



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Cicero vs. Mark Antony: Identity construction and ingroup/outgroup formation in *Philippics One and Three*.

Breunesse, M.R.E.

DOI

[10.1515/9783110678222-024](https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110678222-024)

Publication date

2019

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

Clause and discourse

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Breunesse, M. R. E. (2019). Cicero vs. Mark Antony: Identity construction and ingroup/outgroup formation in *Philippics One and Three*. In L. Gils, C. Kroon, & R. Risselada (Eds.), *Clause and discourse* (pp. 448-463). De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110678222-024>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

UvA-DARE is a service provided by the library of the University of Amsterdam (<https://dare.uva.nl>)

Merlijn Breunesse

Cicero vs. Mark Antony: identity construction and ingroup/outgroup formation in *Philippics One* and *Three*

Abstract: This chapter is concerned with the beginning of the conflict between Cicero and Mark Antony, which was sparked by the orator's performance of the *Philippics* and ended with his death in 43 BCE. This starting point has been the subject of much debate among many scholars, including Ramsey (2003), Manuwald (2007), and Usher (2010). Based on Cicero's intent with and Antony's interpretation of the speeches, the content of the speeches, and the political climate of 44–43 BCE Rome, they have argued convincingly in favor of either *Philippic One* or *Philippic Three* as the conflict's beginning. This chapter adds to their analyses by taking a Social Constructionist approach to the texts, considering the subtle ways in which Cicero constructs Antony's identity in *Philippics One* and *Three* through his use of language. Taking the three dimensions of identity construction suggested by Bamberg (e.g. 2011a) – sameness/difference, agency, and diachronic identity navigation – as a starting point, it investigates the linguistic devices that contribute to ingroup/outgroup formation. Based on an analysis of phenomena such as category-bound activities, footing-shifts, agency expression, and dissociative demonstratives, it concludes that the conflict between Cicero and Antony started with *Philippic Three*.

Keywords: Latin linguistics, Cicero, *Philippics*, identity construction, ingroup/outgroup formation, historical pragmatics

1 Introduction

Cicero was killed by Antony's soldiers in 43 BCE as the result of a conflict that was sparked by the delivery of his *Orationes Philippicae*. Although scholars agree that the conflict was caused either by *Philippic One*, which was delivered on September 2, 44 BCE, or by *Philippic Three*, which was delivered on December 20,

Acknowledgment: I would like to thank two anonymous reviewers for their comments on an earlier version of this chapter. Any remaining errors are, of course, mine.

Merlijn Breunesse, Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena

<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110678222-024>

44 BCE, there is no consensus as to the exact speech that got Cicero in trouble. Ramsey (2003) claims that it was the *First Philippic*. He argues that, although “on the surface, the tone is both friendly and even conciliatory” (Ramsey 2003: 81), *Philippic One* is rather an invective, because Cicero himself considers it as such in the *Familiares* (12, 25, 2), and because Antony reacted to it by declaring Cicero his enemy (cf. *Cic. Phil.* 5, 19). Similarly, Usher (2010) admits that *Philippic One* “would have seemed reasonable and measured to most of his audience”, but he argues that “the speech contains a number of passages which Antony will have found, in varying ways and degrees, provocative” (Usher 2010: 131). He also points out that the alternative offered by Cicero, restoring government by law, was unacceptable to Antony, because Cicero had openly chosen to side with Octavian and had resisted the consul’s authority by not attending the senate meetings that he had previously called for (Usher 2010: 133–136).

Manuwald (2007) disagrees with Ramsey (2003) and Usher (2010) and states that “the actual conflict started with *Philippic Three*” (Manuwald 2007: 295). She shows that the political circumstances were favorable for Cicero to attack Antony, since he had just received support from Brutus, and that Cicero himself later points to *Philippic Three* as the beginning of the conflict (Manuwald 2007: 300). Cicero’s aim with *Philippic Three*, she says, is “to depict Antonius as a public enemy” (Manuwald 2007: 305). This chapter provides linguistic evidence, in the form of an analysis of identity construction and ingroup/outgroup formation in *Philippics One* and *Three*, to support Manuwald’s (2007) claim. After showing that Cicero avoids presenting Antony as the senate’s enemy in *Philippic One*, but convinces the senate of Antony’s threat to the Republic in *Philippic Three*, it concludes that the conflict between Cicero and Antony started with *Philippic Three*.

The chapter is structured as follows: Section 2 introduces the methodology and the theoretical framework of this study. Section 3 analyzes two dimensions of identity construction, viz. sameness/difference and agency, in *Philippics One* and *Three* and draws some preliminary conclusions based on the differences between the two speeches. The third dimension, viz. diachronic identity navigation, is investigated in Section 4. Section 5 provides a conclusion and suggests some possibilities for future research.

2 Methodology and framework

Identity is studied in many different scientific fields, including sociology, anthropology, and psychology. In linguistics, it is defined as “the linguistic

construction of membership in one or more social groups or categories” (Kroskrity 1999: 111). In Kroskrity’s definition, the word *construction* indicates a Social Constructionist approach, which considers identity a construct that can be manipulated, rather than an inherent part of an individual.¹ This approach allows linguists to analyze the manipulation of linguistic devices that create group membership and identity. The present chapter analyzes identity along the three dimensions that were suggested by Bamberg (2010, 2011a, 2011b), viz. sameness/difference, agency, and diachronic identity navigation.²

Before the analysis is presented, however, a note on the decision to choose *Philippics One* and *Three* for a study of identity construction is required. Apart from the fact that this analysis may shed new light on the scholarly debate mentioned above, both speeches are directed against Mark Antony and delivered in front of the senate, for which reason they lend themselves well for an analysis of ingroup/outgroup construction. Secondly, the circumstances in Rome changed drastically between *Philippics One* and *Three*, so that diachronic identity navigation is of particular interest, as will be shown in Section 4. Note that *Philippic Two* is excluded from the analysis since it was not delivered at the time and only published at a later date. Thirdly, the speeches are comparable, since they were delivered within months of each other, so that changes in Cicero’s language and style are minimal.

Finally, readers should keep in mind that this chapter is not concerned with Cicero’s ‘real’ intention with *Philippics One* and *Three*. It does not try to find out what the orator meant or thought, since this is something on which we can only speculate. Instead, it aims to understand how Cicero constructs identity through the use of language and how he manipulates this process in *Philippics One* and *Three*.

1 For a discussion of these different approaches, see e.g. Hall (1996).

2 The construction of identities is a dynamic process in which speakers contrast their own identity with that of others, for example by comparing their own actions with others’ actions (*I love to do stuff on the weekend, but he only wants to hang on the couch*). They thus construct another person’s identity in a similar way as they do their own. For this reason, it is justified to use these dimensions, which are used by Bamberg to analyze a person’s own identity construction, for an analysis of Cicero’s construction of Mark Antony’s identity.

3 Sameness/difference and agency in *Philippics One and Three*

The dimension of sameness/difference is closely related to Social Identity Theory, as formulated by Tajfel (1981). Tajfel argues that people attempt to make their social surroundings easier to understand by categorizing people into different groups. Group membership defines a person's position in society and can be based on similarities, a common fate, and proximity (Van de Mierop 2015: 408–409). Groups mostly define themselves, however, through their differences with other groups, which leads to a contrast between ingroup and outgroup, between 'we' and 'they'. Ingroup members focus on their similarities with other ingroup members and regard outgroup members as different. This is what Bamberg's sameness/difference dimension refers to.

Individuals can display their membership of a certain group in many ways, but one of the most important demonstrations of group membership is taking part in activities that are considered typical of the relevant group, which Sacks (1995) calls 'category-bound activities'. An example of a category-bound activity is for the inhabitants of country X to support the soccer team of that same country. Supporting the team of country Z would compromise their membership of the group 'inhabitants of country X'. The following sections will show how Cicero manipulates these activities in *Philippics One* and *Three*.

Actions necessarily involve agents and patients, which makes agency also a relevant dimension in this context. The agency dimension focuses on individuals' active- and passiveness in certain situations and therefore on their accountability for their actions. Bamberg et al. (2011) show that speakers use linguistic devices to present themselves or others as agents or as 'undergoers'. High-agency marking devices present the entity in question as a strong hero who is in control, whereas low-agency marking devices present people as victims, or as people without much influence and therefore without responsibility (Bamberg et al. 2011: 187).

3.1 Ingroup formation in *Philippics One* and *Three*

In both *Philippic One* and *Philippic Three*, Cicero uses language to construct an ingroup for himself and his audience and to defend this ingroup when it threatens to fall apart. Category-bound activities play an essential role, as is exemplified by (1):

- (1) *Ego cum sperarem aliquando ad uestrum consilium auctoritatemque rem publicam esse reuocatam, **manendum** mihi statuebam, quasi in uigilia quadam **consulari ac senatoria**.* (Cic. Phil. 1, 1)³
 ‘Hoping, as I did, that the Republic had at last been restored to your guidance and authority, I took the view that I **ought to stay** on a vigil, so to speak, of the sort **that befits a consular and a senator.**’

In (1), Cicero describes how he takes part in an activity that is bound to the ingroup, viz. protecting the Republic. He shows that protecting the Republic is typical for senators and consuls by using the adjectives *consulari* and *senatoria*. Moreover, the gerundive of obligation *manendum* shows that Cicero considers this activity as obligatory for ingroup members.

When ingroup members neglect a category-bound activity such as this, their group membership gets compromised. It is essential for Cicero, however, that his ingroup remains stable, so that he can count on the senate’s support. For this reason, Cicero takes care not to present ingroup members who misbehave as outgroup members, and he does so in two different ways. First, he avoids directly criticizing them himself, instead attributing any criticism to a third party. This technique is called a *footing-shift* and it is a common strategy that speakers use to create a certain distance between themselves and their utterances.⁴ Consider (2):

- (2) *quos quidem doleo in suspicionem **populo Romano** uenire non metu, quod ipsum esset turpe, sed alium alia de causa deesse dignitati suae.* (Cic. Phil. 1, 5)
 ‘I am sorry indeed that **in the eyes of the Roman people** the latter [the senators who should have spoken out in support of Piso, but had not; MB] fall under the suspicion of not living up to their high rank, not out of fear, which would be dishonorable enough, but for their several particular reasons.’

In (2), Cicero uses a footing-shift with *populo Romano* to avoid reprimanding his ingroup members and appearing harsh.

A second way in which Cicero handles ingroup members’ misbehavior is by consequently underplaying their agency in actions that compromise their group membership. When he does so, he states that his group members had

³ The Latin texts in this paper come from Ramsey (2003) for *Philippic One* and Manuwald (2007) for *Philippic Three*. When differences in the layout are relevant, Ramsey’s layout is chosen. Capitals ‘V’ are written as ‘V’ and not as ‘U’. All translations of the *Philippics* were taken from Shackleton Bailey (2009: vol. I).

⁴ See Clayman and Heritage (2005) for the use of footing-shifts in news interviews.

acted that way because they had no other options, or he leaves the agents of the actions unexpressed.

In addition to the use of category-bound activities, Cicero also strengthens ingroup identity by emphasizing the common ground that he shares with his ingroup. Common ground, or shared knowledge, refers to information shared between two people or between the members of a larger collective. When this common ground is *context-specific* (i.e. when the speaker and the addressee share the immediate context, as is the case for Cicero), it “is closely linked to a communicator’s self-awareness as a member of the collective implied in the common ground, and therefore his or her collective identity” (Kashima et al. 2007: 34). Cicero draws on shared knowledge by using proverbs. Consider (3), in which Cicero describes how he advised Octavian on certain matters:

- (3) *quamquam ille non eguit consilio cuiusquam, sed tamen **currentem, ut dicitur, incitavi***. (Cic. Phil. 3, 19)

‘Not that he needed any advice; all the same, **I spurred a willing horse, as they say.**’

The proverb *currentem incitare* in (3) is accompanied by the impersonal passive construction *ut dicitur*, ‘as they say’. The agent of impersonal passives is the general public, so that *ut dicitur* indicates that Cicero expects his audience to know and understand the proverb.⁵

A second way in which Cicero draws on shared knowledge is by using the distal demonstrative *ille* in its so-called recognitional use. According to Himmelmann (1996), speakers use recognitional demonstratives when they assume that their addressee knows the intended referent, i.e. when they assume that they share a common ground. In (4), Cicero uses *illam* to draw on shared knowledge, because he expects his audience to remember ‘that abortive burial’:

- (4) *nam cum serperet in urbe infinitum malum idque maneret in dies latius, idemque bustum in foro facerent qui **illam insepultam sepulturam effecerant**, . . .* (Cic. Phil. 1, 5)

‘For when a boundless infection was gaining ground in Rome and spreading wider and wider day by day, and when the authors of Caesar’s **abortive burial** were raising a tomb in the Forum, . . .’

⁵ See Pinkster (2015) for the general public as the agent in impersonal passive constructions.

Note that *ille* in this use is different from the dissociating *ille* that is discussed with example 9 below. The dissociating use of *ille* marks the speaker's negative stance toward the referent, whereas the recognitional *ille* signals to the addressee that (s)he should be able to identify the referent through common ground.

3.2 Outgroup formation in *Philippics One* and *Three*

Whereas ingroup formation remains stable between *Philippics One* and *Three*, the way in which Cicero presents Antony changes significantly: he avoids portraying Antony as an outgroup member in *Philippic One*, but he actively creates outgroup membership for him in *Philippic Three*. In *Philippic One*, Cicero shows that Antony takes part in ingroup category-bound activities, such as shielding the Republic from possible dictators, as exemplified in (5):

- (5) *multa praetereo eaque praeclara; ad singulare enim M. Antoni factum festinat oratio. dictaturam, quae iam uim regiae potestatis obsederat, funditus ex re publica sustulit; . . .* (Cic. Phil. 1, 3)

'I pass over many items, notable ones too, as my tongue hastens on to **Marcus Antonius**' most remarkable gesture, the total **removal** of the office of dictator from our constitution, an office that had usurped the power of absolute monarchy . . .'

In (5), Cicero uses the subjective genitive *M. Antoni* and the active verb form *sustulit* to express Mark Antony's agency, which is something he does consistently when Antony engages in positive activities in *Philippic One*. Whenever Antony is involved in negative actions, however, Cicero negotiates this bad behavior in the same way as he does for his ingroup members. In (6), Cicero describes how Antony called on his veterans to come to Rome to support the consul's controversial *lex agraria* in 44 BCE:

- (6) *ueterani qui appellabantur, quibus hic ordo diligentissime cauerat, non ad conseruationem earum rerum quas habebant, sed ad spem nouarum praedarum incitabantur.* (Cic. Phil. 1, 6)

'The veterans, who **were being called upon as supporters**, of whose interests this body had taken the greatest care, **were stirred up**, not to preserve what they already had but to hope for fresh plunder.'

Note that, although Cicero's audience certainly knew that it was Mark Antony who had called on the veterans, Cicero does not mention the agent with the passive verbs *appellabantur* and *incitabantur*. In *Philippic Three*, however, we see that Cicero does express the agent in similar situations, as in (7):

- (7) ...; *quod flagitabam equidem cotidie, quippe cum bellum nefarium contra aras et focos, contra uitam fortunasque nostras **ab homine profligato ac perdito non comparari, sed geri iam uiderem. Expectantur Kalendae Ianuariae; quas non expectat Antonius, qui in prouinciam D. Bruti, summi et singularis uiri, cum exercitu impetum facere conatur; ex qua se instructum et paratum ad urbem uenturum esse minitatur.*** (Cic. Phil. 3, 1)
 '...; I was pressing every day for a meeting, inasmuch as I saw a wicked war not **in preparation** but **in actual conduct by a profligate and desperate man** against our altars and hearths, against our lives and property. We are waiting for the first of January: but **Antonius does not wait** for this date. He is attempting **to invade** the province of our noble and distinguished countryman Decimus Brutus with an army, and from that province **he threatens**, when equipped and ready, to march on the city.'

In (7), Cicero uses the two passive infinitives *comparari* and *geri* to describe Antony's negative actions, but, in contrast with his approach in cases such as (6), he does express their agents in the *a(b)* + ablative construction. Moreover, Cicero presents Antony as an extremely active force by saying that he does not wait, that he threatens, and that he invades.

Back to *Philippic One*, in which Cicero, in addition to category-bound activities, also uses footing-shifts to avoid presenting Antony as an outgroup member:

- (8) *quod si, **ut mihi a quibusdam eius familiaribus dictum est, omnis eum quae habetur contra uoluntatem eius oratio grauiter offendit, etiamsi nulla inest contumelia, feremus amici naturam.*** (Cic. Phil. 1, 28)
 '**Certain of his closest friends**, however, **tell me** that all speech that is contrary to his wishes gravely offends him, even if no insult is involved. If that be so, I shall put up with a friend's humor.'

Cicero uses a footing-shift in (8) to avoid directly criticizing Antony himself, instead attributing this criticism to 'certain of his closest friends'. In *Philippic Three*, on the other hand, Cicero uses footing-shifts to convince his audience that Antony is a common enemy:

- (9) *ille autem homo adflictus et perditus quae de se expectat iudicia grauiora quam amicorum suorum?* (Cic. Phil. 3, 25)
 ‘As for that ruined and desperate individual, what harsher verdict upon himself does he expect than that of **his friends**?’

By repeatedly using footing-shifts and attributing any criticism of Antony to another member of the Republic, such as Decimus Brutus (Cic. Phil. 3, 12) and the tribunes of the plebs (Cic. Phil. 3, 13), Cicero presents the Republic as united against Antony, and Antony as a common enemy to them all.

Finally, consider the use of the distal demonstrative *ille* in (9). In this example, *ille* is used in the noun phrase *ille homo adflictus et perditus* which refers to Mark Antony. Jackson (2013) shows that the use of distal demonstratives in constructions like these, in which the speaker uses a rather vague description for reference to a familiar person, places the referent outside the social circle of the speaker. Similarly, Wiczorek (2013) argues that modern politicians use distal demonstratives to distance themselves from their adversaries (Wiczorek 2013: 96). In (9), Cicero uses the noun phrase with *ille* to express his contempt for Antony and distance himself from the consul.

In conclusion, an analysis of Cicero’s construction of Mark Antony’s identity in *Philippics One* and *Three* along the dimensions of sameness/difference and agency shows that Cicero manipulates category-bound activities, agency, and footing-shifts in *Philippic One* to avoid criticizing Antony. In *Philippic Three*, he manipulates these same devices and uses the distal demonstrative *ille* to present Antony as an enemy to the ingroup.

4 Diachronic identity navigation in *Philippics One* and *Three*

The dimension of diachronic identity navigation is concerned with the way in which people explain identity changes. According to Bamberg et al. (2011), speakers constantly seek to find a balance between two extremes: an identity that is always exactly the same and one that changes constantly. They choose to portray their identities as changing somewhat, but not completely (Bamberg et al. 2011: 188–189). This identity change can be analyzed along two parameters. First, the change is either gradual or sudden. Second, it either covers up

a person's real identity, or reveals their true self. In cases in which a real identity is covered up, speakers may blame others for that cover to avoid taking responsibility for their actions (Bamberg et al. 2011: 189).

Diachronic identity navigation is of particular interest in an analysis of *Philippics One* and *Three*, because Cicero mentions a change in Antony's character, shown in (10), which alludes to the fact that "commencing with 1 June, Antony turned his back on the senate and began forcing a host of measures through the popular assembly" (Ramsey 2003: 94).

(10) *ecce enim Kalendis Iuniis, quibus ut adessemus edixerant, mutata omnia: . . .* (Cic. Phil. 1, 6)

'Well on the first of June, the day of the meeting to which we had been summoned, **everything was changed: . . .**'

Cicero constructs this change in Antony's behavior differently in *Philippics One* and *Three*. The following sections show that Cicero adjusts his description of Antony's character (Section 4.1), and of the way in which he acts toward the senate (Section 4.2).

4.1 Mark Antony: from hero to villain

In *Philippic One*, Cicero claims that Mark Antony is an inherently good man, whose bad behavior in the past was brought about by his bad advisors. In (11), Cicero constructs his hope that, although Antony is acting like an enemy to the Republic, he will change his course in the future. Cicero also blames Antony's *malis suasoribus* for corrupting him.

(11) *. . . Kalendis Sextilibus senatum frequentem fore; Antonium, repudiatis malis suasoribus, remissis prouinciis Galliis, ad auctoritatem senatus esse rediturum.* (Cic. Phil. 1, 8)

'[They reported] that there was to be a full meeting of the senate on the first of August, and that Antonius would divorce himself from his **bad advisors**, give up the Gallic provinces, and return to the guidance of the senate.'

In (12), Cicero again mentions Antony's *mutatio*, calling it a 'sudden and significant change', and states that the consul is an inherently good man:

- (12) *unde igitur subito tanta ista mutatio? non possum adduci ut suspicer te pecunia captum. licet quod cuique libet loquatur, credere non est necesse. nihil enim umquam in te sordidum, nihil humile cognoui.* (Cic. Phil. 1, 33)
 ‘What, then, is the cause of **this sudden and significant change in your course**? I cannot bring myself to suspect that you yielded to a pecuniary temptation. **People may say what they please**; one does not have to believe them. I have never known anything mean, anything sordid in your character.’

In (12), Cicero claims to be unaware of anything sordid in Antony’s character, and he even uses a footing-shift with *licet quod cuique libet loquatur* to avoid criticizing him. In *Philippic Three*, however, Cicero states that the opposite is true: Antony was always an inherently bad man, but had covered up his evil character in the months after Caesar’s murder:

- (13) *quid est in Antonio praeter libidinem, crudelitatem, petulantiam, audaciam? ex his totus uitiiis conglutinatus est. nihil apparet in eo ingenuum, nihil moderatum, nihil pudens, nihil pudicum.* (Cic. Phil 3, 28)
 ‘What is there in Antonius save lust, cruelty, insolence, audacity? **He is wholly compacted of these vices**. No trace in him of gentlemanly feeling, none of moderation, none of self-respect, none of modesty.’

The change in identity construction illustrated above also affects the way in which Cicero describes the interaction between Cicero’s ingroup and Mark Antony. This is considered below.

4.2 Antony and the ingroup in interaction

In *Philippic One*, the joint actions of Mark Antony and the senate are usually positive. In the case of negative actions, Cicero discreetly points to Mark Antony as the wrongdoer, although he usually avoids expressing the consul’s agency in these actions, as was shown in Section 3.2. Moreover, Cicero never presents his ingroup as the active participant, but instead forces a leadership role on Antony:

- (14) *scriptum senatus consultum quod fieri uellet attulit, quo recitato auctoritatem eius summo studio secuti sumus eique amplissimis uerbis per senatus consultum gratias egimus.* (Cic. Phil. 1, 3)

‘Antonius brought the draft of a decree that he said he wished the senate to pass. As soon as it had been read aloud, **we followed his lead with the utmost enthusiasm** and by a decree voted him our unstinted thanks.’

Thus, when the senate and Mark Antony collaborate, Cicero presents Antony as the leader of the senators, who simply follow his lead, as in (14). He thereby avoids attributing an active part to his ingroup in their joint actions with Antony, so that they cannot be held responsible for any negative actions and will not be associated with the consul. Moreover, Mark Antony often even acts as a savior to the senate, as in (15):

(15) *quanto metu **senatus**, quanta sollicitudine ciuitas tum **a te liberata est** . . .*
(Cic. Phil. 1, 31)

‘From what fear **was the senate delivered by you**, from what anxiety did you deliver the community . . .’

The passive verb *liberata est*, ‘was delivered’, with the explicit agent in the *a(b) + ablative* construction *a te* shows that Cicero emphasizes Antony’s active role in protecting the senate. The fact that Antony and the senate are not presented as enemies in *Philippic One* does not mean, however, that Cicero constructs a real ingroup role for Antony. He never describes, for example, that they undergo something together, so that they never experience a feeling of solidarity based on some sort of shared victimhood (cf. the ‘common fate’ in Van de Mieroop 2015: 408–409).

In *Philippic Three*, on the other hand, after it has become clear that Antony will not ‘return to the guidance of the senate’, as was suggested in (11), Cicero starts portraying Antony as a true enemy to the senate. On the one hand, he presents Antony as a very active force and constructs a victim role for the senate and the Roman Republic, as in (16):

(16) . . .; *quod flagitabam equidem cotidie, quippe cum **bellum nefarium contra aras et focos, contra uitam fortunasque nostras** ab homine profligato ac perditio non comparari, sed geri iam uiderem.* (Cic. Phil. 3, 1)

‘. . ., inasmuch as I saw a wicked **war** not in preparation but in actual conduct by a profligate and desperate man against our altars and hearths, **against our lives and property.**’

In (16), Cicero shows that Antony is actively waging war *contra uitam fortunasque nostras*. He refers to his ingroup members with the first person plural possessive pronoun *nostras*, which contributes to the unity within his ingroup.

This is the first time in *Philippics One* and *Three* that Cicero calls the conflict with Antony a war, which reflects his change of approach toward Antony that was described in the preceding sections.

Another way in which Cicero presents Antony as an outgroup member, is by creating an opposition between him and the ingroup. This is exemplified in (17), in which Cicero uses the distal demonstrative *ille* to refer to Antony, contrasting him with *nos*:

- (17) *quapropter, quoniam res in id discrimen adducta est **utrum ille** poenas rei publicae luat, **an nos** seruiamus, . . .* (Cic. Phil. 3, 29)

‘Therefore, since there is now the critical question before us **whether he** pays his penalty to the Republic **or we** become slaves, . . .’

The distal demonstrative *ille* is often used to create a contrast between two or more discourse participants.⁶ Its contrastive interpretation in (17) exemplifies how Cicero, instead of avoiding ingroup/outgroup opposition as he did in *Philippic One*, creates it in *Philippic Three*. Cicero does this throughout the speech in, amongst others, the following sections: Antony against Cicero (Phil. 3, 18), against other Roman citizens (Phil. 3, 23), and against the Republic itself (Phil. 3, 6).

As a consequence of his presentation of Mark Antony as an enemy of the Republic, Cicero starts advising the senate to react to his threats. Although Cicero keeps portraying the senate as passive, as he does in *Philippic One*, he constantly urges them to take action. These exhortations usually include a deontic form with an explicit agent, as in (18):

- (18) *neque enim Tarquinio expulso maioribus nostris tam fuit optata libertas quam **est** depulso iam Antonio **retinenda nobis**.* (Cic. Phil. 3, 8)

‘When Tarquin was driven out, our ancestors welcomed freedom; even more **must we retain** it, now that Antonius has been dislodged.’

In (18), the dative of agent *nobis* provides the agent with the gerundive of obligation *est retinenda*. Note that Cicero qualifies the ancestors as *nostris* to emphasize the common heritage that he shares with his ingroup. In (19), the deontic modality is expressed in an exhortative subjunctive. Moreover, Cicero explicitly says that there has been enough talking: the senate should take action.

⁶ Cf. e.g. Kroon (2010: 591–592), who describes its use in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*.

(19) *quam ob rem omnia mea sententia complectar, uobis, ut intellego, non inuitis, ut et praestantissimis ducibus a nobis detur auctoritas et fortissimis militibus spes ostendatur praemiorum et iudicetur non uerbo, sed re non modo non consul, sed etiam hostis Antonius.* (Cic. Phil. 3, 14)

‘Accordingly, I shall embrace it all in my proposal, as I believe will not be disagreeable to you: to provide that authority **be given by us** to the eminent commanders, hope of rewards **held out** to the brave soldiers, and Antonius judged, **not in word but in fact**, to be not only not a consul but a public enemy.’

In (19), Cicero uses the passive exhortative subjunctives *detur* ‘be given’, *ostendatur* ‘be held out’, and *iudicetur* ‘be judged’ with *a nobis* to urge his ingroup to take an active stance (cf. *non uerbo, sed re*). Cicero’s exhortations culminate in a motion at the end of *Philippic Three* to support the people who are fighting Antony (Phil. 3, 37–39).

This section has demonstrated how diachronic identity navigation affects ingroup/outgroup interaction in *Philippics One* and *Three*. It has shown that, in *Philippic One*, the senate and Mark Antony work together, but their collaboration is rather unequal, since Antony acts as the senate’s leader. In this way, Cicero makes sure that the ingroup cannot be held accountable for Mark Antony’s crimes. On the other hand, Cicero does not express Mark Antony’s agency when the consul treats the senate badly, to avoid publicly condemning him. Moreover, he sometimes even portrays Antony as the senate’s savior. In *Philippic Three*, on the other hand, Cicero openly declares Antony an enemy and explicitly mentions him as the agent of actions that harm the senate. Moreover, whereas Cicero portrays the senate as a passive body in *Philippic One*, he criticizes the senators for this attitude in *Philippic Three* and urges them to be more active in the future. This is especially revealing when one considers that both speeches were written after Antony’s *mutatio*, so that Cicero could have used either of these approaches in both texts.

5 Conclusion

From the differences in identity construction and ingroup/outgroup formation between *Philippics One* and *Three*, analyzed along the dimensions of sameness/difference, agency, and diachronic identity navigation, it may be concluded that Cicero’s conflict with Mark Antony, in terms of active outgroup formation, started with *Philippic Three*. The benefit of an identity analysis like the one presented in

this chapter is that it is based exclusively on the text of the two speeches. It adds to the existent analyses by offering a new approach to *Philippics One* and *Three* which analyzes them from a linguistic perspective and focuses on the way in which Cicero uses, amongst other things, footing-shifts, demonstratives, agency, and category-bound activities, which are rhetorical strategies that modern politicians use as well.

Future research into identity construction in *Philippics One* and *Three* may focus on one important aspect of identity analysis that was not considered in this chapter, viz. “the use of linguistic structures and systems that are ideologically associated with specific personas and groups” (Bucholtz and Hall 2005: 594). It might be interesting to see, for example, whether Cicero uses the same style and register that he uses in his senate speeches, in his *contio* speeches, which are addressed to the popular assembly. Furthermore, extending this type of analysis to other political speeches might enable Latin linguists to get a better understanding of particular texts and, more generally, of the part played by identity construction in ancient political rhetoric. This opens the doors to a comparison with modern texts and may eventually teach us valuable things about political discourse in both ancient and modern times.

Bibliography

- Bamberg, M. (2010). Blank check for biography? Openness and ingenuity in the management of the “who-am-I-question” and what life stories actually may not be good for. In D. Schiffrin, A. De Fina & A. Nyland (Eds.), *Telling stories: Language, narrative, and social life* (pp. 109–121). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Bamberg, M. (2011a). Who am I? Narration and its contribution to self and identity. *Theory and Psychology*, 21(1), 3–24.
- Bamberg, M. (2011b). Narrative practice and identity navigation. In J. A. Holstein & J. F. Gubrium (Eds.), *Varieties of narrative analysis* (pp. 99–124). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bamberg, M., De Fina, A. & Schiffrin, D. (2011). Discourse and identity construction. In S. J. Schwartz, K. Luyckx, & V. L. Vignoles (Eds.), *Handbook of identity theory and research* (pp. 177–199). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Bucholtz, M. & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, 7(4–5), 585–614.
- Clayman, S. & Heritage, J. (2005). *The news interview: Journalists and public figures on the air*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, S. (1996). Introduction: Who needs ‘identity’? In S. Hall & P. du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity* (pp. 1–17). London: Sage.
- Himmelman, N. P. (1996). Demonstratives in narrative discourse: A taxonomy of universal uses. In B. A. Fox (Ed.), *Studies in anaphora* (pp. 205–254). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Jackson, C. (2013). 'Why do these people's opinions matter?' Positioning known referents as unnameable others. *Discourse Studies*, 15(3), 299–317.
- Kashima, Y., Klein, O. & Clark, A. E. (2007). Grounding: Sharing information in social interaction. In K. Fiedler (Ed.), *Social communication* (pp. 27–77). New York: Psychology Press.
- Kroon, C. H. M. (2010). Anaphoric reference and referential choice in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. In P. Anreiter & M. Kienpointner (Eds.), *Latin linguistics today: Proceedings of the 15th international colloquium on Latin linguistics, Innsbruck April 4–9 2009* (pp. 579–593). Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- Kroskrity, P. (1999). Identity. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 9(1–2), 111–114.
- Manuwald, G. (2007). *Cicero, Philippics 3–9* (2 vols.). Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.
- Pinkster, H. (2015). *The Oxford Latin syntax: Vol. 1, the simple clause*. Oxford: University Press.
- Ramsey, J. T. (2003). *Cicero: Philippics I-II*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sacks, H. (1995). *Lectures on conversation* (Eds. G. Jefferson & E. A. Schegloff). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R. (2009). *Cicero: Philippics* (2 vols., rev. J. T. Ramsey & G. Manuwald). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories: Studies in social psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Usher, S. (2010). Cicero's *First Philippic* and the fall of the Republic. *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, 53(1), 129–136.
- Van de Mierop, D. (2015). Social identity theory and the discursive analysis of collective identities in narratives. In A. De Fina & A. Georgakopoulou (Eds.), *The handbook of narrative analysis* (pp. 408–428). Malden: Wiley Blackwell.
- Wieczorek, A. E. (2013). *Clusivity: A new approach to association and dissociation in political discourse*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. *Ego sum Amphitruo*