführers Clodius, Antonius' Stieftochter, Frau des Augustus | Popillius LÄNAS,

Tribun und Parteigänger des Octavian | VENTIDIUS, Parteigänger des Antonius und Unterfeldherr | PHORMIO, GNATHO, BALLIO, GALENUS, Anhänger des Antonius | TIRA, Sklave und Freigelassene, Sekretärin und Lektorin des Cicero, spätere Herausgeberin seiner Werke (eigentlich männlich: Tiro) | Vier SENATOREN (darunter Servilius, Fuvian und Cato) | DORALLA, alter Mann, bürgerlich | Vier BÜRGER (darunter ein Corannus) | ANTIUS, Bandenführer in Rom, plebejisch | BERLUS, sein Gehilfe | Zwei BOTEN | weitere Soldaten, Bürger, Senatoren, Diener und Räuber

### *Comment*

This play is set in 43 BCE and dramatizes Cicero's death as part of the development from republic to principate. As a note printed before the start of the play indicates,<sup>303</sup> its main focus is on demonstrating how Caesar's assassination led to the establishment of monarchical rule because of the failures of the people involved. Accordingly, Cicero's death is only shown in the brief final act; most of the plot is devoted to the presentation of the feelings of and negotiations between Antonius (Mark Antony), Octavian, Cicero, the senators and ordinary citizens. These interactions indicate the failure of the system to cope with challenges and result in an ambiguous presentation of the character Cicero.

At his first appearance, Cicero, in contrast to others, is hopeful since Octavian has defeated Mark Antonius (I 4). When, at a meeting of the senate, Cicero therefore suggests confirming the position and the deeds of the current leaders of armies, including Octavian, and granting them an ovation upon their return to Rome, the other senators disagree since this plan is against the traditional formal procedure; they ignore Cicero's arguments and believe that even his persuasiveness fails and that he may be eager for power for himself (I 5). At a second meeting of the senate, after Cicero has changed his mind about Octavian and regards his requests as inappropriate, he suggests giving Caesar's assassins, Cassius and Brutus, the command over troops in Greece and Illyria and ordering the troops from Africa and Spain to return to Rome (cf. Cic. *Phil.* 11). The senators agree with this plan; they disagree, though, with Cato's proposal of an additional tax for wealthy citizens and of the recruitment of troops (III 5). Finally, at another meeting of the senate, when Octavian has demanded the consulship, the reversal of Mark Anton's declaration as

a public enemy and the punishment of murderers and when Cicero suggests not complying and fighting instead, the senators disagree and approve of Octavian's requests, since they feel that they cannot fight against a Roman citizen (V 1).

Octavian has never been a reliable ally for Cicero's attempt to preserve the republic. In Octavian's view (according to what he says when alone on stage) Cicero is a man of the past, who utters impressive, but empty words, wishes to preserve the status quo, while he does not recognize that in view of the existing political situation a great goal is required to restore unity or a 'great man', whereby Octavian probably alludes to himself. This Cicero is no longer a rival for him to be feared (III 2: 'Ein leeres Wort kann Menschen nicht bewegen, / selbst wenn ein Mann wie Cicero es spricht. / Der will auch nicht bewegen, nur erhalten; / genießen soll der Bürger, was er hat. / Will Cicero sich damit Menschen finden / und begeistern für das Leben und die Tat? / Großer Redner, damit lockst du keinen, / dir folgt nur, wer Veränderung ängstlich scheut. / Du täuscht dich und die andern Bürger alle, / die deine Rede doch nur trunken macht. / Neid und Mißgunst kannst du niemals bannen / mit leeren Worten und viel kleiner Tat. / Ein großes Ziel schafft Eintracht, wo es fehlt, / ein großer Mann. Das ist Gesetz der Stunde, / das du nicht ändern willst und kannst. / Den Cicero muß ich nicht länger fürchten, / er ist der Traum der altgewordnen Zeit. / Sein Denken mag das Material uns geben, / aus dem wir die Kultur der Zeit erstellen. / Drum können wir ihn ehren und behalten, / wenn seine Zeit schon längst vergangen ist.').

That the political situation after Caesar's assassination has indeed remained unsatisfactory for ordinary citizens is illustrated by (fictional) conversations among the People and the activities of seditious gang-like groups. For instance, the old citizen Doralla feels that Cicero should pursue a goal; orderly conditions would then follow (III 7). Cicero's single aim is the preservation of the republican system against tyranny, but he is not able to engage with suggestions brought to him by non-senators; yet he is able to adapt his policy as circumstances change and to consider unusual and untraditional steps to confront the disorderly situation (he says in the senate, I 5: 'Bei solcher Verkehrung und Verwirrung aller Verhältnisse fordert es die Notwendigkeit, der Lage mehr Rechnung zu tragen als dem Herkommen.'). This attempt, however, is unsuccessful since the other senators wish to preserve traditional procedures and their own comfortable position.

The impression that Cicero is someone who prefers to speak rather than to carry out actions required by the circumstances (as Octavian claims) is corroborated because Cicero is also presented as a literary person through interactions with his secretary in several scenes (III 3; III 6; V 5; V 7). Since this secretary is the female servant Tira rather than the historical male Tiro (as noted in the list of characters), and Cicero comments that he feels well looked after by Tira, even better than by his wife and daughter, there seems to be more than a professional relationship. Still, when Cicero dies in the final act, his concern is both for his writings, which she should preserve, and for her welfare, when he frees her, as is demonstrated by his last words to Tira (V 7): 'Laß mich ein Wort, bevor du deiner Pflicht / genug getan, zu meiner Tira sagen. / Dir vertrau ich Bücher und die Schriften. / Erhalte du der Nachwelt sie als Zeugen / meines Strebens. Suche mich in ihnen, / nicht im Körper, der dir bleibt, wenn dieser / das, was er Pflicht nennt, bald vollzogen hat. / Du sollst nicht trauern, diese letzte Pflicht / erbitt ich mir von Dir. Vor diesen Zeugen / will ich dir die Freiheit schenken. Sei / Rom ein besserer Bürger als die Herrn, / die es jetzt knechten.' When Cicero hopes that Tira will be a better citizen of Rome than the masters subduing the city now, it is obvious that he is aware of the breakdown of the traditional republican structures.

Thus, while the triumvirate comes to power and is victorious in the end, the play's overall perspective and message are gloomy since various scenes have demonstrated that the current system has failures, that the senators are not up to the job and that ordinary people are unhappy, yet not in a position to make changes although at least some of them see the existing problems: monarchical rule becomes inevitable, but is not a solution. In this context the character of Cicero displays his usual attributes of a polished orator (including reminiscences of the works of the historical Cicero) and a preserver of the republican system. But, as the author has Octavian comment, Cicero does not offer any substantial ideas of how to shape the system so that it could cope with the issues facing it. Moreover, although the measures envisaged by Cicero would probably not have changed the eventual outcome, they are not even tried, i.e. he is unsuccessful because of the representatives of the traditional order, which he intends to preserve. Thereby the failure of the republican system is indirectly attributed not only to Cicero, but also to the lack of insight among the senatorial elite (in contrast to ordinary citizens). When,

at the end of the piece, Cicero has been put on the proscription list by the triumvirs and is killed, this symbolically marks the switch to the monarchical system, which this Cicero could not prevent.

*While no new dramas on Cicero appeared during almost two decades around the year 2000, three fairly recent plays continue the tradition of Cicero dramas into the twenty-first century. In these modern plays there is a tendency to present the ancient world as a parallel to the contemporary political situation.*

#### 4.63 Richard John Nelson, *Conversations in Tusculum* (2008)

##### *Context*

Richard John Nelson (b. 1950) is an American playwright. He has written a large number of plays for the theatre since 1975 and also some radio plays and screenplays; he has directed many of these plays himself. Nelson has received numerous awards for his work. His dramas often comment on contemporary social and political issues.

*Conversations in Tusculum* was first performed at the Public Theatre in New York City on 11 March 2008, directed by the author. It was immediately seen by critics as a comment on the political situation in the USA at the time, as a drama on the use and abuse of power and potential reactions.

The play's title alludes to the philosophical treatise *Tusculan disputations* by the historical Cicero, written in 45 BCE, in the year in which the play's plot is set (May – September 45 BCE). The drama's opening indicates that the main characters have withdrawn to Tusculum ('a small village outside Rome') from Rome and feel that they can more easily have a conversation there, though the topics are dominated by the political situation on the eve of Caesar's assassination (on 15 March 44 BCE) rather than philosophical issues.

This is the only one of Nelson's plays set in the ancient world. As the Author's Note at the end of the play indicates (pp. 113–114), Nelson read key ancient sources in English translation, though few of Cicero's own writings (Plutarch's *Lives*; Suetonius' *The Twelve Caesars*; Cicero's *Tusculan disputations*), as well as some secondary literature about the period in preparation for this play; he lists the play's minor deviations from the historical record.

*Bibliographical information*

text:

CONVERSATIONS | IN TUSCULUM | *Richard Nelson* | FABER AND FABER, INC. | *An affiliate of Farrar, Straus and Giroux* | New York [2008].

characters:

CHARACTERS: BRUTUS, forties | PORCIA, thirties, his wife and cousin | CASSIUS, forties, his brother-in-law | SERVILIA, late fifties, his mother | CICERO, sixties | SYRUS, forties, an actor

*Comment*

This play is the only drama including ‘Cicero’ as a character explicitly alluding to the historical Cicero’s estate in Tusculum and the alleged conversations held there (Cic. *Tusc.* 1.7), which, in their written version, are dedicated to M. Iunius Brutus (e.g. Cic. *Tusc.* 1.1; 5.121). While the play does not address the same philosophical topics as the historical Cicero’s *Tusculan disputations*, it presents a series of conversations among the main characters (in different villas) in Tusculum, which take place at the same time as the *Tusculan disputations* were written. Over the play’s eight scenes, the protagonists, representing figures with Republican beliefs, come and go, and they report and discuss what is happening elsewhere, but there is hardly any action on stage: it is indeed a play of ‘conversations’.

Because in the literary tradition the name Tusculum is so closely associated with the historical Cicero, the title suggests that a stage version of him will be among the protagonists. Indeed, the character of Cicero is on stage in almost every scene. Some elements of his private life also play a role, particularly that his daughter Tullia has recently died and that he has divorced his first wife and would now like to divorce his second wife, a young girl, too (though these women are not named in the drama): the personal circumstances serve to illustrate Cicero’s current sombre state of mind.

The drama’s main focus is on conversations between Cicero, Brutus and Cassius (the future assassins of Caesar) on the state of the republic and on initiatives that could or should be done in the light of Caesar’s position and plans. Caesar’s arbitrary and despotic rule is illustrated by the treatment of the Roman citizen and playwright Liberius (actually Decimus Laberius): it is reported how Caesar forced Liberius to appear on

stage, which means losing his Roman citizenship, but that Caesar generously restored it to Liberius afterwards (Scene 2; cf. Macrob. *Sat.* 2.7.1–9). Thus, although Caesar is merely talked about and does not appear on stage, he looms large throughout the play. The issues raised include the question of whether suicide is an appropriate response to undemocratic political developments, whether opposing autocrats or trying to negotiate with them and flattering them to exert an influence is more successful or whether withdrawing from the centre of power might be best.

Since an actor is among the main characters, (Publius) Syrus, known as a writer and actor of mimes in Cicero's time, who also performed before Caesar, another theme is that one can make political statements in drama in a veiled way while they would still be obvious to a contemporary audience. Thus, the play ends with the actor Syrus, wearing a mask, reading a speech Brutus gave him (pp. 111–112): 'He who takes away our country. Our Republic. Pits us against ourselves. He who takes away our freedoms and our rights. He who takes away our pride in ourselves and in each other, takes away our moral purpose and resolve. He who corrupts what we cherish. Who divides us to conquer us, who attempts to crown himself and his family "name." He – must die.' This ending implies that, after considering various ways of how to react to the contemporary situation, Brutus has decided that assassinating Caesar is the only way forward; yet, because of the ploy of involving an actor, he is not made to say it himself directly. Such an arrangement turns the expression of this intention into a more general statement, as a result of the reflections shown throughout the play: in this drama set before Caesar's assassination the underlying thoughts are more important than the actual deed; potential consequences of such a deed are not explored.

Cicero is presented as a successful writer, dealing with difficult situations by writing about them. He is shown to have added essential words to the Latin language, and his judgement on literary matters is regarded as weighty. He appears as the wise elder statesman who anticipates people's reactions and is able to foresee developments, but does not take any action himself. When it comes to his personal life, Cicero appears weaker: he is devastated by the death of his daughter Tullia and needs the help of others to get rid of his second wife after he realized that marrying her was a mistake, though the separation will cause financial difficulties for him. The plot focuses on the situation at



the time of the action and the various characters' views and reactions; earlier political interventions (e.g. Cicero's deeds as consul) are not mentioned.

The characters are just given as much personal profile as necessary, and there is no concrete action taken yet. Thus, although their political conversations are set in a specific time and place and address a particular situation, the general issues raised acquire perennial relevance.

#### 4.64 Nicole Berns, *Die Catilinarische Verschwörung* (2015)

##### *Context*

This play (*Die Catilinarische Verschwörung. Oder: stirb langsam, Cicero*) is available from the German publisher Theaterbörse, which specializes in theatrical works for performances in schools or by lay people and also runs a website that provides various pieces of information on theatre for such groups (<https://www.theaterboerse.de>). It is advertised as 'ein Historienstück voller Spannung und Witz' and designed as a piece for school theatre particularly appropriate for students between the ages of 14 and 20. It was written by a student at a grammar school in Germany (Albert-Schweitzer-Gymnasium in Kaiserslautern), after reading Sallust's *De coniuratione Catilinae* in class, and performed by students at the school in July 2015.

The main title and a note on the plot at the start indicate that the piece is set in Rome in 63 BCE and focuses on the clash between Catiline and Cicero. The subtitle (*stirb langsam* – lit. 'die slowly') alludes to the German title of the American action thriller *Die Hard* of 1988, which was immensely successful and led to four sequels (1990, 1995, 2007, 2013). This phrase as well as the title of one of the sequels (*Die Hard with a Vengeance – Stirb langsam: Jetzt erst recht*, 1995) are put into the mouths of characters in the play and identified as allusions in notes (pp. 14, 23). There is also a reference to a famous statement about the Berlin Wall, made in 1961 by Walter Ulbricht, an influential politician in the German Democratic Republic (p. 20). Other than that, there are no explicit contemporary allusions.

The author makes extensive use of Sallust's *De coniuratione Catilinae* and Cicero's *Catilinarian Speeches*, standard school texts; there is no obvious engagement with other sources. The characters generally speak in German, but they are made to employ some Latin words and quotations in Latin from Cicero's speeches in their utterances; the meaning of these Latin

phrases is usually clear from the context. Like earlier Jesuit plays, the drama has a didactic angle and is meant to make students understand the historical events of the Catilinarian Conspiracy and bring to life the texts by Sallust and Cicero that they might be reading.

The edition is produced simply, and the text includes a few typographical errors.

### *Bibliographical information*

text:

*Nicole Berns* | Die Catilinarische Verschwörung | Oder: stirb langsam, Cicero.

{available at: <https://www.theaterboerse.de/verlag/theaterstuecke/genre-historische-themen/5767-die-catilinarische-verschwoerung.html>}

characters:

Personen: Sallust | Cicero | Terentia | Catilina | Orestilla | Sempronia | Cethegus | Lentulus | Manlius | Fulvia | Quintus Curius | Senator1 | Senator2 | Caesar | Cato | Ritter1 | Ritter2 | Antonius | Sklave | Allobroger1 | Allobroger2 | Allobroger3 | T. Volturcius | Umbrenius | Secundus | Geliebter von Fulvia | Pomptinus | Soldaten | Verschwörer

### *Comment*

The play charts the main stages of the Catilinarian Conspiracy in a series of conversations (in five acts and twenty consecutively numbered scenes) with no particular setting as the play is intended to be performed with little effort in terms of props and scenery. Throughout most of the play the historian Sallust is on stage as a kind of commentator who provides additional information on background, history and even future developments as well as notes on the characters, sometimes directly addressing the audience (Scene 7). Both Sallust and the character Cicero voice excerpts from the writings of their historical counterparts at appropriate places in the plot.

Cicero is presented as a *homo novus* keen to become consul, though less confident than his wife Terentia that he will be successful and that this position will be advantageous for him (Scene 3). Later, it is Terentia who is worried that Cicero might be killed and wants him to get rid of his enemies, while he claims that he is safe in his role as consul, and he does not want to take action without any evidence, though he is worried that

this procedure might be misrepresented later. Yet, when informers report to him that there are plans to kill him, he offers them a reward and has an idea of how to deal with the situation (Scene 8). Cicero is ready to sacrifice himself for the sake of the Republic. After he has obtained evidence by intercepting the letters given to the Allobroges, he confronts the men responsible with the facts in the senate, so that the Catilinarian conspirators are found guilty (Scene 16). Afterwards, Cicero is praised for having saved Rome. He, however, is uncertain whether the captured conspirators should be punished and wonders about the consequences for himself ('Strafe ich die Verschwörer nicht, strafe ich Rom, setzte ich aber Strafe fest, strafe ich mich selbst. '); then he decides that the senate's approval and the emergency decree will be fine as a basis; the death penalty is decreed (Scene 17). At Cicero's last appearance he is happy with his achievements ('Bin ein Held! Das macht sich sicher gut im Lebenslauf. Cicero – Vater des Vaterlandes.') and anticipates a successful last battle (Scene 19). The final scene demonstrates that victory for Rome has only been achieved by citizens fighting against each other (with an allusion to the ending of Sallust's historiographical piece).

While the dialogues in this piece are mostly fictitious and use modern language, the course of events and the motivation of the individual characters are portrayed fairly accurately in line with the historical sources, presumably because the piece is meant to be a pedagogical tool. Accordingly, Catiline is presented negatively throughout and characterized as a person who wishes to obtain power in Rome by destroying the current system and then to rule according to what suits him and his associates (Scene 2). By contrast, Cicero appears as an ambitious, though insecure person, who eventually achieves his main goal (of becoming consul and successfully fighting the conspiracy), while it is indicated that these activities might have negative consequences for him and that peace and unity in Rome have not been maintained. Caesar's future dictatorship is adumbrated (Scene 18).

#### 4.65 Robert Harris / Mike Poulton, *Imperium* (2017)

##### *Context*

At about the same time as these two twenty-first-century plays were produced, the British writer Robert Harris (b. 1957) wrote a successful

novel on Cicero's life, a trilogy consisting of *Imperium* (2006), *Lustrum* (2009), *Dictator* (2015), with the story being narrated by Tiro, Cicero's secretary. This long narrative was then turned into a dramatic version by the British adapter Mike Poulton, staged as two performances of three plays each. The two performances are entitled *Imperium, Part I: Conspirator* and *Imperium, Part II: Dictator*, and the six plays are called *Cicero*, *Catiline*, *Clodius*, *Caesar*, *Mark Antony* and *Octavian*. This dramatic version was first put on stage by the Royal Shakespeare Company in the Swan Theatre in Stratford-upon-Avon between November 2017 and February 2018 as part of their 'Rome Season' and transferred to London in 2018. The script of the plays was published as a book at the end of 2017.

In the introduction to the print version of the drama Mike Poulton describes the process of turning the novels into a dramatic sequence: it meant an emphasis on the conflicts with Catiline and Mark Antony.<sup>304</sup> That some material of the novels had to be left out to achieve this focus is confirmed by Robert Harris in an interview in connection with the performance.<sup>305</sup> Thus Part I focuses on the Catilinarian Conspiracy in 63 BCE and its aftermath; Part II dramatizes the struggle for power between the young Octavian and Mark Antony after Caesar's assassination in 44 BCE.

### *Bibliographical information*

text:

IMPERIUM | The Cicero Plays | *Adapted for the stage by* | Mike Poulton | *From the novels by* | Robert Harris | *With an introduction by* Mike Poulton | NICK HERN BOOKS | London | [www.nickhernbooks.co.uk](http://www.nickhernbooks.co.uk) [2017].

characters:

Characters: CICERO | TIRO | SOSITHEUS | OCTAVIUS | MOB 1 | MOB 2 | MOB 3 | POMPEY | CRASSUS | CATILINE | CAESAR | TERENTIA | VERRES | NUMITORIUS | JUDGE | CATULUS | ISAURICUS | RUFUS | TULLIA | CLODIUS | RABIRIUS | ISAURICUS | POMPEIA | HYBRIDA | CELER | JUNIOR AUGUR | QUINTUS | CATO | CETHEGUS | SURA | PIUS | MARCUS | CAMILLA | LUCULLUS | SERVANT BOY | CLODIA | MURENA | SILANUS | VIRIDORIX | CAEPARIUS | STATILIUS | CAPITO | FULVIA | MARK ANTONY | DOLABELLA | MESSENGER |

POMPEY'S OFFICER | FONTEIUS | YOUNG OFFICER | HIRTIUS | PANSA | DECIMUS | POPILLIUS | OCTAVIAN | BRUTUS | CASSIUS | LEPIDUS | PISO | CALPURNIA | SLAVE 1 | SLAVE 2 | SLAVE 3 | TREBONIUS | TILLIUS CIMBER | CASCA | GLADIATOR 1 | GLADIATOR 2 | CINNA | SERVIUS SULPICIUS | MARCELLUS | CHIEF VESTAL | ACTOR CAESARS | SERVANT | AGRIPPA | SERVILIA | NURSE | VATIA | CALENUS | JULIA | MESSENGER | OCTAVIAN'S SECRETARY | *And* MARINES, CROWDS, MOBS, SOLDIERS, AQUILIFERS, SLAVES, THE PEOPLE OF ROME, BEGGARS, PROSTITUTES, GANGS, SENATORS, PRIESTS, VESTALS, SERVANTS, LICTORS, GUESTS, BODYGUARDS, SUPPORTERS, GAULS, GUARDS, OFFICERS, SECRETARIES, EUNUCHS, GLADIATORS, MOURNERS, VETERANS, THUGS, SCRIBES, CENTURIANS

### *Comment*

Because this drama has been developed from a trilogy of novels, portraying Cicero's entire biography, and consists of six plays spread over two performances, it can cover more events over an extended period of time than plays concentrating on a single episode in Cicero's life. Nevertheless, by deciding to leave out Cicero's early career and to focus on his confrontation with Catiline and Mark Antony (and their repercussions) in the two parts, Robert Harris and Mike Poulton have selected the most exciting and most politically telling episodes in Cicero's life, which have also been frequently chosen for this reason by other playwrights for single plays. Although Cicero is the main character throughout, obviously, not all six individual plays could be named after him: the first play, introducing Cicero and dealing with his assuming the consulship in early 63 BCE, is entitled *Cicero*; the titles of the following ones indicate his main opponents.

The fact that the two parts are called *Conspirator* and *Dictator*, mainly referring to Catiline and Caesar respectively, indicates that the plays revolve around Cicero's role in the associated events, but that tracing his biography is only one of their dimensions, carried over from the underlying novels; additionally, these dramas serve as a presentation of power relations. The title of the entire dramatic sequence *Imperium: The Cicero Plays* adopts the well-known title of the first item in the novel trilogy and combines it with the familiar name of the main character: at

the same time this combination of overall title and subtitle probably highlights the plays' main political idea. What *imperium* meant in the late Roman Republic or for the historical Cicero becomes less important; emphasizing clearly recognizable key words is obviously dominant. In fact, the decision to bring Cicero on stage and to highlight the events selected from his career seems to have been prompted by the opportunities for political interpretation. Both Robert Harris and Mike Poulton were attracted to the material by its political aspects, and both regard the presentation of the political circumstances in ancient Rome as relevant for the present and see parallels to the contemporary situation.<sup>306</sup>

In these plays, as in the underlying novels, Cicero's secretary Tiro plays an important role: he functions as a kind of guide to the story, providing background explanations and transitions as someone who has all the information, but, because of his status, is not directly involved in the political struggle and thus able to comment as a detached observer. Particularly at the beginning and the end, there are metaliterary remarks on Tiro as the reporter and on the lasting fame of Cicero and his writings. This arrangement enables the drama to make views on Cicero explicit, as in a conversation between Tiro and Cicero at the close of the last play, set shortly before Cicero's death (*Octavian*, Scene Thirteen [p. 264]): 'TIRO. My book might be read a hundred years from now. – CICERO. Longer – much longer – a thousand ... It's the case for my defence. I lost the past – I shall lose the present – but the future will be mine. Put it all in, Tiro – the good and the bad. – TIRO. What – all of it? You wouldn't want to appear greedy, vain, duplicitous – – CICERO. Everything! Everything. Let me stand before history naked as a Greek statue. Let future generations laugh at my follies – just so long as they read me. I fought a good fight. I did my best ... And I failed. What does it matter – set it all down, Tiro – tell future generations how magnificently I failed. Those who come after me will learn more from my faults than from all Caesar's Triumphs ...'. Especially in conversations between Cicero and Tiro there are explicit references to writings of the historical Cicero, and some of the utterances of the dramatic character Cicero are modelled on texts by his historical counterpart.

Despite the political focus, Cicero's family is more prominent in the plays than in Cicero's writings. This is shown by the development of

family scenes, which, due to their personal nature, are unlikely to be mentioned in the kinds of texts that survive from Cicero. Even such scenes are made to underline the political dimension: for instance, after Cicero's election to the consulship and the prospect of governing a province subsequently, his daughter Tullia asks: 'Will Papa be like a king?'; her mother answers 'Yes.' while her father is horrified and says 'No!' (*Cicero*, Scene Two [p. 23]). Cicero's reaction in this conversation exemplifies one of his main characteristics in this drama: his opposition to any autocratic tendencies and non-republican principles.

As the genre requires, other scenes too have been elaborated beyond what might be inferred from ancient sources, some minor historical characters have been given more developed characters, and a few generic scenes (e.g. sacrifices, weddings, discussions in court) have been supplemented. Other than that, however, the basic plot structure stays fairly close to the historical sequence of events, without any entirely unhistorical incidents or subplots added. The narrative is generally based on information in the works of Cicero and other ancient historical sources.

Since the sequence of plays ends with Mark Antony's partner Fulvia displaying the head of the dead Cicero (cf. Cass. Dio 47.8.4), while Octavian and Agrippa are dressed for a triumph (*Octavian*, Epilogue [p. 268]), it is acknowledged that Cicero ultimately is unsuccessful with his political initiatives and dies in the face of opposition; neither is it denied that he has personal weaknesses, including uncertainty, ambition and desire for glory (see quote above). Equally, however, the play stresses that this Cicero wishes to preserve the 'democratic' structure of the Roman Republic against autocratic tendencies displayed by men like Catiline, Pompey, Mark Antony or Caesar. While Cicero becomes progressively disillusioned, he is still shown supporting a worthy cause in 'defending the Republic' (see *Caesar*, Scene Six [p. 178]). As a result, the way in which Cicero is portrayed in this drama comes closer to the image that the historical Cicero tried to create of himself than the impression of him conveyed by the piece *Everie Woman in her Humor* (ch. 4.8), which, like the dramas developed by Mike Poulton, is based on a prose text.