MYTH, HISTORY AND CULTURE IN REPUBLICAN ROME

Studies in honour of T.P. Wiseman

edited by

David Braund & Christopher Gill

UNIVERSITY of EXETER PRESS

7

Ancestral Virtues and Vices

Cicero on Nature, Nurture and Presentation

SUSAN TREGGIARI

> People will not look forward to posterity, who never look backward to their ancestors.
>
> (Burke, *Reflections on the Revolution in France*)

The Roman ruling class did both these things, often publicly. Arguments about the status of ancestors and appeals to posterity were deployed in the expectation that they would be effective with the republican electorate.

Moral Claims: Presenting Individuals in Relation to their Families

It will hardly be necessary to remind the author and readers of *New Men in the Roman Senate* how frequently known ancestry (or the lack of it) was a theme in the presentation of politicians.[1] Nobility, descent from high office-

1. Wiseman 1971, 107–16. Cf. Earl 1961, 28–40, 1967, 44–58; Hellegouarc'h 1972; Woodman 1977, 255–63; Courtney 1980, 381–4; Flower 1996, 16–23. Translations are my own. Dates are BC. References to Cicero will be by title of work only. In citations from the letters of Cicero, Shackleton Bailey's number is given first, before the slash, then the traditional numbers. (The fourth number is that of the paragraph and does not appear in all translations.) References to moderns are deliberately sparing. I am grateful for the suggestions of participants in the Exeter conference, and to an earlier audience at Santa Barbara which heard some of this material. My own collection of data was supplemented by cross-references supplied by published discussions and commentaries: I acknowledge that my debt to the scholars cited goes beyond the specific references to them.

holders, was precisely 'known virtue', *cognita uirtus* (*ep. Hirt* fr. 3 Watt pp. 162–3). The voters were supposed to think they knew something about a man already: he would be like his ancestors, of whose deeds they were aware or likely to be reminded. New men, however, relied on the reputation they themselves had achieved. When standing for election, men offered themselves and, if possible, their families for scrutiny. Success implied endorsement by fellow-citizens and built on whatever repute had previously been achieved. A politician coming before the people, for instance, to thank them for his election, would speak in praise of his ancestors, if possible, as well as of himself.[2] Similarly, prosecutor, defendant and witnesses in criminal cases—and the corresponding actors in civil cases—would highlight the reputation of individuals and families. It was, for example, routine for a candidate accused of bribery to specify his parents, his way of life and the merits which encouraged him to stand for office (Quint. *Inst.* 4.2.15; cf. *Inv.* 2.106–7).

Much of what shows up in the surviving sources concentrates on rank, the offices which ancestors had won, and on social station, the great names. But even there, a moral claim is implicit.[3] The ancestors had conferred benefits on the Roman people and deserved well.[4] Their names were famous because of their deeds. Nobility and excellence were closely linked: Cicero often uses *optimus*, 'best', and *nobilissimus*, 'noblest' in the same phrase.[5] Similarly, the honourable status of a man and the honour he won from others were intimately linked with what was right (*honestum*). Each man's record was scrutinized each time he stood for election. His reputation was earned by what he did. This is a continuing two-way process of negotiation between individual and group.

2. *Agr.* 2.1–3; *Fin.* 2.74; cf. Sal. *Jug.* 85.21 (on speeches in the Senate or to an assembly). Sal. *Cat.* 31.5 has Catiline protesting, against the First Catilinarian, that the fact that he is born from such a family (*ea familia ortum*) should make the Senate distrust the parvenu Cicero. The idea is already parodied in Plaut. *Pseud.* 581, cf. 589–90 and Earl 1960: 237.
3. e.g. Lucr. 1.42–3. I do not agree with Earl 1967, 47–51 and Woodman 1977, 257 that there is a sharp contrast between the claims of new men and nobles, the former claiming *uirtus* and the latter ancestry. Rather, the nobles claimed both. Q. Cic. *Pet.* 9 evaluates the *uirtus* of a noble. See Lucr. 2.11 for competition in both *nobilitas* and *ingenium*. Hor. *Carm.* 3.1.9–13, admittedly, contrasts the better-born and the man with better character and reputation ('it happens that this man comes down to the Campus as a candidate of nobler birth . . . that this one is contending, better in character and repute', *est ut/. . . hic generosior descendat in Campum petitor /. . . moribus hic meliorque fama / contendat*) as does App. *BC* 2.2. But Liv. 7.32.13 makes Valerius in 343 say explicitly that, once the consulship was open to plebeians, it was the reward of *uirtus*, not just high birth (*genus*), as before. The new man, of course, had to rely solely on *uirtus* (e.g. *Ver.* 2.5.180–2). See Wiseman's point that Cicero redefined *nobilitas* in a moral sense (1971, 110).
4. Pl. *St.* 303: 'benefits of my ancestors', *bene facta maiorum meum*; *Inv.* 2.106: 'benefits of their ancestors', *maiorum suorum beneficia*; Liv. 3.56.9: 'deserving acts of ancestors for the commonwealth', *maiorum merita in rem publicam*; cf. Sal. *Jug.* 14.3.
5. *S. Rosc.* 142, *Cael.* 72, *Phil.* 13.26; cf. Woodman 1977, 257.

I explore here how Cicero deploys ideas about a family's moral capital. Much of what he says can be paralleled in other writers: Plautus earlier and Sallust, his younger contemporary. But Cicero, in letters, speeches and works on rhetoric and philosophy, is the dominant source for the first century BC. Because we know more about his audiences than we do for most other writers, we can conclude that he was attuned to the conventional views of his society. I leave aside some of the best-known passages on the conflicting claims of nobles and new men in order to focus on those where the subject of *moral* qualities is most explicit.

Calpurnius Piso, the consul of 58, came to office with all the recommendation of noble birth, 'that charming little match-maker' (*blanda conciliatricula*), as Cicero says in his invective a few years later:

> All of us good men always favour the nobility, because it is useful to the commonwealth that noblemen should be worthy of their ancestors, and because the memory of famous men who deserved well of the commonwealth works powerfully on us, even when they are dead.
>
> (*Sest.*)[6]

Cicero claims the electorate knew nothing of Piso but his birth:

> You have slithered into office because men made a mistake, because of the recommendation of your smoky family portraits, which you resemble only in your complexion. Should this man have kept boasting to me that he achieved all his offices without a repulse? I am allowed to advertise that fact about myself with true glory, for the Roman people conferred all offices on me as a man. For when you were made quaestor, even those who had never seen you still entrusted that office to your name. You were made aedile; it was a Piso who was made aedile by the Roman People, not that Piso. The praetorship in the same way was offered to your ancestors. They, though dead, were known; you, though alive, were not yet known to anyone. When I was elected quaestor among the first, aedile ahead, praetor first, by all the votes of the Roman People, they gave that office to the man not the family, to my character not to my ancestors, to the virtue which they had perceived not to a nobility of which they had heard.
>
> (*Pis.* 1–2)[7]

6. Contrast *Planc.* 18 for dislike, *de Orat.* 2. 242 for mockery of *nobilitas*; cf. Malcovati *Orat.* 8 Cato 173: 'having read through the benefits of any ancestors', *maiorum benefacta perlecta*; Sal. *Cat.* 31.7.; *Phil.* 3.11.
7. Cf. Millar 1998, 74.

The new man had to claim personal *uirtus*. *Uirtus* was, in the first century BC, a usefully comprehensive word for manly qualities, especially physical courage, essential since soldiering was a vital part of a senatorial career.[8] The new man would also need to argue that he was better than the nobles, men of senatorial antecedents and other new men with whom he was competing on each occasion. The form that this argument takes is often denigration. The author of the handbook on electioneering claims that Cicero has an advantage in his campaign for the consulship because his rivals are nobles of such a type that no one could dare say that their nobility ought to stand them in better stead than Cicero's *uirtus* should profit him (Q. Cic. *Pet.* 7, cf. 9).

Taken together, the *dignitas* ('worth' or 'standing') of a man's family and his own *uirtus* constituted claims on his fellow-citizens.[9] Election of an individual put a family into the annals of Rome and into the electorate's communal memory; to come from a family with a record of public service was an advantage in the individual's candidacy for office. The record of both individual and family was subject to scrutiny by voters, friends and enemies. Whether in an election, or a trial, an assembly or where men gathered at the games, the individual put his reputation on the line. A man claimed *uirtus*, his opponents denied it to him. Although the struggle for honour was not a zero-sum game, as has been suggested for some later Mediterranean cultures, and although the Romans did not duel, it was possible for a man to challenge his opponent to prove an alleged act, or, more vaguely, to prove that he was the better man or that the challenger was not a good man. If the challenge was accepted, the point was decided by litigation. If the man challenged refused to submit to adjudication, conclusions might be drawn.[10] Usually, however, rival politicians seem to have resorted merely to counter-charges and not to have taken legal action.

The electorate was not supposed to believe simply that an ancestor who achieved the rank of consul gave a descendant an automatic claim to be elected to the same office. They were supposed to believe that merit ran in families. William Harris puts it well in the military context:

> The political and social system was supported by the almost inevitable notions that glory was inherited by sons from their fathers and was accumulated by distinguished families; and it was supported in a more

8. For a more precise understanding of the development of the concept of *uirtus*, I am indebted to a forthcoming book by M. McDonnell.
9. *Phil.* 13.7, *Font.* 41, *Brut.* 127; Asc. *Sc.* 20C, 23C, 27C.
10. I am grateful to Andrew Lintott for reminding me of Crook 1976. See also Wiseman 1985a, 4. For some later Mediterranean ideas see e.g. Pitt-Rivers 1966. Rome saw intense competition, but co-operation was built-in, and the ruin of an opponent was rarely expedient. Defendants risking exile and the end of a political career, Scaurus in 54, attracted wide support.

> subtle way by the notion that inherited glory imposed a heavy obligation on the descendants to perform great deeds of their own.[11]

Dignitas had to be reasserted by the behaviour of the individual and by recognition by the voters. The word has moral content. It implies that a man was *worthy* of a specific promotion or position.

Cicero, at the beginning of his consulship, could not point to his family's record in Roman politics, but he claimed that their morals were as good as his own:

> As for me, Quirites, I am not granted the opportunity of speaking before you about my ancestors, not because they were not such men as you see me to be, born from their blood and trained in their moral practices (*disciplinis*), but because they lacked the praise of the people and the light conferred by being elected to office by you.
>
> (*Agr.* 2.1–2)

He could get no recommendation from his ancestors and was known through himself alone, so he had to show gratitude to the people by doing his duty (*Cat.* 1.28).

Later in his life, when he was one of the senior consulars, he dared assert, in a dignified letter to Appius Claudius Pulcher, that he respected a tradition of virtue far more than an aristocratic name. He refers especially to Appius, his predecessor in the governorship of Cilicia (53–1, *cos.* 54), and to Appius' predecessor, his own friend and supporter, P. Cornelius Lentulus Spinther (56–4, *cos.* 57). Both were patricians of ancient name.

> Do you think that any Appietas or Lentulitas has more weight with me than the distinctions won by *uirtus*? When I had not yet attained the honours which men esteem most illustrious, yet I never admired those names of yours. The men who had left them to you I thought great. But after I held and administered the highest commands in such a way that I thought I had nothing more to gain for honour or glory, I hoped I had become equal to you, though never superior.
>
> (*Fam.* 71/3.7.5.)

The concept is well expressed in one of the epitaphs of the great family of the Scipios:

> By my character I added to the acts of courage (*uirtutes*) of my family. I begot offspring. I emulated the deeds of my father. I maintained the praise

11. Harris 1979, 30. Cf. May 1988, 5–6; Corbeill 1996, 77–8. Plb. 6.54 is an important witness.

> of my ancestors so that they rejoice I was born from their line. Honour has ennobled my stock.
>
> (*ILLRP* 316 = Courtney 1995, 13)

Uirtus was the best possible inheritance from one's ancestors. Cicero can claim it for the whole Roman people:

> Although Nature has indeed prescribed death for everyone, *uirtus* can drive off death's cruelty and disgrace. *Uirtus* is the especial possession of the Roman race and seed. Hold on to this, citizens, which your ancestors have left you as an inheritance. All other things are false, uncertain, fleeting, fickle; only *uirtus* is planted with deep roots and cannot be shaken by any violence nor moved from its place. By this did your ancestors first conquer the whole of Italy, then destroy Carthage, overthrow Numantia, bring powerful kings and warlike races into subjection to this empire.
>
> (*Phil.* 4.13)

It is appropriate to remind sections of the Roman people of the *uirtus* of their ancestors (e.g. *Sest.* 81) and to represent the electorate as thinking of the examples set by their ancestors (*Planc.* 12). The kinship of citizens was merely notional, since they were generous with the franchise, but a fictitious spiritual kinship is enforced.[12] The same idea was applied to the individual, with more plausibility:

> The best inheritance which is handed down from fathers to children and one which is better than any patrimony is the glory of *uirtus* and of deeds.
>
> (*Off.* 1.121)

Cicero, in a letter, hoped to leave his name as patrimony to his son. In *On Duties*, he openly boasts of the inheritance of his glory in suppressing the Catilinarians, which his son Marcus will enjoy.[13] It was wrong to disgrace this inheritance. Plautus had earlier given vivid expression to this concept in a dialogue between two young men in the *Trinummus*, when Lysiteles accuses Lesbonicus of ruining the good repute, *fama*, left him by his ancestors. His father and grandfather had expected him to follow the path to honour

12. Cf. e.g. Sal. *Hist.* (Reynolds) 2.47.14 (*gloria maiorum*, 'glory of ancestors').
13. *Fam.* 154/2.16.5, *Off.* 1.78; idea adapted jokingly in *Fam.* 326/9.14.4 = *Att.* 371A/14.17A.4. Polybius speaks of reputation being transmitted or handed down (6.54). Cf. V. Max. 4.4.10 (dowerless daughters who had inherited nothing but *gloria* from Fabricius Luscinus and Scipio).

which they had made smooth for him and to claim it for his descendants in turn.[14]

An individual's character and career affected the standing of his antecedents, living and dead. The privilege and risk did not affect politicians alone: Cicero praises the manly courage, good faith and conscientious work—the qualities of a patron—of Caecilia Metella, who helped Sextus Roscius. She is a lady of high visibility, *spectatissima femina*:

> She has a renowned father, illustrious uncles, a distinguished brother. Yet, although she is a woman, she has, through her courage, brought it about that, however great the honour she enjoys from their *dignitas*, she gives them as much distinction again from the praise she earns.
>
> (*S. Rosc.* 147; cf. 27)

On the other hand, the actions of an individual might disgrace his whole family. In his poem on his consulship, Cicero seems to have taunted the Catilinarians by saying that their parents had engendered them as a disgrace to themselves. *Dedecore sibi gignere* is the phrase (*Cons.* fr. 4). The slur was a common one. While Cicero claims that Piso's maternal grandfather had been a Celt who infiltrated Roman society, Piso managed to be a disgrace even to his mother's side of the family, not just to his father's aristocratic lineage, but also to the Calventii as well as the Calpurnii, to Piacenza as well as Rome, not just to his father's line but to his trousered Celtic relations![15]

The Romans were sharply aware that the individual's reputation affected his descendants too. A man would want the credit of specific deeds to reflect on his son and descendants. So the third year of Quintus Cicero's governorship of Asia was expected to bring glory to his and his brother's posterity. So was the vote of the Senate which, in Cicero's formulation, proclaimed that not to defend Cicero's rights as a citizen was tantamount to not wanting the commonwealth to be safe, and thus implied that he had been right in 63.[16]

14. Pl. *Trin.* 642–7 (a reference I owe to Dyck 1996, 294), on which see also Earl 1960 at 235–7. The verb here is *tradere* ('hand down'): cf. Sal. *Jug.* 31.5, Liv. 3.18.6. For *relinquere*, 'to leave': Sal. *Jug.* 85.30, 38. Liv. 6.35.2 sees honour (including offices) (*honos*) as reward for *uirtus*.

15. *Pis.* 53. Piso's trophies in Macedonia marked the eternal 'disgrace of his family', *dedecus generis* (*Pis.* 92.). Cf. *Phil.* 11.36: the three *Antonii* shamed not only their families, but the name of Roman. Tac. varies the expression (*Ann.* 3.32.2). Mam. Scaurus, the shame (*opprobrium*) of his ancestors, dishonoured his great-grandfather, *cos.* 115 (Tac. *Ann.* 3.66.3); Livia, wife of Drusus, fouled herself, her ancestors and her descendants by her adultery with Sejanus (*Ann.* 4.3.4); Catiline detracted from the reputation of his great-grandfather M. Sergius (Plin. *Nat.* 7.104). For those who do not shame their ancestors cf., for example, Prop. 2.11.27–55.

16. *Q.fr.* 1/1.1.3, *Red. sen.* 25, cf. *Fam.* 154/2.16.5. For moral obligation running both to ancestors and to descendants cf. Tac. *Ann.* 6.24.3 (Tiberius should pay the penalty to the name and 'stock' (*genus*) of his ancestors and to *posteri*, 'descendants').

Disgrace was communicable. P. Sulla, already in retirement because he had been convicted of electoral corruption in 66, so that he could not hand down to his son intact the fruits of the consulship he had won for 65, was charged with complicity in the Catilinarian conspiracy. The fond father can be portrayed as hoping that he will not leave his son the eternal memory of disgrace, the name of the son of a conspirator, criminal and traitor. Conviction left the 'stain of crime' on posterity (*Sul.* 88). Fonteius, who, when he went fearlessly into battle, was confident of leaving a good reputation to console his family if he were killed as his father had been, fears to leave eternal disgrace and ignominy to his wretched family if they have to grieve for him as a condemned exile (*Font.* 48). Cicero protested to Quintus in a letter that he was afraid of bringing destruction on his family by his exile. He could also admit that he was leaving young Marcus nothing but the scandal and ignominy of his name.[17] A member who did not live up to the standards of the family would leave a lasting disgrace. Cicero, tactfully, draws Brutus' attention to a blot on his family: an individual whose father was excellent and skilled in the law, but who was so degenerate that he refused to be a candidate for office and dedicated himself to the role of prosecutor (*Brut.* 130). These examples refer to the individual disgracing the living or future generations. Like Burke in my epigraph, Romans could scarcely think of predecessors without thinking of successors.

It was suggested that Cicero's son would have an easier ride because his father had achieved the consulship. But Cicero claims that he would prefer him to have to struggle as he had done himself. Cicero addresses his remarks to the opposing counsel (*subscriptor*) L. Cassius Longinus, a young member of the equestrian class (*eques*, 'knight') who would later embark on a senatorial career:

> You asked whether I thought that the path to office had been easier for me, the son of a Roman knight, than it would be for my son, member of a consular family. Although I want everything for him rather than for myself, I still have never wished that the approach to office should be no easier for him than for me. On the contrary, to stop him thinking that I have already obtained offices for him rather than showing him the way to obtain them, I'm in the habit of giving him the same advice that the king who was descended from Jupiter gave his sons—although he is not old enough to take advice seriously—
>
> > Aye watch and ward. Against good men foul plots
> > Are laid. What many envy . . .

17. *Q.fr.* 4/1.4.4, *Att.* 68/3.23.5, cf. *Phil.* 11.17.

> You know how it goes on. Surely the wise and clever poet wrote, not for those royal boys who did not exist, but to rouse us and our children to toil and praise?
>
> (*Planc.* 59)

Cicero re-asserts the need for individual merit.

We cannot say much about the unborn. So ancestors pre-occupied the orator. The invaluable author of the treatise to Herennius explains how he will praise or blame a person in the narrative portion of the speech and specifically in treating descent. In talking of his family-background or descent (*genus*)

> . . . the orator who wishes to praise, will focus on from what ancestors he is descended; if of good family, we say he was equal or better; if of humble family, that he has had his support from his own virtues, not those of his ancestors. In denigration, if he is of good family, we say he was a disgrace (*dedecori*) to his ancestors; if of bad family, we say that he damaged even these.
>
> (*Rhet ad Her.* 3.13; see Nisbet 1961, 194)

The rhetorician here slides easily from social to moral status. This is a pervasive habit. *Bonus*, after all, can mean morally good, politically sound, socially respectable and financially solid. Cato's phrase 'sound men from sound stock' is a routine one.[18] Social and moral values become inextricably intertwined. I try here to isolate the moral strand. Cicero is rich in examples of good men from good families, bad men from bad families, and bad men from good families. Good men from bad families are in short supply. Indeed, it seems to have been accepted that a bad father could not produce a good son (*Q. Rosc.* 30, though Cicero briefly entertains the possibility on occasion [*Ver.* 2.3.159, 162]). It would be insulting and counter-productive to praise a man while denigrating his ancestors.

In getting the sympathy of the court for a defendant, the orator may, where it would be convincing, introduce a father or remoter ancestors. So Cluentius' father must be described as the best in his town and region for virtue, repute and status (*Clu.* 11). When P. Sestius was accused of political violence in 56, Cicero appeals to the judges' own memory of his father as an austere and upright man, 'wise, holy and severe', who decided not to stand

18. Malcovati *Orat.* 58 = Gel. 10.3.17, of Bruttians: *bonis, bono genere gnatis*, 'good men, born from a good stock'. Cf. Ter. *Ph.* 115, Hor. *Carm.* 4.4.29–31.

for further office after his tribunate, but was concerned to appear worthy of promotion.[19] He pays his own family an amusing compliment in *On the Orator*, when he makes Caesar Strabo (*aed.* 90) praise a remark of M. Cicero the elder, father of the excellent man his audience knew as his friend. The excellent man is Cicero's own father.[20]

To denigrate an opponent, the orator can deploy the theme in two ways. Either a man has discreditable ancestors and he is like them, or he has praiseworthy ones and is himself degenerate. Ancestors alleged to have practised certain professions brought not just the taint of low social status but a moral taint. Piso's grandfather made money by dubious means and so managed to marry off his daughter to the noble son of a thieving L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus. Noble descent on one side was not enough to counteract such maternal connections and dishonesty in the paternal line, hence Cicero's ironic emphasis on the nobility of the son of Caesoninus. He implies that a descendant might have sticky fingers. Later in the invective against Piso, Cicero condemns him for corruption and extortion in his province (*auaritia*) (86–91). Clearly he had been influenced by what he had seen as a grown lad in his father's house, when his father (the praetor of 90) had, during the Social War, been a successful profiteer in the leather needed in huge quantities by Roman armies.[21] Later, Cicero taunts Antony with his father's marriage to the daughter of a man from Fregellae who had betrayed his city to the Romans.[22]

Morality of a Particular Family

What are Cicero's ways of discussing the morality of particular families? The categories overlap. In many of my quotations there are several key words.

The moral traditions to which a family laid claim were based on the acknowledged merits of specific individual members. Just as a common Roman tradition picked individual citizens as examples to be admired and followed, so a family might boast its particular models, *domestica exempla*. Cicero conceives of such traditions even in lower-class families: in the *Fourteenth Philippic*, where his praise of those who fell in civil war against

19. *Sest.* 6, cf. *Lig.* 11, 32, 36–7. When recommending young men of whom little could be said, Cicero may find the demonstrated excellence of their fathers worth mentioning (*Fam.* 132/13.54, 276/13.79, 317/13.15.1. Conversely, the Antonii are all bad (e.g. *Phil.* 3.35).
20. *De Orat.* 2.265. Cf. E. Rawson 1971/91, 17/76.
21. *Pis.* frr. 11 Clark = ix Nisbet, 13 Clark = xiii Nisbet, 62, 87.
22. *Phil.* 3.17. M. Antonius Creticus (*pr.* 74) married the daughter of Q. Numitorius Pullus, on whom cf. *Fin.* 5.62.

Antony evokes the lofty tones of Pericles' Funeral Speech in Thucydides (2.35–46), he eulogizes the Martian legion as saviours of the state. They poured out their blood for the life, liberty and fortunes of the Roman people and for the City and for the temples of the immortal gods (*Phil.* 14.38). They have earned both a place among the blessed in the afterlife and lasting remembrance among the living, which is the proper reward for selfless actions. Senate and people must raise them an immortal monument, the everlasting witness to their godlike courage (32–3). The children (*liberi*—both sexes) of those who fell fighting Antony had domestic models of *uirtus* and their brothers (and perhaps sisters, for *fratres* may include the female) could be consoled by the thought that they resembled them not only physically but in manly courage (*uirtutis similitudo*). Cicero urges his fellow-senators:

> Let us console their families. This is the best sort of consolation: for their parents that they gave birth to such defenders of the commonwealth; for their children that they will have domestic examples of courage; for their wives that the husbands they will be without are ones whom it is better to laud than to lament; for their brothers that they will be sure that they are like them in courage as in body.
>
> (*Phil.* 14.34)

The combination of praise of ancestors and praise of a worthy descendant is frequent. Keeping up ancestral standards is a merit regularly attributed to those whose family history was known. L. Marcius Philippus (*cos.* 56) was the son of the highly successful consul of 91 and censor of 86, a key consular under Sulla and later, because of his survival and oratorical skill. He lived up to his father, grandfather and ancestors (*Phil.* 3.25). In a letter, Cicero solemnly adjured Ap. Claudius, as censor-elect, to think much about his ancestor, Ap. Claudius the Blind, censor centuries earlier (*Fam.* 74/3.11.5).

Bad stock is a fairly frequent theme. We have seen it used against Piso, the consul of 58. But it had to be tactfully handled if it were not to implicate friends or enrage members of the family whom Cicero did not wish to attack (*Red. Sen.* 15; *Sest.* 11; cf. Cornell 1982, 206). (For instance his son-in-law Piso Frugi was a good Piso.) In a letter addressed to one friend, Papirius Paetus, Cicero can run, amusingly, through the history of two plebeian branches of the Papirii. He advises Paetus to have nothing to do with Turdi and Carbones. The only good citizen among the Carbones was the Gaius killed by Damasippus. Cicero deals comprehensively with three generations of the family, whose most famous member, the Cinnan consul of 85, 84 and 82, was the wickedest man in Cicero's whole experience (*Fam.* 188/9.21.3).

The best families also produced bad apples. The Decii, canonical heroes of

the early Republic, had offered themselves to death in battle to secure a Roman victory. Their unworthy descendant, the Antonian and former tribune P. Decius, had, according to Cicero's taunt, offered himself in a bankruptcy auction.[23]

In his relentless and monotonous questioning of the arrested Catilinarians on the famous Nones of December 63, when Cicero asked each of them if he recognized his seal on the letter which would prove his guilt, Cicero makes play with the patrician Lentulus' choice of his grandfather's portrait for his device:

> 'It is indeed', I say, 'a well known seal, the portrait of your grandfather, that famous man, who above all others loved his country and his fellow-citizens; this portrait, voiceless though it is, ought to have called you away from such a crime.'
>
> (*Cat.* 3.10.)

Dignus

Praise or blame are often cast in terms of worthiness and unworthiness. To say that a child is worthy of his father is part of the normal courtesy of letter-writing to the father. So the younger Spinther and Cassius of Parma pay this compliment to Cicero (*Fam.* 405/12.14.8, 419/12.13.2, cf. *Fam.* 18/1.7.11). It is also used to commend third parties in correspondence (*Fam.* 276/13.79, 305/13.34). It may even be used to someone's face, as in a fictitious dialogue in which Cicero compliments Torquatus ironically on being worthy of his ancestors by being active in politics and so on being inconsistent with his Epicurean principles (*Fin.* 2.62). Though *dignus* or *dignissimus maioribus* is the stock term (e.g. *Flac.* 101, *Sest.* 21), it may be strengthened by specifying father, grandfather and so on.[24] This would be especially helpful if the audience identified the antecedent who was meant. The stock nature of the phrase is illustrated by an example of wit which Cicero puts into the mouth of Caesar Strabo. You may yield a point which an opponent is making against you; thus C. Laelius, when someone of bad stock said he was unworthy of his ancestors, retorted, 'Yes, but you are worthy of yours' (*de Orat.* 2.286).

People may also be termed 'like' or 'unlike' their ancestors, *similis* and so

23. *Phil.* 11.13; cf. e.g. *Sest.* 48 (Decii and others as models of self-sacrifice for Cicero), *Rab. Post.* 2, *Fin.* 2.61, *Tusc.* 1.89. Sallust makes Cotta claim ancestral models of *deuotio*, 'self-sacrifice' (Sal. *Hist.* 2.47.10, Reynolds).

24. e.g. *Pis.* 62, *Phil.* 3.25; Virg. *A* 12. 649: 'never unworthy of my great-grandfathers'.

on.[25] Cicero cites to Torquatus a story of a second-century ancestor of his, who charged his son with peculation and with not behaving in his governorship as his forebears had done.[26] Alternatively, one acted in accordance with the qualities of father and antecedents (*Phil.* 10.25, 13.50) or at least did nothing alien to them.[27] Ap. Claudius Pulcher, as praetor in 57, opposing Cicero's recall, abandoned the manner in which his father, grandfather, great-grandfather and ancestors had ascertained the popular will and adopted Greek demagogic methods (*Sest.* 126). In 49, in a confidential letter to Tiro, Cicero characterizes Caesar, who had just occupied Ariminum, Pisaurum, Ancona and Arretium, as forgetful of his name and honours.[28]

Degeneracy was possible. The Valerii had kept up their defence of liberty over the generations and Cicero's client L. Valerius Flaccus had *not* degenerated from their perennial courage but had fallen in love with their example of championing freedom (*Flac.* 25). But Tiberius Gracchus, the reforming tribune, was conspicuously different from his father (*Fin.* 4.65; cf. Plu. *TG* 14). Both Gracchi could be said to have degenerated from their father's *grauitas* (*prov. cons.* 18). The Gracchi could also be contrasted unfavourably with their maternal grandfather, the great Africanus (*Rhet. ad Her.* 4.42; contrast *Inv.* 1.5). Clodius was quite unlike his father, the consul of 79, an outstanding citizen, who was wrongly deprived of a command, much as Cicero himself had been wrongly driven into exile. Cicero says to Clodius, 'Your father, excellent citizen, the son of a renowned man . . . if he had lived, his severity was such that you would not be alive now' (*Dom.* 83–4). In his invective against Clodius and Curio, Cicero suggests that Clodius should have remembered that he was the grandson of Appius Claudius when he was dressing up as a music-girl to infiltrate the rites of the Good Goddess.[29] Antony too, along with his brothers, was a degenerate descendant of a man whom Cicero admired. Cicero had also (he claims) taken Antony's father as an authority, because of his severity and foresight. Antony should have imitated the consulship of his grandfathers and uncle. In particular, Cicero evokes the great orator, about whom Antony had often heard Cicero speak, and who plays a principal role in the dialogue *On the Orator*. Antony apparently referred to himself grandly as 'both consul and Antonius'. His grandfather would never have done that, as if *dignitas* resided in a name. Nor would Antony's uncle, Cicero's colleague as consul in 63.

25. *Ver.* 2.3.160, *Phil.* 13.29, *Att.* 190/10.1.1, *Off.* 1.121. Cf. *Pis.* 1.22, *Fin.* 1.24; VM 5.8.3.
26. *Fin.* 1.24. Cf. VM 5.8.3.
27. *Vat.* 28; cf. *Clod.* 24, taken with Wiseman 1979, 109–10.
28. *Fam.* 146/16.12.2; contrast Liv. 3.18.6, where Valerius Poplicola claims he is mindful of his ancestors and name.
29. *Clod.* 23. The grandfather was censor 136. For the adjuration to remember who one was see e.g. *ND* 3.5: 'to remember I am a Cotta and a *pontifex*', cf. 3.6, 2.168.

Here Cicero follows his infuriating habit of annexing another man's kin and using them against him.[30] He remembered Carbo in 90 BC calling the elder M. Drusus (*tr.* 122) to witness against his son (*Orat.* 213).

Nature

Characteristics were supposed to run in families.[31] Hence, says Cicero, Piso's austere appearance was thought to spring from a sobriety of conduct and serviceability (*frugalitas*) ingrained in his father's line:

> Because they saw him always gloomy, taciturn, somewhat unrefined and unkempt and because his name suggested that this was the sobriety bred into his family, they were keen to support him, they rejoiced and summoned him in their hopes to the integrity (*integritas*) of his ancestors. But they forgot his descent on the mother's side.
>
> (*Sest.* 21, cf. 19–20).

His complexion cast doubt on his country, his speech on his family, his character on his name (*Pis.* fr. 8 Clark = Nisbet viii = Asc. *Pis.* 2C)

Heredity is highlighted in the speech for Rabirius Postumus, born after his father's death:

> When I was a boy, my client's father, C. Curtius, was leader of the equestrian order, a gallant and important public contractor, whose greatness of heart in conducting affairs would not have received such approval from men, had not his kindness also been incredible, so that in increasing his property he appeared to seek to gain the means of goodness, not loot to satisfy avarice. Begotten by this man, although he had never seen his father, yet with nature herself, that irresistible force, to guide him, and because

30. *Phil.* 1.27, 1.34, 2.42, 2.70, 2.111, 2.118, 8.13. Antony's maternal uncle, L. Caesar, is also deployed (2.14). Cf. *Com.* 2 F 5–8 (Crawford) = Asc. 79–81C: Cn. Ahenobarbus, *tr.* 104, adduced against his nephew Catullus.

31. e.g. Liv. 9.29.8: pertinacity implanted in the Claudii; Tac. *Ann.* 2.37.5: Hortensius on eloquence as 'a family advantage of our house', *gentile domus nostrae bonum*; (with this contrast V. Max. 3.5.4, who compares the different uses to which Q. Hortensius *cos.* 69 and his grandson Hortensius Corbio put their tongues); Tac. *Ann.* 2.43.3: ferocity implanted in the younger Cn. Piso (*cos.* AD 7) by his father; Suet. *Tib.* 1–2, on the aristocratic hauteur of the Claudii: for full discussion see Wiseman 1979, 57–139, with Cornell's critique, 1982, 204–6. That useful word 'implanted' or 'engrafted', *insita*, seems to be used only once by Cicero in a similar context, where it has full metaphorical force (*Brut.* 213 on wisdom). Milo was inspired by 'inborn freedom', *innata libertas* (*Sest.* 88).

> of the constant talk of members of the household, he was brought to take on the pattern of his father's way of life (*paternae disciplinae similitudo*).
>
> (*Rab. post.* 2–4; cf. *Brut.* 213–14)

A child should embody a parent's virtues. 'What more glorious monument could Servius Sulpicius leave than the reproduction (*effigies*) of his character, courage, constancy, sense of duty and talent, his son?' (*Phil.* 9.12; cf. *Arch.* 30). *Effigies* is one of the key words here. Sextus Peducaeus left behind a son who was the effigy of his humanity and probity. His natural virtue was demonstrated by his honesty in dealing with a trust (*Fin.* 2.58, Cicero speaking).

Physical resemblance may be included, but traits of character and virtue are highlighted. Thus Cicero in 58 speaks of his absent daughter to his brother in this way:

> At the same time I long for my daughter. What dutiful love she shows, what good behaviour, what character. She is the reproduction of me in face, conversation and feelings.
>
> (*Q.fr.* 3/1.3.3)

Image, *imago*, is used similarly. The younger Quintus Cicero is the image of his father (*Q. fr.* 3/1.3.3). Caecina's son is the image of his father's body and mind and Cicero praises his constancy and excellence (*Fam.* 234/6.6.13; cf. of non-kin *Att.* 247/12.10.1). It is a good way of complimenting two people at once.

The ancestors may be called vividly to mind. Sometimes the speaker sees them in his mind's eye (*Fin.* 2.72; cf. *Scaur.* 49–50, *Fin.* 3.8). When Cicero was a candidate for the consulship, his ancestors did not provide sureties for him or commend him. He was made consul at the hustings, not in his cradle. No family portraits would intercede for him if he were found wanting (*Agr.* 2.100). The portraits, *imagines*, whether busts or the masks used at funerals, which the great political families could display, give the speaker a useful way of making his audience visualize the ancestors.[32] In the *Second Philippic*, Cicero denies being the inspiration behind the killing of Caesar. If the tyrannicides had needed an instigator, Marcus and Decimus Brutus looked at the portrait of L. Brutus every day of their lives, and Marcus saw Ahala's too. 'Would men descended from such ancestors seek counsel from outsiders rather than from their own people and out of doors rather than at home?'

32. Plb. 6.53–5 and Sal. *Jug.* 4.5–6 are the *loci classici* on the inspiration afforded by the family portraits. See further Münzer 1999, 308–9, citing *Brut.* 331; Flower 1996.

Cicero goes on to pick out ancestors whose specific records and characteristics could have inspired others of the conspirators (*Phil.* 2.26–7).

Iuventius Laterensis, in his prosecution of Plancius, his successful rival in the aedilician election, asked what he should say about his failure to his *imagines* and to his dead father, whom Cicero characterizes as distinguished and excellent. Cicero, in an elaborately detailed passage, claims they would rebuke him for his chagrin. His father had seen Ap. Claudius, L. Volcatius, M. Piso suffer rejection in aedilician elections and later go on to higher things. His grandfather could come up with a longer list. His father and ancestors would use these examples not to console or exculpate him, but to encourage him to continue in the way he had begun.[33]

Often, it is the ghosts who are invoked. Torquatus Imperiosus might be listening to his descendant's philosophical dialogue with Cicero. He would not approve of Epicureanism (*Fin.* 2.60; cf. *Scaur.* 48). The witty orator Crassus, in attacking a certain M. Brutus, had had passages read out from the pamphlets on common law of Brutus' father: each of them mentioned pieces of property which the younger Brutus was alleged to have subsequently squandered. A stroke of luck then enabled Crassus to go one better. An elderly relative of Brutus, Junia, had just died and her body was carried past the court on its way to the funeral. Crassus promptly asked Brutus what message he wanted the old lady to take to his father, to the ancestors whose portraits were carried in the procession and to L. Junius Brutus, who had driven out the Tarquins. What glorious deeds was he doing? Among other things, Crassus points out that he was not studying law like his father, and that, by selling off ancestral property, he had left himself nowhere to set up the portraits, quite apart from his failure to imitate the originals.[34]

Cicero uses the conceit of bringing dead kin into the courtroom most dramatically in the *Defence of Caelius*. He pretends that he gives Clodia the choice of whether she wants Cicero to criticize her in old-fashioned or modern style.

> If she prefers that austere manner and method, I must rouse one of those old bearded men from the dead, not with that little beard in which she delights, but with one of those shaggy ones we see in old statues and portraits. He will rebuke the woman and speak for me so that she is not

33. *Planc.* 51–2; cf. *de Orat.* 2.287 for a son answering for a disgrace to a living father.

34. *Clu.* 140–1. The story is told in almost the same words in *de Orat.* 2.222–6, Antonius speaking. The incident of the funeral occurs only in the latter. Another passing funeral exploited by a speaker: *de Orat.* 2.283. In 142, if we can trust Plutarch, Ap. Claudius Pulcher had invoked Aemilius Paullus' pain at Aemilianus' populist practices (Plu. *Aem.* 38 2, *Praec. ger. reip.* 14). Words are put into the mouth of Caesar's ancestors in [Sal.] *Rep.* 2.13; cf. Wiseman 1985a, 13.

> enraged with me. So let there rise up someone from this very family. Ideally, it should be Appius Claudius the Blind, since he will suffer less grief because he will not see her. If he rises up, he will proceed and speak as follows: 'Woman, what have you to do with Caelius, with a mere youth, with an outsider? . . . Had you not seen your father consul? Had you not heard that your father, uncle, grandfather, great-grandfather, great-great-grandfather, great-great-great-grandfather were consuls? . . . Surely, if the portraits of us men did not stir you, at least my progeny, Quinta Claudia, admonished you to be her rival for family praise in womanly glory? Did not that Vestal Virgin Claudia influence you, she who embraced her father at his triumph and prevented a hostile tribune dragging him from his chariot? Why did the vices of your brother move you rather than the virtues of father and grandfather, which have been exemplified in men and women from my time onwards?'
>
> (*Cael.* 33–4)[35]

Imitatio, Aemulatio

Children were naturally inspired to emulate their ancestors: this could be ascribed to nature and the inculcation of an oral tradition. It was, for example, natural to follow in a father's footsteps. This Panaetian theme is illustrated in *On Duties* by Scipio Aemilianus following Paullus as a warrior and by Q. Mucius Scaevola following his father in the practice of law. Some followed their fathers because of nature, others in response to the father's specific instruction. Others again chose the right way by themselves.[36] Cicero later turns these observations into the precept that ancestors should be imitated (*Off.* 1.121). Both the inheritance of Cicero's glory and the imitation of his deeds 'belong to' young Marcus (*Off.* 1.78, cf. 3.6).

In his speech for Sestius, Cicero introduces his digression on the definition of 'the best people' (*optimates*) by calling on young men to follow their lead in defending the commonwealth:

> And you, young men, if you are nobles, I will rouse you to the imitation of your ancestors, and if you can achieve nobility by your talent and *uirtus* (sc. if you are new men), I will exhort you to adopt the manner of life in which many new men flourished in honour and glory.
>
> (*Sest.* 136)

Conscious imitation of meritorious ancestors was encouraged (*de Orat.* 2. 226 etc). So, because the elder Decius' sacrifice of his life to the benefit of

35. Cf. *Har. resp.* 27 for an ironic remark that Clodia had imitated Quinta's archaic austerity.
36. 1.116–21 with Dyck 1996, *ad loc.* and pp. 13–15. Cf. *Div.* 2.94.

his country was praised, his son and grandson imitated him (*Fin.* 2.61, Cicero speaking). More convincingly, real historic figures might be adduced as imitating the military virtues of their ancestors, as we saw in the passage from the defence of Rabirius Postumus. Elizabeth Rawson has well said, 'one must always bear in mind the pressure to emulate one's *maiores*, often in quite specific ways'.[37] Once a member of a family had achieved the consulship, descendants would hope, and be expected, to reach that level, and that might be enough (*Pet.* 13; Sal. *Hist.* 1.55.26, cf. 1.77.6, Reynolds). One could even try to surpass them (Sal. *Jug.* 3.7). Though it might be immodest to claim success for onself, others might credit a son with excelling his father. It might be agreed that successful new men had done this (cf. Stat. *Silv.* 1.4.68–70). Having achieved greater political success was an obvious criterion. But outsiders might assess moral worth more subtly, as Cicero credits the notorious political non-starter, the son of Africanus, with adding learning to his father's great spirit (*Off.* 1.116). One of the epitaphs of the Scipios claims that if the dead man had lived longer he would have excelled the glory of his ancestors (*ILLRP* 311 = Courtney 1995, 11). A man could be seen as renewing his ancestors' glory by his *uirtus*, as Q. Maximus did that of 'the Paulli, Maximi and Africani' (*Vat.* 28). Brutus might renew and increase the memory of the Bruti and Servilii (*Brut.* 331).

A great family might show recurrent wisdom and virtue in every generation. In the *Brutus*, Cicero bestows effusive praise on the antecedents of Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius Scipio Nasica (*cos.* 52), who had recently killed himself after being defeated by Caesar. The quality identified in the political leaders listed here is wisdom.[38] The *uirtus* of a great-grandfather on the mother's side, P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica Serapio, was displayed by Spinther (*Har. resp.* 22).

In using this concept, an orator could ring the changes as necessary on nature and nurture. For remoter ancestors, heredity and the teaching handed down about them in the family will be stressed. A father's nature might be held to be biologically transmitted in full strength, or the son might be thought of as observing his father's example and consciously imitating him.

37. 1985, 89–90, cf. 1971, 76/1991, 17. Bradley 1993, 249 makes the same point for the age of Pliny. T. Manlius is portrayed as saying that he was sprung from the family which had repelled the Gauls from the Tarpeian Rock (Liv. 7.10.3).

38. *Brut.* 212, with Linderski 1996a, 160. His grandfathers were P. Scipio Nasica (*cos.* 111) and L. Crassus the orator (*cos.* 95). Of his four great-grandfathers, Q. Metellus Macedonicus (*cos.* 143) had produced four famous sons (*Fin.* 5.82); P. Scipio Nasica Sarapio (*cos* 138) had saved Rome from Ti. Gracchus; Q. Scaevola the augur (*cos.* 117) shone for legal expertise and charm. Of the eight males in the previous generation, P. Scipio Corculum 'the astute' (twice consul, censor, Pontifex Maximus, lawyer, orator and *triumphator*; cf. *de Orat.* 3.134: great-great-grandfather of L. Crassus' wife Mucia!) and the wise Laelius deserved mention.

Brothers will naturally be expected to resemble each other. So L. Antonius can be portrayed as being as like his brother Marcus as possible and deliberately imitating him (*Phil.* 3.31, cf. 35).

Exempla

Family examples might have particular force. So Pompey is defended as following a precedent which he had heard was set by Marius and which he himself had observed being followed by P. Crassus, Sulla, Q. Metellus and his own father Strabo, an authority from inside his family, *domesticus auctor* (*Balb.* 51). Lepidus in 43 is urged to act constitutionally in his army-command, after the pattern of his ancestors, taking as his examples men of his own family of an earlier age rather than alien and recent precedents, men who thought it permissible to do whatever it lay within their power to do. Only thus will he be a true M. Lepidus, High Priest and great-grandson of an earlier M. Lepidus who was also High Priest (*Phil.* 13.14–15; cf. Münzer 1999, 281–2).

When Cato in his prosecution of Murena exploits the idea of heredity to praise himself, Cicero cleverly steals the Elder Cato from him:

> Do you think anyone was more obliging, accessible and moderate for all manner of humane feeling (*humanitas*) than was your great-grandfather Cato? When you spoke truthfully and seriously about his outstanding virtue, you said you had a model at home (*domesticum exemplum*) to imitate. That model (*exemplum*) is indeed set before you at home, but resemblance to his nature (*naturae similitudo*) could come down to you better than to any one of us because you are descended from him. But for imitation that exemplar is set before me as much as to you. But if you would sprinkle his graciousness and tolerance on your seriousness and severity, they would not be improved, for they are already excellent, but would certainly be dressed more palatably.
>
> (*Mur.* 66)

In a neat twist years later, when Cicero brings Cato, then recently dead, into his dialogue *On the Ends of Good and Evil*, he makes him say that everyone takes pleasure in contemplating the deeds, words and counsels of great men such as the two Scipiones or the Elder Cato, 'my great-grandfather who is always in your mouth' (*Fin.* 3.37).[39]

39. The pseudo-Sallustian invective against Cicero mocks him for setting himself up as the last remnant of Africanus and for imitating L. Crassus (Sal. *Cic.* 1.1, 3.4). For Cato's self-presentation see Leigh 1995.

For great men could provide exemplars to all Romans (*Sest.* 143). Constant appeal is made to precedents in the actions of selected role models.[40] Cicero claims publicly in his defence of Archias that he set before himself models of great men derived from Greek and Latin literature (*Arch.* 14). The Roman tendency to make lists of role models to emulate was to be given visible form in the Forum of Augustus. Literary lists are familiar from Cicero, Horace, Virgil and Livy.[41] Conversely, there was a traditional pool of villains in public life from which the orator would draw. Men like Spurius Maelius (for would-be tyrants) or Tubulus (for corrupt governors) recur tediously often. Horace's father, giving him the start in life which would lead to his being approved by Maecenas as a decent man, educated him on specific vices by drawing his attention to individuals as examples to shun (*Serm.* 1.4.105–31). The most interesting are those ambiguous figures who, in the controversies of the late Republic, could be exploited either as good or as bad examples. Those who achieved canonical status in public or private life, for good or evil, were neatly classified (in the time of Tiberius) for the convenience of the orator by Valerius Maximus (quarrying Cicero) and so, effectively, sterilized.

Because a family record can be used by an orator either to bolster a man's repute by claims that he lived up to it, or to accuse him of degeneracy, traditions of high moral standards within a family, especially if they passed the test of acceptance by outsiders, were 'symbolic capital'. L. Flaccus' remote ancestor had by his courage secured liberty in the commonwealth, Flaccus himself, following family tradition, as praetor in 63 had taken a leading part in the arrest of the Gallic envoys, whose evidence enabled Cicero to arraign and execute the Catilinarian ringleaders in Rome.[42]

It was appropriate to take a father or ancestor as an exemplar, *domesticus auctor*. The clever orator can parade the special merits of those who provide exemplars to all good Romans while marking their family relationships to members of his audience (cf. *Sest.* 48):

> . . . those who are as your father was, Marcus Scaurus, who resisted all seditious persons from Gaius Gracchus to Quintus Varius, who never trembled at any force, threats or unpopularity, or as was Quintus Metellus, the paternal uncle of your mother, who after censuring that popular demagogue Lucius Saturninus, refusing to list a fake Gracchus despite the violence of the provoked mob and standing alone in refusing to swear to

40. e.g. *Prov.* 20, *Cael.* 39, *Balb.* 40, *Pis.* 58, *Planc.* 60, *Mil.* 8, *Phil.* 9.4–5.
41. Skidmore 1996, 18–21, noting both the adoption of models who were not ancestors and the broadening of the classes of people used as models. Cf. Wiseman 1971, 107–9.
42. *Flac.* 1, 25–6, 102–4; cf. Wiseman 1998, 75–89 for the family historiography.

> a law which he judged had been illegally put to the vote, chose to be removed from the state rather than from his viewpoint; or, to quit old exemplars . . . and not to name any of those who are still alive, as was Quintus Catulus in recent times, whom neither the storm of danger nor the breeze of honour could ever remove from his course by hope or fear. (*Sest.* 101)

Nurture

Much was due to upbringing, the *disciplina* of a family. Children could be deliberately raised in a family tradition. In the introduction to the third book of *On the Ends of Good and Evil*, Cicero sets the scene in the library at the villa at Tusculum which Cicero's young ward Marcus Lucullus had inherited from his dead father, L. Lucullus (*cos.* 74). Dropping in to borrow books, Cicero comes across the boy's half-uncle Marcus Cato, enjoying an orgy of reading about Stoicism. He claims to have talked about his ward to the uncle (*Fin.* 3.7–9).

> For I am much concerned . . . that he should be educated in such a way as to measure up to his father, and our friend Caepio and you, his close relative. . . . For I am moved by the memory of his grandfather (you know how much I valued Caepio, who, in my opinion, would have been among the leading men now, had he lived) and I see Lucullus in my mind's eye, a man who excelled in all virtues and was bound to me in friendship by every wish and opinion (*Fin.* 3.8).[43]

Proper training went hand in hand with good breeding.[44]

Upbringing was part of the category of 'way of life' (*uictus*) explored by rhetorical theorists. According to the youthful Cicero's formulation, the speaker must consider in whose house and under whose control a man was reared, what teachers he had in the liberal arts and what instructors in living, the friends he frequents, his business, gainful employment or craft, how he administers his family property, what are his habits at home.[45]

43. Cf. *Brut.* 222–3. Ward: see Wiseman 1974, 113. ? Grandfather: or maternal uncle (Münzer 1999, 307–8), quaestor 67.

44. Cf. *Fin.* 3.38, 3.57, 5.63; *Ver.* 2.3.157, 159–62. Contrast *Fin.* 3.11 on good men following nature, not *doctrina*. Cf. *SCPP* 90–2 on specific virtues learned by senators from their ancestors—or from the *principes*.

45. *Inv.* 1.35. See, e.g., *Quinct.* 11 (Naevius). Cicero passes over the adolescence of Verres (*Ver.* 1.32).

In considering education, the Romans were aware of the distinction between the natural abilities of the child and the improvement to be produced by training. Nature and innate talent (*natura* or *ingenium* or *indoles*) and sound training in an art (*disciplina*, *doctrina*, *ars* or *scientia*) were both vital. Cicero concerns himself with this in his treatises on oratory.[46] The Tuberones pursued virtue, 'humanity' (*humanitas*), learning and many excellent liberal arts. The traditions of the family compelled L. Tubero to obey the senatorial decree which put him in command in Africa and Q. Tubero to accompany his father: 'anything else would have been unthinkable for your race, name, family and upbringing' (*Lig.* 12–13, 20–1).

Inheritance of political ideals, which Cicero postulated to have taken place over countless generations among the Valerii, is more naturally supposed from father to son, where the nature of politics is assumed not to have radically changed. Cicero may combine this theme with a claim of sympathy with both father and son. In a letter to Atticus, Cicero expressed his pleasure that Sex. Peducaeus approved his conduct in 49. It was as good as having the approbation of his father, who had backed him on the Nones of December 63 and encouraged him with a well-chosen Homeric tag. 'So his authority (*auctoritas*) is alive for me, and his son, who is very like him, has the same weight with me as he had.' [47] Conversely, attention may be drawn to those who have provided a bad example which influence their children (*Phil.* 2.18).

Cicero exploits the natural desire of the father that his son will turn out well in a clever tactic against the consular Fufius Calenus, who at the moment has all a man could want:

> You have an ample fortune, the highest rank, a son, or so I hear and hope, born for glory. I feel warmly towards him for the sake of the commonwealth and for yours. So let me ask you this: 'Would you rather he were like Brutus or like Antony?' I'll let you pick whichever of the three Antonii you like. 'May the gods grant better than that!', you'll say. Why then don't you side with and praise those whom you wish your son to resemble? You will both be consulting the interests of the commonwealth and setting before him models to imitate (*propones illi exempla ad imitandum*) (*Phil.* 10.4–5).[48]

46. e.g. *de Orat.* 1.38, 180, 191; 2.6, 11, 38, 88–9, 147, 150. Pure diction and fluency came from early habit. It could also be demonstrated that knowledge of civil law was naturally handed on in a family (*Brut.* 210–20, 258; *de Orat.* 1.39–40, 3.45, 48). Similarly, Antony could have picked up humour from his mistress, a mime-actress (*Phil.* 2.20).
47. *Att.* 190/10.1.1, with Bailey 1965 34 n. 2, 278. Cf. *Fin.* 2.58, *Fam.* 374/12.28.2.
48. Cf. *ad Brut.* 5/2.5.6; Sal. *Jug.* 85.16, with Wiseman 1971, 112.

A politician might be praised as deliberately repaying what he owed to his ancestors. So Milo

> . . . acted with authority and discretion, acted through the Senate, acted according to the example of good and gallant citizens: he pondered carefully what was worthy of himself and of the commonwealth, who he was, what he ought to hope, what repay to his ancestors. (*Sest.* 87)

Degenerate descendants might reject their role-models, as Sallust says of the hangers-on of Sulla,

> . . . bearers of great names, men whose ancestors set excellent examples, . . . the glorious offspring of Bruti, Aemilii and Lutatii, born to overturn what their ancestors had achieved by *uirtus*. (Sal. *Hist.* (Reynolds) 1.55.2–3, *Or. Lepidi*)

The strength of the appeal to ancestral virtue is demonstrated by the way it is interwoven with other emotional themes. For instance, in an appeal to the president of the court at Verres' trial, Acilius Glabrio:

> Think where you are, what you ought to give to the Roman People, what repay to your ancestors; think of your father's Acilian law . . . You are surrounded by the loftiest authorities, which do not allow you to forget the praise of your house, which admonish you night and day that your father was gallant, your grandfather wise, your father-in-law venerable. So if you take the force and keenness of your father Glabrio to resist unscrupulous men, and the prudence of your grandfather Scaevola to foresee the ambushes which are laid against your reputation and theirs, and the resolution of your father-in-law Scaurus, so that no one can move you from your true and certain judgement, the Roman People will understand that with an irreproachable and honourable praetor and a selected council a great sum of money creates suspicion of guilt rather than a means to acquittal. (*Ver.* 1.51–2)

As Cicero represents the matter, his enemy the consul Metellus Nepos was persuaded to vote for his recall by a blatant appeal to family feeling. P. Servilius metaphorically raised all the Metelli from the dead and persuaded him to return to the *dignitas* of the line they shared and away from the brigandage of Clodius (cousin or possibly half-brother to Nepos). When P. Servilius (Vatia, *cos.* 79) evoked his exiled kinsman Metellus Numidicus (first cousin of his own mother and of Nepos' grandfather) and the memory of a family example (*domestici exempli memoriam*), Nepos wept and became a true Metellus. The

dead Celer, Nepos' brother (Wiseman 1974, 178–9, 182) and Cicero's ally, and the whole family would have been proud of him (*Sest.* 130–1).

Conclusions

That character runs in families is a widespread belief. It is exploited by Suetonius in the introductions to biographies of the Caesars, as it is by Syme in some of his most Roman rhetoric. Cicero makes it clear in his theoretical writings that it is important to appeal to the common beliefs of mankind (*Inv.* 1.29, *de Orat.* 1.17, 94, 2.68, 3.92). The belief about continuity in families depends on ideas of natural heredity and of nurture, both the rearing which created a certain environment and the deliberate training which was given to the child.

If an audience already had a perception about a man's family, an adroit speaker could use that to lead them to form an opinion about the man himself. The documented honours of prominent families, the occurrence of names in the lists of consuls, the temples dedicated from war booty with the name of the donor inscribed on their façade, the actors portraying the characteristics of dead ancestors at a funeral, the claims and anecdotes heard in previous speeches—all these will allow a crowd of citizens to have certain preconceptions about even untried members of such a clan. With individuals of less known families, a speaker has more freedom to invent or embroider, but will often appeal to some knowledge on the part of his hearers. Such are the specific facts or established prejudices about a family or even facts alleged by the speaker which have some artistic verisimilitude—for instance the alleged Gallic auctioneer who was Piso's maternal grandfather. The orator then exploits common beliefs about how things are, for instance nature and nurture. He can now draw apparently plausible conclusions about the moral status and credibility of the targeted individual, whether for good or ill.

The appeal to these ideas is pervasive in the speeches of Cicero. That in itself suggests that the ideas were commonly held. But I hope to have shown that they run through Cicero's other writings as well and that they can be documented also in the scattered or fragmentary writings of other contemporary or earlier Roman writers. The insistence on the moral ancestry of the individual is peculiarly Roman. It cannot be paralleled in Greek thought to anything like the same extent, nor, I would think, in the ideas of the English-speaking peoples. For the Romans of the Republic, the quality of the individual was to be assessed in the light of the moral record of the family and the moral atmosphere in which it was assumed he had been raised. Nor was this mere posturing. If you could convince enough fellow-citizens of your claim to virtue, it might make the difference between being consul or not, or being

exiled or not. In deploying the arguments about socio-political and moral ancestry, Cicero shows that most of his fellow Romans would identify with such ideas. He is tapping into belief and emotion.

Additional Note

Erich Gruen, helpfully, suggested that the epitaphs of the lower classes of the late Republic might (as in the 'trickle-down' effect in portraiture) imitate the élite fashion for making moral claims and show that ordinary Romans were ready to be convinced by orators. Epitaphs (whether set up by self or by family/heirs), predictably, praise the dead person's virtuous behaviour towards family. But they also claim general 'goodness and probity, e.g. of an *eques*: 'Here he was good in much, with much honesty' (*Hic fuit ille bonus multum, multa probitate . . .*, *ILLRP* 692a). It was appropriate to claim for an auctioneer that he was 'deserving' or 'serviceable' (*frugi*) and trustworthy (808) or that Manlia T. l. Gnome, of unknown profession, who had many clients, lived 'honest by nature' (*natura proba*) and 'with good faith' (*quom fide*), and never owed anyone (982). It was more surprising to mention that a freed pearl-dealer (commemorated probably by his freed slaves) was good, compassionate and (?) loved the poor (*hominis boni, misericordis, amantis pauperis*, 797). A doctor's wife, commemorated by her husband was 'good, honest, serviceable' (*bona, proba, frugei*, 799), a cattle-dealer commemorated by himself, says he was 'serviceable, clean-living, lovable to everyone' (*frugi, castus, amabilis omnibus*, 802). Apart from domestic virtues, Asclepias was 'of the greatest good faith' (*fide maxsuma*, 931), Utius lived *honeste*, 'honourably' (978). The People might weep at the funeral of a virtuous sixteen-year-old (974). What cannot be proved here is that such virtues were praised by commemorators who implicitly claimed that they had inherited them: children are unattested and in 974 can be ruled out, though the father may be hoping for credit. Cofod 2001 argues that the choice of what to put on a tombstone in Spain was influenced by what lower-class commemorators saw on other lower-class inscriptions, rather than by upper-class fashions. I would suggest more homogeneity between classes (including freed slaves) in moral claims, at least, in the City of Rome in the Late Republic.

Bibliography

Bailey, D.R.S. 1965, *Cicero's Letters to Atticus* 1, Cambridge.
Bradley, K.R. 1993, 'Writing the History of the Roman Family', *Classical Philology* 88: 237–50.
Cofod, N. 2001, 'Tombstones and Non-elite Self-representation in Roman Iberia', Stanford Ph.D dissertation.

Corbeill, A. 1996, *Controlling Laughter: Political Humor in the late Roman Republic*, Princeton.
Cornell, T.J. 1982, Review of Wiseman 1979, *Journal of Roman Studies* 72 203–6.
Courtney, E. 1980, *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*, London.
Courtney, E. 1995, *Musa Lapidaria: A Selection of Latin Verse Inscriptions*, American Classical Studies 36, Atlanta.
Crook, J.A. 1976, '*Sponsione provocare*: its place in Roman litigation', *Journal of Roman Studies* 66: 132–8.
Dyck, A. 1996, *A Commentary on Cicero's* de Officiis, Ann Arbor.
Earl, D.C. 1960, 'Political Terminology in Plautus', *Historia* 9: 235–43.
Earl, D.C. 1961, *The Political Thought of Sallust*, Cambridge.
Earl, D.C. 1967, *The Moral and Political Tradition of Rome*, London.
Flower, H. 1996, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, Oxford.
Harris, W.V. 1979, *War and Imperialism in Republican Rome: 327–70 BC*, Oxford.
Hellegourac'h, J. 1963, *Le Vocabulaire latin des relations et des partis politiques sous la République*, Paris.
Leigh, M. 1995, 'Wounding and Popular Rhetoric at Rome', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 40: 195–215.
Linderski, J. 1996a, 'Q. Scipio imperator', in Linderski, 1996b: 145–85.
Linderski, J. 1996b, ed., *Imperium sine fine. T. Robert S. Broughton and the Roman Republic*, *Historia Einzelschrift* 105, Stuttgart.
May, J.M. 1988, *Trials of Character. The Eloquence of Ciceronian Ethos*, Chapel Hill.
Millar, F. 1998, *The Crowd in Rome in the Late Republic*, Ann Arbor.
Münzer, F. 1999, *Roman Aristocratic Parties and Factions*, translation. T. Ridley, Baltimore.
Nisbet, R.G.M. 1961, *M. Tulli Ciceronis in L. Calpurnium Pisonem oratio*, Oxford.
Peristiany, J.G. 1966, ed., *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society* Chicago.
Pitt-Rivers, J. 1966, 'Honour and Social Status' in Peristiany, 1966: 21–75 = 'The Anthropology of Honour' in Pitt-Rivers 1977: 1–17.
Pitt-Rivers, J. 1977, *The Fate of Schechem*, Cambridge.
Rawson, E. 1971/1991, 'Lucius Crassus and Cicero: the Formation of a Statesman' in Rawson 1991: 16–33 = *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* n.s. 17 (1971) 75–88.
Rawson, E. 1985, *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic*, London.
Rawson, E. 1991, *Roman Culture and Society: Collected Papers*, Oxford.
Skidmore, C. 1996, *Practical Ethics for Roman Gentlemen: The Work of Valerius Maximus*, Exeter.
Wiseman, T.P. 1971, *New Men in the Roman Senate 139 BC-AD 14*, Oxford.
Wiseman, T.P. 1974, *Cinna the Poet and other Roman Essays*, Leicester.
Wiseman, T.P. 1979, *Clio's Cosmetics: Three Studies in Greco-Roman Literature*, Leicester.
Wiseman, T.P. 1985a, 'Competition and Co-operation' in 1985b: 3– 19.
Wiseman, T.P. 1985b, *Roman Political Life 90 BC-AD 69*, Exeter.
Wiseman, T.P. 1998, *Roman Drama and Roman History*, Exeter.
Woodman, A.J. 1977, *Velleius Paterculus. The Tiberian Narrative* (2.94–131), ed. with intro. and comm., Cambridge.