

Paweł Madejski
Maria Curie-Skłodowska University, Lublin
e-mail: tresvir@gmail.com

Marcus Tullius Cicero, the Avenger of His Father

The turbulent history of the declining Republic has in an exceptional way bound together the families of the Antonii and the Tulli, in particular their most famous members: Marcus Antonius and Marcus Tullius Cicero. The great Orator was deeply interested in all the contemporary Antonii, making out of them the examples of degenerating representatives of the late Roman republican elites and the evidence for a clear decline of ancient customs and ethical role-models.

Nevertheless, it is not the Orator and the Triumvir who are the protagonists of this paper, although the events analysed by me will be presented against the backdrop of their conflict. I will also explain very few facts concerning the lives of both – for the major problem occurred when both of them had been already dead. Consequently, I deal with the early stages of creating the tradition, in this case a negative one for Mark Antony.

The plot was formed in 30 BC and there were four *personae dramatis*: Cicero – the Orator, dead for 13 years; recently dead (1 August 30 BC) Mark Antony and, more than alive, Octavian, at that time referred to as Julius Caesar; and Marcus Tullius Cicero Junior (in the sources also referred to as *minor*). The first three characters need no introduction but it is worth to bring the person of Cicero Junior closer.

He was a son of the great Orator and Terentia. He was born around 65 BC, thus he was nearly Octavian's peer¹. His youth and upbringing are relatively well-known for the father kept updating Atticus about his son's progress and he dedicated to him his treatises². However, when taking into account ancient sources and modern literature on the subject matter, it turns out that young Marcus remains overshadowed by his sister Tullia or even his cousin Quintus Junior³, not to mention his great father⁴.

¹ Controversies regarding the date of birth are summarised by Hanslik 1948, 1281.

² Hanslik 1948, 1281–1284; Boissier 1865, 109–112; Testard 1962, 198–213.

³ There has been a lot written about Tullia, cf. Wiśniewska 2014, 19, *passim*; about Quintus cf. Stinchcomb 1933, 441–448; Garrido Božić 1951, 11–25.

⁴ Cf. a harsh judgement by Seneca the Elder: *homo qui nihil ex paterno ingenio habuit praeter urbanitatem* (*Suas.* 7.13 Bursian).

In 44 BC, Cicero sent his offspring (who already had an officer's episode in the army of Pompey over and done with⁵) to Athens – according to Cassius Dio, in order to attend his studies; according to Appian, he sent him to Brutus for his own safety⁶. By all means, one does not exclude the other and young Cicero went to Brutus only towards the end of 44 BC⁷. Cicero Senior was also meant to stay with his son in Athens but he decided not to leave Rome; according to Cassius Dio, in order to deepen the mutual dislike between Mark Antony and a new Julius Caesar⁸ (in which the *auctor pacis* was unrivalled).

In the meantime, the son of the Orator continued his military career under Brutus' command⁹ (perhaps even as his legate). In 43 BC, together with his father, uncle and cousin he was placed at the lists of the proscribed. Marcus Tullius Cicero¹⁰, Quintus Tullius Cicero Senior and Quintus Tullius Cicero Junior¹¹ died in Italia at the hands of centurions – the head hunters.

After the battle of Philippi, Cicero Junior fled for refuge to Cassius Parmensis and later to Sextus Pompeius. He still held military offices. Perhaps he even fought against Caesar. After the Pact of Misenum in 39 BC, he returned to Rome where he was received by Caesar. Together with the escalation of conflict with Antonius, Caesar's clemency towards the son of the Orator was most assuredly increasing, the evidence for which was the fact of granting some sort of priestly office – it is assumed that he became an augur like his father, although some have suggested that Cicero was admitted to the college of pontiffs¹². The real career was still, however, ahead of him. In 30 BC, by the will of victorious Caesar, he became *consul suffectus* and on the 13th of September the Senate under his leadership enacted honours for the victor of the Egyptian threat¹³; he held

⁵ Cf. Broughton 1952, 271, 627.

⁶ App., *BC* 4.20 Mendelssohn.

⁷ Hanslik 1948, 1285.

⁸ Cass. Dio 45.15.4 and 18.3 Sturzius.

⁹ Broughton 1952, 627.

¹⁰ Ancient sources on the death of Cicero are collected and analysed by Ursula Homeyer, 1964. This work should be, however, used with far-reaching caution due to the fact of using the lost books of Livy, which were fabricated in the 19th century. Good summary of the issue is the article by Wright, 2001, 436–452.

¹¹ An uplifting description of their death is given by Appian, *BC* 4.20 Mendelssohn: *Κόιντος δέ, ὁ τοῦ Κικέρωνος ἀδελφός, ἅμα τῷ παιδί καταληφθεὶς ἐδεῖτο τῶν σφαγέων πρὸ τοῦ παιδὸς αὐτὸν ἀνελεῖν: τὰ δὲ ἐναντία καὶ τοῦ παιδοσκιετέοντος, οἱ σφαγεῖς ἔφασαν ἀμφοτέροις διαιτῆσαι καὶ διαλαβόντες ἕτερονἕτεροι κατὰ σύνθημα φονεῖς ἀνεῖλον ὁμοῦ.* Cf. Stinchcomb 1933, 448; Garrido Božić 1951, 24–25.

¹² Cf. Broughton 1952, 426, 627 (before 30 BC); Babcock 1962, 32 dates the nomination to around 30 BC. Cicero Senior mentioned the pontificate for his son in *ad Brut.* 1.5.3 (43 BC).

¹³ Pl., *NH* 22.6 Mayhoff: *ipsum Augustum M. Cicerone filio consule idibus septembribus senatu obsidionali donavit [...]*; cf. Cass. Dio 51.19.5 Sturzius.

this office until the 1st of November. His main accomplishment was to present to the Senate the account of Mark Antony's death.

He then carried out governor's functions in the provinces of Asia and Syria, even though it is not completely resolved which place he had reached first. Information regarding Cicero breaks off in the 20s BC, presumably in connection to his death¹⁴.

The appointment to a suffect consul in that particular moment was of course not accidental and everyone had to associate it – and did associate it – with the divine or historical justice¹⁵. Two issues overlap here: the Roman habits and practices associated with reprisal and Caesar's politics towards defeated and deceased Antony.

Still very few works dedicated to the problem of retaliation in the Roman society leave no doubt about the duration of this institution and its position, well-established through the examples of the distant and recent past. Form of retaliation underwent transformations and together with the changing political culture, increasingly violent, the stress was also placed on giving up the revenge for the well-being of the Republic. Revenge of an individual could, in fact, become a pretext for the mass purges in the name of law (an example of which are proscriptions under Sulla). The main actors of the Roman political scene of the 1st century BC were, at some point of their careers, facing a dilemma: to take revenge or forgive the offences. Both provided symbolic gain because the decision-maker was in harmony with the sacred and customary solution, which would additionally allow him to maintain his honour. After all, the choice between *clementia* and *violentia* could keep Caesar, Antonius and Augustus, generally the victors, awake at night. The choice was dependent on political deliberations or personalities¹⁶. The second Caesar, future Augustus, built his position on a postulate of revenging his father's murderers¹⁷ and a relatively

¹⁴ Cicero's career is summarised by Appian, *BC* 4.6.51 Mendelssohn: *Κικέρων δὲ ὁ Κικέρωνος προαπέσταλτο μὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα, τοιάδε ἔσεσθαι προσδοκῶντος: ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἐς Βρούτον καί μετὰ Βρούτον ἀποθανόντα ἐς Πομπήιον ἔλθων τιμῆς παρ' ἑκατέρῳ καί στρατηγίας ἤξιοῦτο. ἐπὶ δὲ ἐκείνοις αὐτὸν ὁ Καῖσαρ ἐς ἀπολογία τῆς Κικέρωνος ἐκδόσεως ἱερέα τε εὐθύς ἀπέφηνε καὶ ὑπατον οὐ πολὺ ὕστερον καὶ Συρίας στρατηγόν: καὶ τὴν Ἀντωνίου περὶ Ἀκτιον συμφορὰν ἐπισταλεῖσαν ὑπὸ τοῦ Καίσαρος ὁ Κικέρων ὄδε ὑπατεῦων ἀνέγνω τε τῷ δήμῳ καὶ προὔθηκεν ἐπιτοῦ βήματος, ἔνθα πρότερον ἢ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ προὔκειτο κεφαλῆ; Stinchcomb, *op. cit.*, pp. 447–448; the author recognised M. Tullius Cicero as the last one in his family.*

¹⁵ Even modern scholars are not far from it, cf. Harsh 1954, 97–103.

¹⁶ On the subject of *modo Romano* revenge see de Visscher 1947; Thomas 1984, 65–100 (on retaliation processes); Gaughan 2010; Jońca 2011, 33–43; Flaig 2013, 137–155.

¹⁷ Cf. Thomas 1984, 66; Sawiński 2008, 141–150.

constant support that the Roman people were bestowing on him demonstrates the importance of the command of avenging the loved ones in the Roman value system.

Cicero Junior faced exactly the same command. He was the last male descendant of the deceased and, furthermore, the closest living male relative of both Quinti¹⁸. After the death of the Orator other relatives tried to keep a low profile¹⁹. In fact, women in that period were also avenging the death of their loved ones, the example of which is *Thuria*²⁰. Pomponia, the ex-wife of Quintus, got her hands on Philologus, the freedman of her husband who gave Cicero the Orator away into the hands of the murderers. Interestingly enough, it was Mark Antony who gave her Philologus. She ordered to have him tortured and so that he would not suffering too little, she allegedly forced him to have his own body parts cut off, roasted and eaten²¹. Plutarch did not quite believe this last detail but he passed it on after other historians. The question remains, who did Pomponia avenge: a husband and a son or perhaps her brother-in-law? Considering the turbulent history of Quintus and Pomponia's marriage²², the son should be rather pointed at. The fact that her revenge was exerted on Philologus can be explained by the situation in which she could not reach the actual murderers who were, on top of everything, Roman citizens. In their case, she would have to appeal, just like *Thuria*, to the courts of law and therefore also to trust legal assignees. Philologus, as a freedman and, what is more, a *libertus ingratus*²³, was perfectly suited for the role of an alternative victim. Also clients and freedmen took vengeance on the wrong-doers of their patrons, which Cicero the Father learnt the hard way as, according to one of the versions, he was given away by a shoemaker, the former client of Clodius²⁴. The preserved accounts are silent on such activity of Ciceronian clients, although the biography of Tiro or the epigram of Tullius Laurea²⁵ can be regarded as a form of retaliation.

¹⁸ Possibly, he was the last one in his family – Stinchcomb 1933, 447–448.

¹⁹ della Corte 1937, 337–347.

²⁰ CIL VI 37053 col. I 1.3–6; Jońca 2011, 99–106.

²¹ Plut., *Cic.* 49.2 Perrin: πλὴν ἐν γέ τι φρονήσας μέτριον ἐν τούτοις Πομπωνία τῇ Κοῖντου γυναικὶ τὸν Φιλόλογον παρέδωκεν. ἡ δὲ κυρία γενομένη τοῦ σώματος ἄλλαις τε δειναῖς ἐχρήσατο τιμωρίαις, καὶ τὰς σάρκας ἀποτέμοντα τὰς αὐτοῦ κατὰ μικρὸν ὄπταν, εἰτ' ἐσθίειν ἠνάγκασεν. οὕτω γὰρ ἔνιοι τῶν συγγραφέων ἱστορήκασιν ὁ δ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Κικέρωνος ἀπελεύθερος Τίρων τὸ παράπαν οὐδὲ μέμνηται τῆς τοῦ Φιλόλογου προδοσίας.

²² Cf. Wiśniewska 2014, 67–73.

²³ Although Philologus was not Cicero's freedman, the sources unambiguously indicate (cf. Plutarch's προδοσία) that his deed was a transgression against the rules of social life and duties of freedmen. On *liberti ingrati* cf. Kamienik 1983, 63–81.

²⁴ App., *BC* 4.19 Mendelssohn.

²⁵ pp. 102–103 Morel, Buechner.

Amongst Cicero's friends, only Brutus was officially mentioning vengeance for his death – interestingly enough, only upon Antony²⁶. The only question is, on whom should Cicero the Son focus his attention? Who was responsible for the death of his father – there were four candidates: the actual killer, in the traditional account – centurion Laena/Herrenius and his three paymasters, Caesar, Lepidus and Mark Antony.

Ancient and modern historiography tends to downplay the young Caesar's participation in the proscriptions. In fact, only Suetonius writes that in that particular period of his career, Augustus was obstinate and cruel²⁷. Cassius Dio even states that Caesar could not be responsible for them since he had no time to make enemies, as opposed to Lepidus and Antonius; besides, he had a gentle personality and anyway copied the model of the senior Caesar, while the undeniable fact of authorizing proscriptions by him was a result of conjointly exercising the authority: *ταῦτα δὲ ἐπράττετο μὲν ὑπὸ τε τοῦ Λεπίδου καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀντωνίου μάλιστα πρὸς τε γὰρ τοῦ Καίσαρος τοῦ προτέρου ἐπὶ μακρότατον τιμηθέντες, καὶ ἐνταῖς ἀρχαῖς ταῖς τε ἡγεμονίαις ἐπὶ πλεῖστον γενόμενοι, πολλοὺς ἐχθροὺς εἶχον', ἐδόκει δὲ καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ Καίσαρος κατὰ τὴν τῆς δυναστείας κοινωνίαν γίνεσθαι, ἐπεὶ αὐτὸς γε οὐδέν τι συχνοὺς ἀποκτεῖναι ἐδεήθη: τῇ τε γὰρ φύσει οὐκ ὤμῶς ἦν, καὶ ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς ἤθεσιν ἐνετέθραπτο*²⁸. It is worth noting Dio's ἐδόκει, which expresses insecurity and suggests that the future Augustus got implicated in the proscriptions almost by accident; however, the previous μάλιστα discloses the participation of the young Caesar. Appian, on the other hand, approached the matter formalistically: the triumvirs were collectively responsible for proscriptions, although he also emphasizes the activity of Lepidus and Antonius²⁹.

As long as Cicero Junior stayed with Brutus, Cassius or Sextus Pompeius, it can be stated that he was taking revenge on all those responsible for the death of his father. In 39 BC, Pompeius made a pact with the triumvirs in Misenum. Cicero decided to return to Rome then. Appian writes that Caesar ἐς ἀπολογία, as part of justification (but not compensation), made him an augur or admitted him to the college of pontiffs³⁰. If Appian's words were to be taken literally then Caesar felt guilty. The preserved accounts emphasise that Caesar saved many of

²⁶ Plut., *Ant.* 22 Perrin: [...] ὁ Βροῦτος ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ Κικέρωνι τιμωρῶν [...]; Thomas 1984, 67.

²⁷ Suet., *Aug.* 27 Ihm; Morawiecki 2014, 164.

²⁸ Cass. Dio 47.7.1–2 Sturzius.

²⁹ *BC* 4.7–8 and 12 Mendelssohn.

³⁰ App., *BC* 4.6.51 Mendelssohn; Hanslik 1948, 1285. The ἐς ἀπολογία conduct excellently corresponds with Seneca's commentary that gentleness of a victorious ruler could be the act of repentance for the previous atrocities – *clem.* 1.11.1–2 Basare.

the proscribed who were threatened by death. The same was, after all, done by Sextus Pompeius. The question, however, is why he kept gathering them around himself. In the reality of the 30s BC, it was an understandable step. Caesar was carrying the burden of fights with Pompeius, which were invariably bringing him financial and prestige losses. Pompey, as a patron of refugees, was becoming the defender of the Republic³¹. Admittedly, Pompeius demanded from the triumvirs the amnesty for the survivors of the proscriptions but it was Caesar who profited from it. By accepting at his side men such as Cicero, he took away from Pompey at least part of the grounds for calling himself the only defender of the Republic. The question remains whether it was already at that time when Cicero the Father was perceived as one of its symbols – he most assuredly thought so of himself³². The subsequent fate of his son suggests that the others thought so as well. Public praises of Cicero the Orator, if only by Sextilius Ena, started appearing in the mid-30s BC, which, after all, led to Antonius' discontentment and the polemical reactions of his writers³³.

The potential deriving from having Cicero Junior by his side became thoroughly manifested after Antony's defeat. As has been already mentioned, Cicero became a suffect consul on 13 September 30 BC, evidently for the purpose of announcing to the people on Caesar's behalf³⁴ the death of Antonius and a relevant notice was nailed on the rostra, where the head of his father had been once nailed: *καὶ τὴν Ἀντωνίου περὶ Ἄκτιον συμφορὰν ἐπισταλεῖσαν ὑπὸ τοῦ Καίσαρος ὁ Κικέρων ὄδε ὑπατεύων ἀνέγνω τε τῷ δήμῳ καὶ προύθηκεν ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος, ἔνθα πρότερον ἢ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ προύκειτο κεφαλῆ³⁵*. The vengeance was accomplished. According to Cassius Dio, it was considered to be a divine act (cf. *ὡς οὐκ ἄθεεῖ*) for it was because of Antonius – here once again *μάλιστα* is used – that Cicero the Father was killed: *ἠγγέλθη δὲ τοῦτο Κικέρωνος τοῦ Κικέρωνος παιδὸς ἐν μέρει τοῦ ἔτους ὑπατεύοντος, τοῦτό τε τινες ὡς οὐκ ἄθεεῖ δὴ συμβὰν ἐλάμβανον, ἐπειδήπερ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀντωνίου ὅτι μάλιστ' ἐτεθνήκει³⁶*. Similar opinion was held by Plutarch the moralist, on the one hand, linking the

³¹ Morawiecki 2014, 73, 99–100.

³² Cf. *Phil.* 2.12: after Caesar's murder, Brutus was to congratulate him on the occasion of regaining freedom.

³³ Cf. Harsh 1954, 100. On Cicero's criticism see Petzold, 1911, I.

³⁴ Modern scholarly works reject Plutarch's account which suggests that the resolutions condemning the memory and deeds of Marcus Antonius were enacted during Cicero's consulship. The Senate was to undertake such steps right after the battle of Actium – Babcock 1962, 30–31; Reinhold 1998, 147; Lange 2009, 126–127.

³⁵ App., *BC* 4.51 Mendelssohn.

³⁶ Cass. Dio 51.19.4–5 Sturzius.

appointment for the consulship and the announcement about Antonius' death with Caesar's decision, on the other hand, by no means excluding the intervention of the divine justice (cf. τὸ δαιμόνιον)³⁷. Seneca, far from divine associations, wrote that Cicero the Son owed his consulate only to his father³⁸.

Where is Antonius in all of this? Similarly to Cicero, he was merely a piece of Caesar's puzzle. Immediately after Actium, provisions which served to disgrace the former brother-in-law of Caesar were enacted. His statues were demolished, it was forbidden to use the *praenomen* "Marcus" in the house of the Antonii, the day of his birth was cursed, the surname was erased from the *fasti* and his memorials were also removed³⁹. Even in *Res Gestae* Augustus still does not mention his name⁴⁰. Defeating Antonius in war, the visible sign of the gods' will, demanded, however, a justification because it became the foundation for the domination of the future Augustus. The victory gained a halo of the Republic's defense. Caesar, and immediately after that – Augustus, announced that *Rem Publicam vindicavit* and, as a result, *restituit*. This renewed Republic required living confirmations – Cicero the Son become one of those. But in order to make this happen, it was first of all necessary to make Antony the enemy of the Republic. Formally, he had already been the enemy once⁴¹. Now he had to be granted the status of a symbol of the threats lying in wait for the Republic. Inevitably, he had to be thoroughly blamed for murdering Cicero, who, in turn, had to become a symbol of the Republic⁴² – and a friend of Caesar – Augustus. This was not too difficult. Hostility between Cicero and Antonius is a constant theme in the description of their mutual relations⁴³. The Philippics only confirmed it. Simultaneously, Cicero the Father becomes a member of an exclusive club of men to whom the gods reveal in advance the future greatness of Octavius⁴⁴ and from the Orator's works, which were left behind, emerges an unambiguously positive picture of the future Augustus⁴⁵. In the meantime, Antonius gains fame of a man who

³⁷ Cic. 49.4 Perrin: ἐπεὶ μέντοι τάχιστα κατεπολέμησεν Ἀντώνιον ὑπατεύων αὐτὸς εἴλετο συνάρχοντα τοῦ Κικέρωνος τὸν νίον, ἐφ' οὗ τὰς τ' εἰκόνας ἢ βουλή καθεῖλεν Ἀντωνίου καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἠκύρωσε τιμὰς καὶ προσεψηφίσατο μηδενὶ τῶν Ἀντωνίων ὄνομα Μάρκον εἶναι, οὕτω τὸ δαιμόνιον εἰς τὸν Κικέρωνος οἶκον ἐπανήνεγκε τὸ τέλος τῆς Ἀντωνίου κολάσεως.

³⁸ *De benef.* 4.30.1 Basare: *Ciceronem filium quae res consulem fecit nisi pater?*

³⁹ Strab. 14.685; Plut., *Ant.* 86 Perrin; Cic. 49 Perrin; Cass. Dio 51.19.3 Sturzius; Groebe 1894, 2611.

⁴⁰ Ridley 2003, 72–73.

⁴¹ Liv., *Epit.* 119 Weissenborn, Müller; App., *BC* 3.63 Mendelssohn; Plut., *Ant.* 17 Perrin.

⁴² Cf. Harsh 1954, *passim*. On the changes in perceiving Cicero see Richter 1968, 161–197.

⁴³ Cf. Cass. Dio 45.15.4 Sturzius and the summary of the Philippics in 45.18–47 Sturzius; K. Nakonieczna-Szkutak 2010, 84–125.

⁴⁴ Cass. Dio 45.2.1–2 Sturzius. Apart from Cicero, it included Catullus, family and friends of Octavius and Nigidius Figulus, even though the latter belonged to it, as it were, *ex officio*.

⁴⁵ Nakonieczna-Szkutak 2010, 132–145.

relishes the sight of Cicero's severed head, looking at it even during the meals, not to mention what Fulvia was doing to it, which, in turn, suspiciously reminds Hecuba's conduct towards the head of Polymestor.

In a fierce propaganda battle preceding Actium, both parties were accusing each other of the most diverse transgressions using, at the so-far unprecedented scale, all kinds of lampoons and satire works⁴⁶. Therefore, it is possible to risk the statement that assigning to Antonius the sole responsibility for Cicero's murder was contrived in Caesar's circles⁴⁷ and validated by the conduct of the murdered man's son. In this way, Caesar once again made use the potential embedded in the Romans' attitude towards the revenge. Simultaneously, he subjugated it with a thorough premeditation to his own purposes. At first he slandered the enemy in the eyes of the supporters of the Republic and then he made use of this motive to strengthen his own position. Nevertheless, what can be seen in the preserved accounts is that Augustus was rather not perceived as a friend of Cicero⁴⁸. Perhaps the future Augustus felt some sort of guilt about the Orator and the appointment of Cicero Junior as a consul was to be for Augustus himself a form of keeping his, once already given, word⁴⁹.

And Cicero? He was still used as a symbol. After the consulate he became a legate in Syria⁵⁰ and a governor of Asia⁵¹, which is commemorated on nowadays rare coin emissions from Magnesia ad Sipylum⁵² (Fig.1). As has already been mentioned, the order of taking up these offices is not entirely clear.

⁴⁶ Cf. Wallmann 1989, 318–323.

⁴⁷ Cf. the preserved fragment of a narrative poem of Cornelius Severus, who was writing in the Augustan period, with the description of death of Cicero the Father. – Corn. Sev. frg. 13 Morel, Buechner.

⁴⁸ Which is proven by an anecdote given by Plutarch (*Cic.* 49.3 Perrin: *πυνθάνομαι δὲ Καίσαρα χρόνοις πολλοῖς ὕστερον εἰσελθεῖν πρὸς ἓνα τῶν θυγατριδῶν: τὸν δὲ βιβλίον ἔχοντα Κικέρωνος ἐν ταῖς χερσίν ἐκπλαγέντα τῷ ἱματίῳ περικαλύπτειν ἰδόντα δὲ Καίσαρα λαβεῖν καὶ διελθεῖν ἐστῶτα μέρος πολὺ τοῦ βιβλίου, πάλιν δ' ἀποδίδοντα τῷ μειρακίῳ φάναι "λόγιος ἀνὴρ, ὦ παῖ, λόγιος καὶ φιλόπατρις."*)

⁴⁹ Perhaps it had a personal meaning even for Caesar himself – after all, he had once promised to Cicero that he would be his consular colleague – Cass. Dio 46.42.2 Sturzius.

⁵⁰ App., *BC* 5.51 Mendelssohn.

⁵¹ Sen. Rhet., *Suas.* 7.13 Bursian: *cum M. Tullius filius Ciceronis Asiam obtineret* [...]. On Cicero's career see Hanslik 1948, 1286; Grant 1969, 80, 385.

⁵² RPC I 2448; Hanslik 1948, 1286.



Fig. 1.

Coin emission from Magnesia ad Sipylum Obverse: portrait of M. Tullius Cicero facing right, legend ΜΑΡΚΟΣ ΤΥΛΛΙΟΣ ΚΙΚΕΡΩΝ; reverse: stretched out hand holding spikes and wreath, legend ΜΑΓΝΗΤΩΝ ΤΩΝ ΑΠΟ ΣΙΠΥΛΑΟΥ ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ (source: http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/greece/lydia/magnesia/RPC_2448.jpg. Courtesy of the Berlin Münzkabinett, article 18201912).

The reverse of the coins is interesting, finding no parallels in the coinage of Magnesia in that period – the closest analogy are, however, the coin emissions of Aizanis for the proconsul Messalia Potitus⁵³. As was correctly noticed by Michael Grant, Cicero was, next to Thorius Flaccus, the first once again republican governor of Bithynia, slightly preceding the division into the senatorial and imperial provinces, traditionally dated to 27 BC⁵⁴. The coin emissions of both are unique: Thorius placed Eirene on his, referring to the famous cistophor coins of Caesar Augustus. Ciceronian reverse and Throius' Eirene are witnesses for promulgating the conviction that the evil period has ended and the good, sacred and republican has returned. On a broader scale, it required to make Cicero a symbol of the Republic and Antonius – his killer. In consequence, Antonius aimed for murdering also the Republic but Caesar, as *vindex rei publicae*, successfully prevented it. For centuries, this has marked, however, the perception of Marcus Antonius in the consciousness of the following generations.

Streszczenie

Marek Tulliusz Cynceron, mściciel ojca

Historia i historiografia nierozzerwalnie powiązały ze sobą Marka Tulliusza Cyncerona i Marka Antoniusza. Skojarzenie to w żaden sposób nie stawia osoby

⁵³ RPC I 3067 and p. 415.

⁵⁴ Grant 1969, 385.

triumwira w pozytywnym świetle. Starożytne świadectwa, przynajmniej te zachowane, unisono obwiniają go o zamordowanie wielkiego mówcy i symbolu Republiki. Dzieje się tak przy jednoczesnym zdejmowaniu odpowiedzialności (lub jej minimalizowaniu) z Augusta. Istnieją przesłanki pozwalające sądzić, że w znacznym stopniu odpowiada za to wizja wykreowana w kręgach pierwszego z princepsów w latach trzydziestych I wieku przed Chrystusem. Znaczącą w tym rolę odegrał syn mówcy – M. Tulliusz Cynceron junior.

Dzięki poleceniom ojca udało mu się uniknąć losu przeznaczonego proskrybowanym. Po śmierci ojca, stryja i kuzyna schronił się u Brutusa, walczył pod Filippi, potem przebywał u Kasjusza Parmeńskiego i Sekstusa Pompejusza, by po umowie w Misenum wrócić do Rzymu. Zgodnie z rzymskim systemem wartości Marek powinien pomścić śmierć swego ojca, a także stryja i kuzyna. Można przyjąć, że czynił to, walcząc przeciwko triumwirom. Jednak po powrocie do Rzymu nie rozpoczął żadnej działalności wrogiej wobec młodego Cezara, swojego zresztą niemal rówieśnika. W latach trzydziestych, według zachowanych świadectw daje się zauważyć tendencję do przypisywania odpowiedzialności za zamordowanie ojca Cyncerona wyłącznie Markowi Antoniuszowi (na przykład: Korneliusz Sewerus i reakcja Azyniusza Polliona na te oskarżenia, zanotowana przez retora Senekę). Towarzyszyło temu kreowanie ojca Cyncerona na symbol Republiki. Przypuszczalnie za wszystkim stały kręgi popierające Cezara juniora przeciwko M. Antoniuszowi. W ten sposób bowiem Antoniusz stawał się zabójcą Republiki, wrogiem wszystkiego co rzymskie. Sam Cezar wykorzystał to po mistrzowsku. W 30 roku uczynił go *consul suffectus* tylko po to, aby mógł senatowi i ludowi oznajmić o śmierci Antoniusza i przybić stosowne obwieszczenie tam, gdzie kiedyś przybito głowę i rękę jego ojca: na rostrach. W ten sposób młody Cynceron dopełnił zemsty, młody Cezar stał się mścicielem Republiki (co głosił i na monetach) i jej odnowicielem (co też głosił). Wymagało to wszakże wcześniejszego uczynienia z M. Antoniusza osoby wyłącznie odpowiedzialnej za zabicie Cyncerona (choć istnieją ślady sugerujące jakieś próby oddalenia od siebie takiego zarzutu, na przykład wydanie wyzwoleńca Philologusa Pomponii). Sam Cynceron junior jako pierwszy „republikański” namiestnik zdążył jeszcze trafić do Azji lub Syrii, co świadczy o tym, że po 30 roku Cezar nadal wykorzystywał symboliczny potencjał tkwiący w jego nazwisku.