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Various recent studies have suggested that the love of fathers and mothers for their children was not only one of the ideals of Roman culture but also a natural everyday occurrence. This perspective can be seen as a reaction to Philippe Ariès’s opposite claim, advanced in his landmark study of children and families in the Ancien Régime (1960). Contrary to recent views, Ariès argued that a proper notion of childhood emerged only in the modern period, and that the high child mortality rate in pre-modern societies thwarted the development of an emotional bond between parents and children, especially infants and small children. Over the past few decades, such claims have met with increasing criticism. In her contribution to the second Roman Family Conference (1988), Suzanne Dixon, for instance, asserts that a ‘sentimental ideal of Roman family life’ had already arisen in the Late Republic. She compares this emotional ideal without further hesitation with the modern ideal of the family as a haven of

---

*I began developing the ideas set forth in this essay in a seminar on ‘Gender Relations in Cicero’s Letters’, co-taught with Leonhard Burckhardt at the University of Basel in the summer semester 2002. I am indebted to discussions with both him and the seminar participants, and gratefully acknowledge Dagmar Bargetzi’s seminar paper (2002) in particular. I am very grateful to Mark Kyburz for rendering my German thoughts into English prose.

1 Ariès 1973; for details, see the Introduction to this volume.
peace and refuge against a hostile outside world.2 In the same collection of essays, edited by Beryl Rawson, Emiel Eyben observes that sons would have likewise benefited from increasing paternal ‘warmth and tenderness’, and dates this development to the turn of the third century BCE.3

Seen against this background, the present essay discusses Marcus Tullius Cicero’s relationship with his children—Tullia and Marcus—on the basis of his letters.4 A glance at earlier studies would lead one to expect support for Eyben’s notion of ‘paternal love’5 and also for Dixon’s ‘sentimental ideal’. The relevant literature does indeed mention Cicero’s almost obsessive love for Tullia,6 his ‘unbounded affection for Tullia’,7 or at the very least observes that he loved his daughter more than his son.8 Can our modern notions of parental love, however, actually grasp Cicero’s ‘paternal love’ for his daughter?

2 Dixon 1991: 113. Likewise, Judith Hallett (1984) emphasizes the emotional bond between father and daughter (see also Suzanne Dixon’s critical review of Hallett’s essay in American Journal of Philology 107 (1986), 125–30); see further Pomeroy 1976. 3 Eyben 1991: 142 seems to believe in ‘natural’ feelings when he speaks of ‘maternal instinct’ (117), which he would probably set alongside paternal ‘instinct’. In her contribution to the fourth Roman Family Conference, Susan Treggiari (2005: 18) also uses the term ‘paternal instinct’, but places it in its historical and cultural context, defining it as ‘defence of hearth, home, fortunes, household gods, wives and children’ rather than as a purported universal. Her essay analyses the Roman perception of ‘natural affection’ in family relations in terms of their rhetorical use in Cicero’s political and court speeches.

4 Hereinafter, I refer to M. Tullius Cicero (106–43) as ‘Cicero’, and to his eponymous son (65–after 25) by his first name ‘Marcus’; ‘Q. Cicero’ designates Cicero’s younger brother (c.102–43), and ‘Quintus’ his son (67/66–43). All dates refer to the period BCE.

5 The second section of Eyben’s essays bears this title; see Eyben 1991: 116–21.

6 Hallett 1984: 134.

7 Carp 1981: 351.

8 Eyben 1991: 139. Elizabeth Rawson (1979: 197) also emphasizes how close Cicero was to his daughter, who showed greater understanding for him than his wife Terentia, for whom their son Marcus possessed ‘his mother’s practical outlook and abilities’, thus explaining his father’s lack of continuous interest in him (Rawson 1979: 223). See also Treggiari 2007: 161–2, especially n. 49, which cites the relevant literature, and n. 51, which collates the diminutives and other epithets used to refer to Tullia (see further Ermete 2003: 232 n. 1311). For a general discussion of paternal affection, specifically of fathers favouring daughters over sons, see especially Hallett 1984: 62 ff.; Pomeroy (1976: 215) refers to Plutarch’s coniugalia praecepta 36, mor. 143 B, in which he observes that fathers would love their daughters more than their sons because they felt more needed by the former.
Or does his behaviour instead reveal a specifically Roman type of parental affection? Did Cicero’s endeavour as *pater familias* to secure and perpetuate both the tradition of a consular *domus* and the name of the Tullii Cicerones, which he had founded as a *homo novus*, determine his relationship with his children? If so, however, how would this dovetail with Cicero favouring his daughter over his son, who could after all hand down his name from one generation to the next? Was not a male child, specifically, obliged to follow in the ‘footsteps of his ancestors’, as Catherine Baroin describes the prevailing social norms and expectations about male descendants? Would not Marcus therefore, by virtue of *imitatio patris*, have been obliged to imitate his father’s founding of the family’s consular standing?

These questions raise two issues: first, Cicero’s specific concerns for his children; and, second, the gender-specific differences between Cicero’s treatment of his daughter and his son. In what follows, I will first compare Cicero’s comments in his letters about his children’s education and schooling. Secondly, I will discuss his views on promoting his children’s careers (that is, grooming Marcus for a career in politics and preparing Tullia for her various marriages—and thus for her integration into society and occupation of a particular social rank). This comparative approach to Cicero’s treatment of his children serves to illuminate the everyday practices involved in establishing a tradition in a ‘new family’, how such a tradition was passed on to its children, and how it thus became established as a *tradition*.

---

9 Compared to the numerous studies on the relationship between Cicero and Tullia, his relationship with his son has hitherto received scant attention; see, however, Hall 2005. In the early 1930s, James Stinchcomb (1932/3) compared the biographical facts about Quintus and Marcus with the corresponding passages in the letters. He claims that Marcus received Cicero’s continuous support, even though he hands down the negative image of Marcus still evident in Syme (1939: 303, 498) and even in Fündling’s more recent *DNP* essay (‘[I 10] Tullius Cicero, M.’, in *DNP* 12 (2002), 902–3).

10 See Baroin’s contribution to this volume; for a discussion of *imitatio patris* as a social norm in Roman culture, see Scholz 2006.

11 Even though the relevant literature and scholarship customarily speaks of *homo novus*—and not, for instance, of *domus nova*—I would like to coin the term ‘new family’ to identify the family of the *novus homo*, because individual social ascendency obviously also implies that of the narrower and wider kinship. On the close relationship between the *domus*, that is, the domestic sphere and socio-political status and prestige, see Burckhardt 2003.
Finally, I will consider the nature of Cicero’s ‘paternal love’, and discuss the similarities and contrasts with present-day conceptions.

1. SCHOOLING AND EDUCATING CHILDREN

This first area of paternal care reveals a radical difference between daughter and son: Cicero utterly ignores his daughter’s education in his letters, unlike his son’s. It would be mistaken, however, to assume that Tullia remained uneducated. In the aristocratic domus, daughters quite obviously took part in social events, such as invitations to cultivate friendships and the conversations held on such occasions. Cicero’s earliest surviving letters to Atticus, written in 68 and 67, attest to his daughter’s involvement. For instance, Tullia, who was about 10 years old at the time, asks her father to be remembered to Atticus, whom she admonishes for not yet giving her the small gift that he had promised her. What Beryl Rawson has observed about the Roman aristocracy in general thus also applies to Tullia’s acquisition of knowledge and social customs: in an intellectual milieu in which Roman poets and Greek intellectuals moved freely, the everyday communication about philosophy, literature, and politics in the aristocratic domus contributed to the socialization of daughters as well as sons. Accordingly, Tullia would have had access to Cicero’s library, and we can assume that father and daughter would have discussed books. Later letters reveal that Cicero looked upon his daughter as an educated woman: for not only does she write to

12 Tullia’s precise year of birth is unknown; she must have been born between 79 and 76. See further Hallett 1984: 140 n. 77.
13 Cic. Att. 1.5.8 [SB 1], 1.8.3 [SB 4], 1.10.6 [SB 2]; here and in the following, the first numeral refers to the Vulgata edition of Cicero’s Letters, the second to Shackleton Bailey’s edition. For the English translation and the dating of the letters, I follow Shackleton Bailey, unless otherwise mentioned.
15 See also Peter Scholz (2006: 128), who considers the parental home the site of ‘primary socialization’. As Ann-Cathrin Harders mentions in the introduction to her contribution to this volume, socialization as the unintentional acquisition of knowledge must be distinguished from education as the intentional transfer of knowledge.
16 Rawson 2003: 156.
him, but she also reads the letters addressed to him over his shoulder, and indeed shares her assessment of the critical political situation in 49 with him. But the education she receives at home prior to her first marriage—somewhere between the age of 13 and 16—seems to have been so self-evident that it goes unnoticed in Cicero’s letters.

By contrast, Cicero’s correspondence contains many explicit references to his son’s education. In a letter to Atticus written in April 59, Cicero conveys his 6-year-old son’s request to ‘give Aristodemus the same answer about him as you gave about his cousin, your nephew’. Shackleton Bailey suspects that Aristodemus, referred to only once in Cicero’s letters, was the boys’ private tutor, and that they were obliged to send their apologies for missing a grammar lesson.

Two weeks later, Cicero wrote two further letters to Atticus, on 16 (or 17) and 20 April respectively, whose final salutations each contain a line of Greek. In the first letter, this reads καὶ Κικέρων ὁ μικρὸς ἀσπάζεται Τίτον τὸν Ἀθηναῖον—‘Le petit Cicéron salue Tite l’Athénien’, as Shackleton Bailey translates the line according to his ingenious convention to render the Greek in French. He refers here to Wieland’s nice idea, for which there is obviously no evidence, that Marcus, who had begun to learn writing Greek, had appended the line.

Three aspects of this first reference to Marcus’ education are worth noting: first, Cicero’s paternal interest in his son’s schooling; second, the sons of the two Cicero brothers are educated together; and third, the interesting reference to the essentially bilingual education of the Roman elite. A survey of the other passages in the letters indicating

17 Even though the correspondence contains no letter written by Tullia, explicit reference to such letters is made; see, for instance, Cic. Att. 10.2.2 [SB 192] (dated 5 or 6 Apr. 49) or Att. 10.8.1 [SB 199] (2 May 45).
18 Cic. Att. 10.13.1 [SB 205].
19 Cic. Att. 10.8.1 [SB 199].
20 Cic. Att. 2.7.5 [SB 27]; see Shackleton Bailey 1965–70: vol. 1, 367.
21 Cic. Att. 2.9.4 [SB 29]; see also Att. 2.12.4 [SB 30] and 2.15.4 [SB 35]. See also Shackleton Bailey’s comments on the passages.
22 Unlike a long tradition of German classics scholarship, which has postulated the fundamental difference between Greek and Roman culture since the nineteenth century, a view that is also held in this volume by Ann-Catherin Harders (with reference especially to the work of Ulrich Gotter), I assume the indistinguishable
Cicero’s efforts on behalf of his son’s education confirms the first two aspects mentioned above: Cicero’s concern for his son’s education and for good tutoring, and his mutual concern for his son and nephew. Another aspect is also evident, namely Cicero’s paternal endeavour to oversee and ensure his son’s progress and studiousness.

One of the letters written to his brother, Quintus, establishes quite clearly that Cicero was actively involved in the education of both his son and nephew. Should Quintus raise no objections, Cicero writes in 54, he would tutor his nephew himself, since he had now gained quite some practice through teaching Marcus during his enforced political inactivity.\(^{23}\) Thereupon, his brother, Quintus Cicero, writes to his son, instructing him to now regard his uncle as his tutor.\(^{24}\) Cicero sees his tuition as meaningfully complementing Paeonius’ rhetoric lessons. He informs his brother, furthermore, that he will introduce Quintus to the declamation exercises himself.\(^{25}\)

One important tutor for both Marcus and Quintus was Dionysius, a freedman of Atticus. In July 54, Cicero writes to Atticus, requesting his earliest possible visit so that Dionysus could teach both him and his son.\(^ {26}\) He reiterates his demand a few months later.\(^ {27}\) Three years later, Dionysius is in fact present in Cicero’s household, who commends him in his letters to Atticus.\(^ {28}\) Even though he remarks that the two boys complain about Dionysius’ fits of violent temper, Cicero defends their tutor to the utmost: never had a man been more learned, more virtuous, and more loving of Atticus and himself than Dionysius.\(^ {29}\) It is thus quite surprising that two years later, in 49, Cicero describes this once highly reputable tutor as lacking the

---

\(^{23}\) Cic. ad. Q. fr. 2.13.2 [SB 17]; see also Cic. ad Q. fr. 3.4.6 [SB 24]: Cicero takes Marcus to the Tusculanum, not for recreational but instead for educational purposes.

\(^{24}\) Cic. ad Q. fr. 3.1.19 [SB 21].

\(^{25}\) Cic. ad Q. fr. 3.3.4 [SB 23]; for a general discussion of rhetorical education, see Rawson 2003: 147–53; for a detailed discussion of declamation, see Kaster 2001.

\(^{26}\) Cic. Att. 4.15.10 [SB 90], letter dated 27 July 54.

\(^{27}\) Cic. Att. 4.18.5 [SB 92], written between 24 Oct. and 2 Nov.

\(^{28}\) Cic. Att. 5.9.3 [SB 102].

\(^{29}\) Cic. Att. 6.1.12 [SB 115]: pueri autem aiunt eum furenter irasci; sed homo nec doctior nec sanctior fieri poesi nec tui meisque amantior.
gift of teaching. He would therefore rather teach his son and his nephew himself. In a letter to Atticus written two days later, he reports the dismissal of Dionysius.30

These references suggest that, as a father, Cicero was intensely concerned with his son’s progress and tutoring, just as he was as a patruus (a paternal uncle) with his nephew’s.31 This concern involved strict supervision. Various letters concerning Marcus’ study visits to Athens in 45 and 44 attest to his father’s surveillance: Marcus, on the one hand, writes his father letters that demonstrate that his writing style and knowledge of literature were progressing—in two letters to Atticus, Cicero praises his son’s letters, written ‘in a good archaic style indeed and pretty long’.32 Cicero, however, is not content to let the matter rest there. In several letters to Atticus written in the spring of 44, he expresses his intention to travel to Athens to observe his son’s progress for himself.33 This intention never materialized. Failing his own inspections, Cicero commissioned various tutors, including Leonidas and Herodes, to send regular progress reports.34

C. Trebonius, one of Cicero’s fellow senators, visits Marcus in Athens on his journey to assuming office as proconsul of the province of Asia. In a letter dated May 44, he congratulates Cicero on his

30 Att. 8.4.1–2 [SB 156], dated 22 Feb. 49; see, however, 8.5.1 [SB 157] (written on the same day) where Cicero mentions reconciliation with Dionysius and demands a sharp letter from him, addressed to Atticus, in return; Att. 8.10 [SB 159], dated 25 Feb. 49, reports the dismissal of Dionysius; in this letter, Cicero mentions that while he is reluctant to see him leave as the boys’ tutor, he is pleased to see the back of an homo ingratus, an ‘ungrateful fellow’.

31 On Cicero’s conduct as patruus, see Bettini 1986: 47–9.

32 Cic. Att. 14.7.2 [SB 361; my translation is slightly modified]: litterae sane πεπνουμέναι et bene longae; see also Cic. Att. 15.16 [SB 391].

33 Att. 14.16.3 [SB 370], dated 2 May 44, and beforehand 14.13.4 [SB 367], dated 26 Apr. 44.

34 Cic. Att. 14.16.3–4 [SB 370]. Incidentally, Cicero quite as a matter of course also informs his brother, Q. Cicero, about his son’s progress during his absence from Rome—Quintus is obviously quite often at his uncle’s house, for instance in March 56 when Cicero reports his nephew’s good progress, since he was being taught by Theophrastus of Amisus (referred to as Tyrannio in the letter); see Cic. ad Q. fr. 2.4.2 [SB 8]. See further Cic. ad Q. fr. 3.1.14 [SB 21], where Quintus’ studiousness is praised; in the same letter, Cicero assures his brother that he forgives his ‘continual enquiries’ about young Quintus; the letter also requests his brother’s wife Pompeonia to come to Arpinum, since Cicero would like to have Quintus’ company during the otium (3.1.7 [SB 21]).
son: ‘I came to Athens [...] and there saw what I most desired to see, your son devoting himself to liberal studies and bearing an extraordinary reputation on account of his modesty.’ He also mentions that following Marcus’ interest in becoming acquainted with Asia, he had invited Cicero’s son to visit him during his governorship. Trebonius assures Cicero that Marcus would be accompanied by Cratippus, his tutor, so that his education would suffer no interruption.

Cicero was not afraid to impose decisions concerning tutors upon his son, even against his will. Thus Plutarch mentions that Cicero suspected one tutor, Gorgias, of inciting Marcus to indulge in merrymaking and excessive drinking. He had therefore forbidden his son from attending any more lessons with Gorgias. With Cicero’s *Letters to Friends*, a parallel body of correspondence has survived, allowing us to verify Plutarch’s statement. In a letter to Tiro, Cicero’s secretary, dating from the summer of 44, Marcus mentions not his father’s reasons but indeed his directive, observing that his ‘kindest and dearest father’ (*humanissimus et carissimus pater*) had imposed upon him the dismissal of Gorgias, his teacher of rhetoric. While Marcus found the latter’s lessons useful, he realizes that he would have been ‘taking a lot upon myself in judging my father’s judgement’ (*grave esse me de iudicio patris iudicare*).

These references to Cicero’s paternal concern for his son’s studies suggest a notion of education that differs markedly from modern educational goals: in ancient Rome, sons were not meant to develop their individual abilities and interests, but instead lessons were aimed...
at imparting skills designed to enable male children to further pursue the social and political prestige established by their fathers. The purpose of paternal control was to maintain a certain social standing for male offspring, and to thus safeguard the family name. Cicero’s funding of Marcus’ education plainly reveals this underlying intention: his repeated enquiries to Atticus about the safe receipt of monies, and his frequent requests that Marcus be well endowed indicate his concern about his son possessing sufficient freely disposable assets to afford a lifestyle commensurate with his status. Marcus must be amply provided for (honestissime copiosissimeque), not simply as a matter of paternal duty but also as a matter of safeguarding his father’s social standing and dignity. Cicero compares Marcus to the sons of other senators, and observes that his expenditure should not be lower than that of Bibulus, Acidinus, or Messalla, who were all staying in Athens at the same time. Consequently, Marcus’ lifestyle in Athens must at the very least match but preferably surpass that of his peers. He thus becomes his father’s alter ego, whose political and social standing he must display outwardly. What Cicero has achieved for his domus, Marcus must show before the Greeks and Romans in Athens.

Various other aspects of the education of Marcus and his cousin Quintus illustrate how the Tullii Cicerones sought to establish a joint family tradition. Cicero’s comments to his brother, Quintus, about Paeonius’ rhetoric lessons are remarkable in this respect. He informs his brother that he will teach his son and his nephew additional lessons. He asserts that his own rhetorical training is more learned and more abstract than Paeonius’. He therefore intends to introduce their sons to a declamatory technique that both fathers ‘have been
through [...] ourselves. In so doing, he resorts to the fathers’ own youth. Is the joint education of Marcus and Quintus not aimed precisely at establishing a tradition, or indeed at continuing a tradition based on the bond between their fraternal fathers? On account of its only recently achieved upward social mobility, and on the basis of unique historical sources, I would argue that the case of the Tullii Cicerones allows us to explore how family identity was established in Roman culture. Whereas established aristocratic families could model themselves upon a more or less long line of ancestors selected on the basis of their success, thereby allowing descendants to ‘follow in their footsteps’, as Catherine Baroin’s contribution to the present volume suggests, or whose images function as continuous reminders or admonishment, as Véronique Dasen and Ann-Cathrin Harders demonstrate, the Tullii Cicerones must first establish their connection with a glorious past. One constituent element of this endeavour is Cicero’s active involvement in the education of his son and nephew. He thus assumes the task of both pater and paterus severus—even though he later reproaches himself for not having been strict enough with either boy. Marcus’ letter to Tiro allows us a glimpse of the Roman notion of severitas: even at the age of 20, Marcus would never dream of questioning his father’s judgement, at least not in a letter to his secretary which ran the risk of being seen by Cicero. Evidently, the relationship between father and son was such a fundamental part of Roman culture that a son’s obligation to exercise pietas and dutiful respect of his father’s will made open criticism inconceivable.

44 Cic. ad Q. fr. 3.3.4 [SB 23].
46 With regard to Andrew Lintott’s (2008) warning about placing too much faith in the accuracy of facts in Cicero’s speeches and letters (on the need to situate the texts in their pragmatic context of utterance, see Hall 2005), I would argue that the relevance of family tradition and identity concepts have nothing to do with Lintott’s concern for positivist facts but rather with conceptions and meanings; Cicero’s representation of matters is thus singly decisive in historical terms, irrespective of whether it coincides with extratextual reality. For a more detailed discussion of the relationship between text and reality, see Späth 2006.
47 See also Scholz 2006: 128–36; for a discussion of the social and especially legal dimensions of the relationship between fathers and sons, see Thomas 1983.
Cicero’s endeavour to establish a family tradition along the lines described above becomes evident in areas other than schooling and education; these concern his daughter as much as his son.

2. CICERO’S SUPPORT FOR HIS CHILDREN’S CAREERS IN POLITICS AND SOCIETY

In the aristocratic domus, a son’s cursus honorum corresponded to a daughter’s marital career. In a culture in which her father’s and her husband’s positions in society determined a woman’s social standing, marriage represented a crucial decision for daughters. In the 1970s and 1980s, women’s studies heavily criticized the fact that women served solely to secure relationships between men, and that their personal interests were ignored as a result. Does such an assessment of marriage as a means of abusing or exploiting daughters not amount to a rather simple projection of current notions onto another, foreign society such as ancient Rome? Closer examination of Tullia’s marriages suggests that our modern concept hardly corresponds to Tullia’s and Terentia’s perception. While a Roman father by all means ‘instrumentalized’ his daughter by marrying her off to political friends, and thereafter dissolved the marriage depending upon political and financial developments, to subsequently remarry her, he instrumentalized his son in exactly the same fashion. Instrumentalization must here be conceived as a descriptive rather than as an evaluative term.

Tullia’s ‘Marital Career’

Tullia’s first engagement was to C. Calpurnius Piso Frugi in December 67. Cicero conveys this news to Atticus in a somewhat terse comment: Tulliolam C. Pisoni L.f. Frugi despondimus—‘We betrothed

---

49 See, for instance, Teresa Carp’s observation (1981: 352): ‘[...] Cicero, no less than other Roman aristocrats, did not fail to exploit her [scil. his daughter’s] political value’.
Tullia to C. Piso Frugi, son of Lucius. In his letters, Cicero routinely uses the diminutive Tulliola, which carries an affective connotation, to refer to his daughter. Tullia, however, was also ‘small’ with regard to her age: she was aged between as little as 9 and no more than 12, by no means an unusual age for sponsalia in the Roman elite. Her fiancé, aged about ten years older, was the son of a praetor and descended from a consular family with whom Cicero entertained friendly relations on a political level. There are no records of the exact date of the marriage. In 63, Cicero refers to Piso as gener in his fourth Catiline Oration; the designation could apply not only to an actual son-in-law, but in a broader sense to a man only engaged to be married to his daughter. Calpurnius Piso was appointed quaestor in 58, and died either while holding office or shortly thereafter. He had stood up for his father-in-law during Cicero’s exile.

Tullia became a widow as early as 58 or 57, that is, when she was about 20. Her next marriage was instigated in 56 when she became engaged to Furius Crassipes, a rich patrician, who attained the quaestorship in 51. Cicero mentions the engagement in various

50 Cic. Att. 1.3.3 [SB 8]; I replace Shackleton Bailey’s impersonal translation (‘Tullia is engaged . . .’) with the exact pluralis maiestatis employed by Cicero in the original text. On the age of marriage, see, among others Hopkins 1965; Shaw 1987b; Lelis, Percy, and Verstraete 2003.

51 Presuming that he became quaestor in 58, at the earliest at the age of 30 (in accordance with Sulla’s lex Cornelia de magistratibus of 82), he would have been born in 88. See Treggiari 2007: 42.

52 The father of Tullia’s fiancé, L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi, was made tribune of the plebs in 90 and appointed praetor in 74, together with Verres; his grandfather, who also served as praetor, was killed in the Hispania ulterior in 112; his great-grandfather, the annalist C. Calpurnius Piso Frugi, was appointed tribune of the plebs in 149, held the office of consul in 133, and probably became censor in 120. See Shackleton Bailey’s commentary on Att. 1.3.3 [SB 8].

53 See Beryl Rawson (2003: 247; nn. 105–6) and Patricia Clark (1991: 33–4); all that is certain is the terminus ante quem: as Rawson notes, the marriage must have occurred before 58. For a reference to Piso as gener, see Cic. Catil. 4.3. Treggiari 2007 (43, 47) suggests dating the marriage to the end of Cicero’s consulship or immediately thereafter in 62.

54 Cicero mentions that he had accompanied him to the unsuccessful discussion with L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus, who was consul in 58, and whose assistance he sought against Clodius, the tribune of the plebs; see also Cic. Pis. 12–3.

letters written to his brother, Quintus, in April 56. One letter, for instance, refers to an engagement dinner hosted by Cicero to celebrate the occasion.\textsuperscript{56} In a letter to Lentulus\textsuperscript{57} dating from July 56, he mentions the engagement and closes by thanking Atticus for extending his congratulations.\textsuperscript{58} Scholars have on the whole assumed that Tullia and Crassipes married shortly afterwards, and that they were divorced in 51. No direct records of either occasion have survived.\textsuperscript{59} In an essay published in 1991, Patricia A. Clark asks whether the marriage ever occurred.\textsuperscript{60} Her interesting reasoning contrasts with Susan Treggiari’s hardly disputable view that it is difficult to imagine a young widow remaining unmarried for six years, and that Cicero would have waited for five years to urgently pursue his objective to remarry his daughter shortly before leaving Rome to assume the governorship of the province of Cilicia.\textsuperscript{61}

Cicero was indeed looking for a new husband for Tullia in 51, the year in which he left Rome to assume his duties as proconsul. Much has been written about Tullia’s third marriage. This episode offers a striking example of how in Roman culture the mater familias conducted the affairs of the domus in the absence of the pater familias, and also took decisions independently of her husband.\textsuperscript{62} Not only did Terentia, Cicero’s wife, and Tullia, his daughter, choose the

\textsuperscript{56} The engagement is first mentioned in Cic. ad. Q. fr. 2.4.2 [SB 8] (mid-March 56), thereafter 2.6.1 [SB 10] (9 Apr. 56), which gives the date of the engagement as 4 Apr., and of the banquet as 6 Apr.

\textsuperscript{57} In Cic. fam. 1.7.11 [SB 18], Cicero thanks P. Cornelius Lentulus Spinther, consul in 57, for his congratulations on Tullia’s engagement.

\textsuperscript{58} Att. 4.4a.2 [SB 78]; see also Clark 1991: 31.

\textsuperscript{59} This might be connected to the fact that Cicero wrote only infrequently to Atticus between 56 and 55, and not at all from November 54 to May 51 when they were both in Rome. About 50 letters ad familiares have survived from the same period, but these are scarcely concerned with family matters. From Cic. Att. 4.4a.2 [SB 78], we can infer that in June 56 (Shackleton Bailey dates letter 78 to ‘circa 20 June (?!) 56’), Tullia is still staying at Cicero’s country estate at Antium. In a letter to P. Cornelius Lentulus Spinther written in December 54 (fam. 1.9.20 [SB 20]), Crassipes is referred to as gener, which need not, however, as suggested above in n. 53, imply a formal marriage.

\textsuperscript{60} Clark 1991.

\textsuperscript{61} Treggiari 2007: 76.

\textsuperscript{62} See especially the letter to Appius Claudius Pulcher dating from either 3 or 4 Aug. 50 (Cic. fam. 3.12.2 [SB 75]): Quibus ego ita mandaram ut, cum tam longe futurus essem, ad me ne referrent, agerent quod probassent (‘I had told them [i.e. my family] not to consult me since I should be so far away, but to act as they thought best.’)
latter’s new husband during his absence but they also proceeded with
the engagement and shortly thereafter with the marriage between
May and early June 50.63 This placed Cicero in a delicate political
situation: shortly before the marriage, his future son-in-law, Dolabella, had accused Appius Claudius Pulcher, Cicero’s predecessor
as proconsul of Cilicia, of a breach of official duties, thereby prevent-
ing his triumph. Shortly thereafter, Dolabella instigated legal
proceedings for electoral bribery.64 Immediately upon his
appointment as Appius’ successor (in the first months of 51),
however, Cicero sought to establish amicable relations with
Appius Claudius Pulcher.65 In a letter to this influential politician,

63 In a letter written at the beginning of June 50, Caelius Rufus congratulates
Cicero on the marriage alliance with Dolabella (Cic. fam. 8.13.1 [SB 94]); for a
discussion of the possible assumptions about the date of the marriage, for which
no historical evidence exists, see Treggiari 2007: 97 f. At the time of the marriage,
Tullia was between 26 and 29 years old; while Dolabella’s age has remained uncertain,
there is good reason to believe that he was born around 74 (see Shackleton Bailey
1965–70, vol. 3, 269; Treggiari 2007: 93), thus making him two to five years younger.
The marriage lasted almost four years. Various letters contain references to the fact
that payment of the dos in three instalments in 49, 48, and 47 meant a considerable
financial burden (see Ioannatou 2006: 225, 426–9).

64 See Cicero’s letter to Appius Pulcher, Cic. fam. 3.10.1 [SB 73]; in the same letter,
dating from the the first half of April 50, Cicero also mentions that he had defended
Dolabella twice against a capital charge (capitis iudicia), and therefore considered
Dolabella’s action against Appius Pulcher as a breach of the obligation to friends
(fam. 3.10.5 [SB 73]). Moreover, he assures Appius Pulcher that Dolabella’s ‘silly,
childish talk’ (sermo stultus et puerilis)—that is, his allusions to a prospective mar-
riage with Tullia—should under no circumstances be taken seriously. This clearly
suggests that in April 50 Cicero was utterly unaware of the marriage negotiations
between Tullia and Dolabella, or that he at least followed Caelius Rufus’ advice to
postpone such a possibility (see Caelius Rufus’ letter to Cicero, fam. 8.6.1–2 [SB 88],
written in February 50—which Cicero probably received in April). See, moreover,
Cicero’s direct congratulations on Appius Pulcher’s acquittal from both the charge de
maiestate (fam. 3.11.1–2 [SB 74], 26 June (?) 50) and de ambitu (fam. 3.12.1 [SB 75],
3 or 4 Aug. 50).

65 See his letters to Appius Pulcher, Cic. fam. 3.2–13 [SB 65–76], written between
February/March 51 and August 50. The letters written between February and August
51 reveal that before leaving for the province he did his utmost to arrange a meeting
with Appius Pulcher, who was on the return journey; the meeting, however, never
took place (which Cicero complains about politely but none the less assertively; see
fam. 3.6.3–4 [SB 69]).

66 One indication of his eminent network of friends is that Appius Pulcher’s
daughters were married to the eldest son of Pompeius and to M. Junius Brutus, the
son of Servilia and M. Junius Brutus (tr. pl. in the year 83).
written in August 50, Cicero emphasizes his embarrassment about the ‘arrangement made by my family without my knowledge’ (*ea quae me insciente facta sunt a mei*),\(^{67}\) meaning Tullia’s marriage with Dolabella. Cicero thanks Appius Pulcher for conveying his tactful good wishes for the couple’s marriage fortunes.

Even though the reasons prompting Terentia and Tullia to choose Dolabella can be discerned no more than hypothetically through a web of conjectures, closer scrutiny of this affair is worthwhile—since it allows us to at least make substantiated assumptions about what determined the choice of husband from a *female* viewpoint, and about the scope of action available to female Roman aristocrats. Based on a reading of three letters written by Cicero to Atticus,\(^{68}\) John H. Collins suggested some time ago that there were originally three marriage candidates.\(^{69}\) From the letter that Cicero wrote to Atticus on 12 May 51 from Beneventum,\(^{70}\) Collins deduces the identity of an unnamed candidate, whom he calls ‘B’; Cicero rules out this candidate because he would not be acceptable to Tullia. Marriage negotiations with the second candidate (‘C’), whom Cicero refers to as ‘Servius’, could be conducted, as he writes, through Servilia, the mother of Brutus, acting as an intermediary. This candidate can be identified as Servius Sulpicius Rufus, the son of Postumia and Servius Sulpicius Rufus, a jurist, who stood for election in 52 to become consul in 51. The third candidate (‘A’), finally, remains

---

\(^{67}\) Cic. *fam.* 3.12.2 [SB 75]; see also the reiteration two sentences later: *in quo unum non vereor, ne tu parum perspicias ea quae gesta sint ab aliis esse gesta*, ‘On one point, though, my mind is easy—you will not fail to realize that what has been done has been done by others’; this follows on from the apology cited above (see n. 62) concerning the assignment of decision-making powers to his family during his absence—these passages clearly show how Cicero is desperate to maintain good political relations and pulls out all the stops of epistolary-rhetorical courtesy.

\(^{68}\) Cic. *Att.* 5.4.1 [SB 97] (Beneventum, 12 May 51), 5.21.14 [SB 114] (Laodicea, 13 Feb. 50), and 6.1.10 [SB 115] (Laodicea, 20 Feb. 50). Cicero also admonishes Atticus—without being more specific—in *Att.* 5.13.3 [SB 106], 5.14.3 [SB 107], and 5.17.4 [SB 110] (written between July and August 51) to attend to what he considers an important ‘domestic affair’ (*domesticus scrupulus, ἐνδομέσχοι, mea domestica*).

\(^{69}\) Collins 1951: 164.

\(^{70}\) Cic. *Att.* 5.4.1 [SB 97].
unnamed, but Cicero mentions that he comes on the recommenda-
tion of a woman known as Pontidia. Writing to Atticus on 13
February 50 from Laodicea in the province of Cilicia, Cicero ap-
proves of the advice given by Atticus in an earlier letter which has not
survived: Atticus had evidently recommended Sulpicius Rufus (can-
didate ‘C’), Postumia’s son, ‘since Pontidia is trifling’ (*quoniam
Pontidia nugatur*), thus ruling out candidate ‘A’. One week later,
however, in a letter to Atticus written on 20 February, he returns to
the matter on the basis of newly received letters (from either Terentia
or Atticus, or indeed from both). He writes, ‘I much prefer Pontidia’s
candidate [‘A’] to Servilia’s [‘C’]’, citing one of Atticus’ previous
letters: ‘you had written to me “but I wish you had gone back to
your old gang”’. Thus Cicero had made up his mind, and a letter
containing a corresponding instruction was duly dispatched to Ter-
entia and Tullia. Given six to eight weeks conveyance time, the
letter would have reached his wife and daughter in mid-April. Who
was ‘Pontidia’s candidate’, however, who would return Cicero to his
‘old gang’—whether socially in terms of his knightly status, or indeed
in terms of his Arpinate origins.

Based on Cic. *Brut.* 70.246, which mentions a Marcus Pontidius as
*municeps noster*, Collins suggests that candidate ‘A’, who meets with
the unanimous approval of Atticus and Cicero, must have belonged
to a *gens Pontidia* and would have stemmed from an Arpinate family
of equestrian rank. He argues that it ‘seems clear that Pontidia had
proposed some good, solid *eques*, perhaps an Arpinate, but certainly

---

71 She is mentioned in Cic. *Att.* 5.21.14 [SB 114] and 6.1.10 [SB 115].
73 Cic. *Att.* 6.1.10 [SB 115]: *De Tullia mea tibi adsentior scripti que ad eam
et ad Terentiam mihi placere; tu enim ad me iam ante scripteras ‘ac vellem te in
tuam veterem gregem rettulisses’ [...] multo enim malo hunc a Pontidia quam illum a
Servilia: ‘I agree with what you say about my Tullia, and have written to her and to
Terentia to say that I approve; you had already written to me “but I wish you had gone
back to your old gang” [...] for I much prefer Pontidia’s candidate to Servilia’s.’
74 Collins 1951: 167.
75 With regard to *vetus greg*, Shackleton Bailey observes: ‘the implication here is
doubtless partly social’ (Shackleton-Bailey 1965–70: vol. 3, 244).
not a member of a patrician family active in politics. Consequently, in December 51 or at the beginning of January 50, Terentia and Tullia found themselves in the following situation: the negotiations with Pontidia, whose respectability had at first been doubted, had resulted in a tangible outcome, since Atticus supported Pontidia’s candidate; Tullia and Terentia obviously knew, moreover, that Atticus would write to Cicero along these lines. Apparently, however, rumours about a possible marriage between Dolabella und Cicero’s daughter were afloat in Rome as early as February 50, suggesting that discussions between Tullia, Terentia, and Dolabella had already taken place—despite, or as I would suggest, because Atticus, Cicero’s adviser, had begun to express his preference for the Arpinate eques. As mentioned above, Cicero’s wife and daughter did not receive news of his explicit approval for Pontidia’s marriage candidate until April. Cicero, moreover, changed his mind again a few weeks later—presumably in April 50—after Tiberius Claudius Nero had conducted negotiations with him about the marriage in the province. He now dispatched ‘reliable persons’ to Rome—but these evidently only arrived after Tullia’s engagement to Dolabella. In a letter to Atticus written in early August, Cicero observes: ‘Here am I in my province paying Appius all manner of compliments, when out of the blue I find his prosecutor becoming my son-in-law!’

The circumstances surrounding Tullia’s third marriage point to various interesting aspects: first, women quite evidently performed a decisive role in proposing possible marriage candidates; negotiations

76 Collins 1951: 166. Shackleton-Bailey (1965–70, vol. 3, 195) thus speaks of ‘a mere eques’, and Susan Treggiari (2007: 87 f.) suspects that the man in question could have been either a young eques at the beginning of his political career, or that fathers in Cicero’s situation ‘might lower their sights to a husband not active in public service’—for instance opting for a ‘cultured, wealthy, well-born eques, rather like Atticus himself’.

77 See Caelius Rufus’ letter to Cicero written in February 50, fam. 8.6.1–2 [SB 88].

78 Shackleton Bailey assigns ‘April (?) 50’ as a date to Cicero’s letter of recommendation concerning Tiberius Claudius Nero, Cic. fam. 13.64 [SB 138], addressed to Minucius Thermus, propraetor of the province of Asia (Shackleton Bailey amends the traditional name of the addressee ‘Publius Silius’ thus).

79 Cic. Att. 6.6.1 [SB 121], dated 3 Aug. 50: ego dum in provincia omnibus rebus Appium orno, subito sum factus accusatoris eius socer; on the charges brought by Dolabella against Appius Claudius Pulcher, see n. 64 above.
were conducted with Servilia and Pontidia, and the correspondence between Cicero and Atticus specifies marriage candidates under reference to their female brokers. Such arrangements constitute a remarkable form of identifying suitable men in a society in which individuals were routinely named after their father and grandfather. Secondly, we can infer from Cicero’s first letter to Atticus, in which the subject is broached, that a daughter’s views were much heeded: Cicero, as observed, rules out candidate ‘B’ because he doubts whether Tullia ‘could be brought to consent’. Thirdly, the episode provides a concrete example of how marriages served to establish and cultivate political and amicable relations (which amounts to the same) in the Roman elite. Tullia’s first two husbands, whom Cicero helped choose, belonged to a highly prestigious and considerably affluent domus. The engagements and marriages enable Cicero to secure amicable relations. It is thus neither accidental that Calpurnius Piso committed himself to Cicero’s return from exile, nor that Crassipes visited Cicero at his country estate in 49 to convey news of the situation in Pompeius’ camp.

While securing advantages for himself, these marriages also enabled Cicero to establish circumstances for Tullia commensurate with her social standing. In this respect, the episode surrounding the third marriage reveals another important aspect: Tullia and her mother quite obviously proceeded in full compliance with the criteria applicable to marriages among the Roman elite, aimed at enhancing the social prestige of one’s own family—and, by further implication, of one’s daughter. Not only did they take decisions in Cicero’s absence but they in effect took advantage of it to avert a mistake on his part. If Cicero and Atticus were actually seriously considering someone born into an Arpinate equestrian family as

---

80 Cic. *Att.* 5.4.1 [SB 97]: *vereor adduci ut nostra possit*. We must consider, however, that Tullia was between 25 and 28 years old in 51; she obviously had less influence on her first engagement when she was aged no more than between 9 and 12.

81 See above, p. 158 and n. 54.

82 Cic. *Att.* 9.11.3 [SB 178].

83 See Servius Sulpicius Rufus’ reference to Tullia’s husband as belonging to ‘young men of distinction’ in his letter to Cicero, Cic. *fam.* 4.5.5 [SB 248].
Tullia’s third husband, this would have entailed her clear social demise. Just like her father, this marriage would have returned Tullia to what Atticus calls the ‘old gang’ (vetus grex), which Cicero’s brilliant career had catapulted him out of, and which her first two marriages had elevated her above. I would argue, possibly somewhat daringly, that faced with the impending decision for wedlock with a man from a rural equestrian family, mother and daughter forged ahead with negotiations with Dolabella. Choosing him contributed decisively to safeguarding Tullia’s social prestige but also brought about a better decision for the domus Tullia than the pater familias would have reached himself. The episode demonstrates that Terentia and Tullia made an essential contribution to protecting and continuing the family tradition. Given that Dolabella held the promise of good connections to Caesar’s camp, we can perhaps even surmise that Cicero’s wife and daughter made a very conscious political choice based on their assessment of the circumstances prevailing in Rome at the time.84

Along these lines, the episode discussed above exemplifies my introductory remarks about so-called ‘instrumentalization’.85 It is by no means impossible that women were themselves actively involved in employing marriage and matrimony to serve political ends. Given the opportunity, for instance in the absence of the pater familias, as shown, they took matters into their own hands or brokered engagements. Hence, we can justifiably speak of a female marriage career, one which by all means compares with the male political career in terms of social standing.

84 By no means is this the only passage revealing the independent political deliberations of the women in Cicero’s domus: see, for instance, the decision at the beginning of 49 about whether to remain in Rome or to flee the city in Cic. Att. 7.14.3 [SB 137], 7.16.3 [SB 140], 7.17.5 [SB 141], or Cicero’s complaint that while he had been mindful of his family, they were now reproaching him for his indecisive wavering between Caesar and the Pompeians, Cic. Att. 9.6.4 [SB 172]. As mentioned above (n. 19), in Cic. Att. 10.8.1 [SB 199], Cicero alludes to letters written by Tullia in which she advises her father on how to assess the political situation in the spring of 49.

85 See above, p. 157.
Preparing Marcus’ Career

Cicero’s efforts to advance his son’s career are at first the subject of great concern in his letters. In the letters to his wife and family, and to Atticus and his brother, during his exile in 58, Cicero incessantly reproaches himself for what he has brought upon his family, and in particular upon his son.86 In November 58, he tells Atticus how unfortunate his son is for having a father who has passed on nothing other than resentment and an ignominious name: *invidia* and *ignominia nominis mei*.87 Cicero’s complaint reveals how much it mattered to him as a father to hand down a *good* name to his son.88 Almost ten years later, this concern has dissipated and self-assuredness has returned. In a letter to M. Caelius, Cicero writes that his son Marcus will be ideally placed should the *res publica* somehow survive the Civil War, for his name would ensure a ‘grand heritage’, *amplum patrimonium*.89

Cicero’s governorship of Cilicia clearly illustrates how he paves the way for Marcus’ future career. He takes his son and his nephew, Quintus, along on his journey east in early summer 51. Their slow progress and numerous stopovers en route to the province, among others in Athens, Delos, and Ephesus, undoubtedly served to introduce the two boys to the Greek Orient.90 During the military campaign in the summer and autumn of the same year, Cicero entrusts the boys to the younger Deiotaros, the son of the King of the Galatians, upon whom the Senate had already conferred the royal title during his father’s lifetime.91 Deiotaros returned Marcus and Quintus to Cicero in Laodicea in February 50. Cicero confers upon

---

86 See the letters written between April and November 58, for instance Cic. *fam.* 14.1 [SB 8], 14.2 [SB 7], 14.3 [SB 9]; Cic. *Att.* 3.19 [SB 64], 3.23 [SB 68], *ad Q. fr.* 1.3 [SB 3]; in Cic. *fam.* 14.3.1, he laments the *acerbissimos dolores miseriasque* (‘bitter sorrow and suffering’) that his guilt has brought upon his son.
87 Cic. *Att.* 3.23.5 [SB 68] (29 Nov. 58).
88 For a detailed investigation, see Catherine Baroin’s Chapter 1 in this volume.
89 Cic. *fam.* 2.16.5 [SB 154] (2 or 3 May 49).
90 See Stinchcomb 1932/3: 443, who has gone to great lengths to collate the passages in the letters concerning the course of the journey.
91 Cic. *Att.* 5.17.3 [SB 110], 5.18.4 [SB 111], 5.20.9 [SB 113].
Quintus the *toga pura* while Marcus receives the adult’s toga a year later at Arpinum. Cicero and the two boys thereafter travelled to Rhodes where Poseidonios and Molon had taught him philosophy and rhetoric twenty-five years before. From Rhodes they continued their return journey to Athens and then to Rome.

Following the outbreak of the Civil War, Cicero is undecided whether to take the boys along to Greece or, should he hold out in Italy, to send them there on their own. He also considers fleeing to Malta, but does not wish to create the impression that he has no stomach for danger. Cicero commends Marcus, whose chief concern is his father’s dignity, for being more courageous than himself. In 49, Cicero finally decided to join Pompeius in Greece, accompanied by his son, his brother, Quintus Cicero, and his nephew. Soon afterwards, in 47, he returns to Brundisium, and contemplates dispatching Marcus as an envoy to Caesar. A year later, Marcus himself considers joining Caesar in Spain, thus following his uncle and cousin who had already broken away from Cicero following the defeat of the Pompeians at Pharsalos in August 48 to join Caesar’s forces. Cicero, however, calls this decision into question: Atticus had...

---

92 Cic. *Att.* 5.20.9 [SB 113], 6.1.12 [SB 115].
93 In Cic. *Att.* 9.6.1 [SB 172], Cicero also contemplates whether Caesar might take offence if he did not perform the ritual in Rome; on conferring upon Marcus the *toga virilis*, see also 9.17.1 [SB 186], 9.19.1 [SB 189]; the letters were written between 11 Mar. and 2 Apr. 49, thus before and after the traditional dates of the ritual, the festival of Liber and Libera on 17 Mar. On the ritual, see Dolansky 2008 (including further references in n. 2, 59 f.)
95 Cic. *Att.* 6.7.2 [SB 120], *fam.* 14.5.1 [SB 119].
96 See Cicero’s deliberations in the letters written to Atticus in January and February 49: *Att.* 7.13.3 [SB 136], 7.17.1, 4 [SB 141], 8.2.4 [SB 152], 8.3.5 [SB 153].
97 Cic. *Att.* 10.9.1–2 [SB 200].
98 See the two letters written to Terentia on 14 and 19 June 47, *fam.* 14.11 [SB 166] und 14.15 [SB 167]. While Cicero does not ask for his wife’s opinion, he promises to inform her should they send their son to Caesar. In the second letter, he informs her that he has decided against sending him to Caesar. Written shortly before his divorce from Terentia, scholars have often interpreted these terse letters as a clear indication of the alienation of affection and breakdown of relations between Cicero and his wife (see, for instance, Claassen 1996: 217, or the unacceptable simplification in Dixon 1984: 88). Notwithstanding these circumstances, Cicero none the less keeps his wife abreast of the questions and plans he is turning over in his mind.
evidently raised the subject,\(^{99}\) and Cicero recalls his ‘very open’ (*liberalissime*) discussion with his son, in which he held out the prospect of financial assistance compatible with the funds available to the sons of other dignified aristocrats. Cicero, however, bids his son remember that his father had faced a volley of reproaches for leaving the optimates to return to Italy; Marcus’ prospective journey to Spain, moreover, would be interpreted as Cicero himself switching allegiances. This is a further indication of how self-evidently father and son were considered one and the same. Besides, Cicero warns Marcus that he could feel excluded once he realized how much more popular and well-connected his cousin Quintus, who had been staying with Caesar in Spain for quite some time, was. The letters reveal no more about the further deliberations between Marcus, Cicero, and Atticus.\(^{100}\) Eventually, however, Marcus travelled to Athens in 45 rather than to Spain.\(^{101}\)

The available evidence shows how Marcus was groomed for aristocratic duties through accompanying his father, thus providing him with first-hand experience, through acquiring the necessary intellectual skills like the art of conversation and rhetoric, and especially through his introduction to vital social networks. The correspondence, however, provides only one example of Cicero actively boosting his son’s political career, namely when he has Marcus, his nephew

\(^{99}\) The wording in Cic. *Att.* 12.7.1 [SB 244]—[...] *de Cicerone, cuius quidem cogitationis initium tu mihi attulisti* (‘[...] about Marcus, you started me thinking about this’)—leads one to suspect that Marcus had first conferred with Atticus before disclosing his intentions to his father. Does this perhaps point to the downside of Marcus’ above-mentioned respect for his father, namely that he does not in the first instance seek to conduct an open discussion with his father?

\(^{100}\) It is difficult to interpret the following remark in Cic. *Att.* 12.8.1 [SB 245]: *de Cicerone multis res placet* (‘About Marcus, many people approve the plan’). The *res* has been seen mostly as a reference to the decision to travel to Athens; as Shackleton Bailey has quite rightly suggested, however, it could also refer to joining Caesar in Spain. Presumably, this letter was written towards the end of the second intercalary month (that is, the month of November according to the actual calendar) in 46 while *Att.* 12.7.1 [SB 244], mentioned in the previous note, was written at the beginning of this intercalary month, so that the *res* could very well refer to the preceding letter.

\(^{101}\) See pp. 153–5 above.
Quintus, and his friend M. Caesius elected aediles in Arpinum to manage municipal finances. 102

Cicero died too soon to properly lead his son, aged only 22 at his father’s death at 43, to the cursus honorum. The above elements suggest, however, that Cicero actively laid the foundations for Marcus’ political career in a manner characteristic of the Roman aristocracy, specifically through involving his son in his own activities. The above division between ‘Schooling and Education’, on the one hand, and ‘A Career in Politics’ on the other, would therefore have made little sense from a Roman perspective. Other than grammar and rhetoric, a son’s education would have included practical instruction alongside his father: male children were assigned duties and tasks serving their father’s ends. Such instrumentalizing, however, enabled sons to obtain the necessary career qualifications. This permitted Marcus, the sole male family member surviving proscription, to become pontifex, without his father’s support but due to Octavian’s patronage; ultimately, he even became suffect consul in 30. 103

Comparing Cicero’s advancement of his children’s respective social careers shows that Tullia and Marcus received equal attention. The gender-specific difference in his attention lies simply in the distinction between socially determined female and male careers. The children’s welfare and social standing, on the one hand, and their father’s prestige and position, on the other, are all inextricably bound up in his paternal concern. ‘Instrumentalizing’ one’s children thus befitted a Roman citizen and a pater familias who instrumentalized himself to safeguard for the longer term his family’s social esteem and name. Both Tullia and Terentia’s decision concerning her marriage and Marcus’ pious obedience demonstrate that Cicero’s children and wife adopted and internalized Cicero’s conception of self. Far from being mere ‘victims’ or ‘objects’ of his paternalistic decisions, they

102 In a letter to M. Brutus, who is based in Gaul at the time, Cicero requests him to assist the Arpinate delegation of knights to collect tributes so that municipal finances can be rehabilitated; he refers to the office held by his son, nephew, and friend. See Cic. fam. 13.11.3 [SB 278], presumably written in the first half of 46.

103 The letters make no reference to a marriage involving Marcus—which would have also been part of his political career—with the exception of an allusion to a marriage offer in connection with a discussion about financial matters in a letter to Atticus written on 8 July 44 (Att. 16.1.5 [SB 409]).
instead contributed as active subjects to attaining social prestige, if necessary redressing his indecision; they thus became an integral part of family tradition.

3. EMOTIONAL AFFECTION OR FAMILY TRADITION?

Examining Tullia and Marcus’ education and how Cicero sought to advance their careers (and the expenses he incurred in pursuing both objectives) has revealed his very rational motives, aimed at constructing and maintaining family tradition in social and political respects. Obviously, such motives do not exclude emotional affection. Closer scrutiny of Cicero’s expressions of love and affection, however, reminds us to exercise caution about all too readily assuming ‘paternal love’ or ‘unbounded affection’ on his part. Contrary to claims for an ahistorical, universal ‘paternal love,’ Cicero’s letters reveal a specifically Roman paternal love, situated within a concrete historical context in which family tradition is a decisive element.

Cicero, as observed, conveys the prestige of the domus onto his children through advancing their respective careers, thus establishing a family tradition in the first place; doing so obviously presupposed his own ascendency, through which he acquired the necessary social and political capital for himself and for the Tullii Cicerones. The love and affection that he expresses for his children fits into this context. Cicero protests his love through recourse to prevailing norms of expressing esteem and appreciation. Rather than valuing particular individual attributes, Cicero commends Tullia, ‘the most loving, modest, and clever daughter a man ever had; for her pietas, modestia, ingenium.’ In a letter to Terentia written in 47 while anxiously awaiting Caesar’s benevolence at Brundisium, he praises

104 On the emotional connotations of the vocabulary used with regard to Tullia, see Treggiari 2007: 161 f. and Ermete 2003: 232 n. 1311.
105 Cic. ad Q. fr. 1.3.3 [SB 3]; Cicero wrote this letter to his brother from exile, on 13 June 58, and it becomes generally apparent that his exuberant expressions of love and affection occur especially in letters written in extreme circumstances.
his daughter’s *virtus*,\textsuperscript{106} *humanitas*, and *dignitas*,\textsuperscript{107} for she is ‘so wonderfully brave and kind’. Likewise, Marcus must embody his father’s *dignitas*, and Cicero praises his *fortitudo* and *modestia*, ‘courage and modesty’.\textsuperscript{108} Apparently, Cicero’s love for his children focuses not on specific behaviour or abilities but instead on their highest possible conformity with those aristocratic values that he expects every *vir bonus* to possess, and for which he commends both his children and his friends.

Notwithstanding that his esteem for his children has nothing to do with their individual personality but instead with conforming to overarching social norms and values, we need not refute claims to Cicero’s ‘paternal love’. His esteem, however, allows us to recognize the historical and cultural contingency of this particular ‘love’. Cicero expresses his affection for his children because this corresponds to the requirements and moral rules that he expects from the *boni* and that serve as the yardstick with which he measures his own life. For it is precisely this yardstick that determines whether a name will find the approval of the senatorial aristocracy in Rome or not.\textsuperscript{109} In Cicero’s case, the essential condition of Roman ‘paternal love’ is the successful adoption of a family tradition and its continuation. Cicero loves his children as images of the Tullii Cicerones family. Tullia and Marcus follow in the footsteps of their father, each according to their gender, in what amounts to the transmission of tradition through


\textsuperscript{106} In this context, *virtus* designates ‘virtue’ or ‘reaching one’s highest human potential’ (in the sense of Greek *aretē*). Even though it is undisputed that the etymology of the Roman notion of virtue refers to *male* virtue in the first instance (and thus also to Greek *andreia*), I would argue that attempts to reduce the re-emergence of the word in texts written in Latin during the Republican period to an exclusive ‘manliness’—see, for instance, McDonnell 2006, who postulates a semantic field with exclusively military connotations—fail to capture actual usage. While *virtus* is attributed much more frequently to male figures, assigning this quality to Tullia is by no means an isolated case.

\textsuperscript{107} Cic. *fam.* 14.11 [SB 166] (14 June 47).

\textsuperscript{108} See the above-cited references to *dignitas* (Cic. *Att.* 14.7.2 [SB 361], 14.11.2 [SB 365]), to *fortitudo* (Cic. *Att.* 10.9.1–2 [SB 200]), and to the son’s *modestia* mentioned in Trebonius’ letter (Cic. *fam.* 12.16.1 [SB 328]).

\textsuperscript{109} Cicero refers to those values which *conventionally* decide on social ascendency; during his lifetime and amid the turmoil of several civil wars, however, these values were severely called into question.
their metonymization: each part of the family refers to the family as a whole.

In a letter to his brother written from exile in June 58, Cicero observes that Tullia is ‘the image of my face and speech and mind’;110 thus lavishing the highest praise on her. This might also account for the *fanum*111 that Cicero intended to erect following his daughter’s death. Cicero’s unbounded grief and his obsession with such a ‘monument’ or ‘shrine’ puzzled his contemporaries—Atticus showed little enthusiasm for the idea—as much as it has continued to mystify scholarship.112 If we, however, assume paternal love along specifically Roman historical and social lines, that is, as love for one’s own image, one’s own name and its prestige, Cicero mourning his daughter’s death could be conceived as the loss of part of his own identity. Identity was considered to be neither autonomous nor individual in Roman culture, but instead it was strictly aligned with generational lines of transmission. Cicero’s endeavour to erect a *fanum* as a means of solace thus amounts not merely to an emotionally upset father’s overstrung reaction to his daughter’s death. Erecting such an edifice would have served not only to render eternal homage to his virtuous daughter but also to immortalize the Tullii Cicerones.113 If ever erected, it would have acted as a substitute for the loss of Tullia as a bearer of family tradition.

110 Cic. ad Q. fr. 1.3.3 [SB 3]: *effigiem oris sermonis animi mei*; thereafter follows the remark addressed to his brother *tuam filium imaginem tuam*, ‘Likewise your son, your image [...]’. Catherine Baroin’s chapter in this collection examines in depth the physical and moral similarities between father and son, which also serve to recall the father; see especially Sect. 8, pp. 37–47, of her chapter. Baroin’s reflections on the similarity not only between sons and fathers but also between daughters and fathers (see pp. 41–2) place Cicero’s comments on Tullia in their social context.

111 See Treggiari 1998: 16 and n. 58 on the relevant passages.

112 See, for instance, Pierre Boyancé’s critical reflections (1944) on the possible philosophical backgrounds of the construction of the *fanum*. Boyancé takes issue with what he considers to be Pierre Grimal’s untenable claims about the neo-Pythagorean foundations and mystical religious beliefs involved. Treggiari 1998: 14–23 analyses the various phases of Cicero mourning Tullia’s death based on a (modern) three-phase psychological model of grief, and thus postulates an ahistorical-universal emotionality of human ‘nature’: she suggests that Cicero’s ‘bitter grief [...] was entirely natural’ (16, my emphasis).

113 The significance of the monument built to commemorate Tullia would be comparable to the inscriptions for *deliciae*, which Christian Laes refers to as ‘monuments of self-representation in a status-conscious society’ in the conclusions to his contribution to this volume.
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