

TULLIA AND CRASSIPES

PATRICIA A. CLARK

THE MARITAL CAREER OF Tullia, the daughter of Terentia and Cicero, is known in considerable detail thanks largely to the survival of her father's correspondence. Briefly, the following sequence of events is generally accepted for her: Tullia was betrothed in 67 at the age of eight or nine to C. Calpurnius Piso Frugi (quaest. 58), whom she married probably in 63, the year of her father's consulship, when she was about twelve or thirteen. She was widowed in 58 or 57, and then betrothed a second time in April 56 to Furius Crassipes, marrying him shortly after but at an indeterminate date. Little is known of this match, but in 51 Cicero was once more and with some urgency looking for another husband for his daughter. The common assumption is, therefore, that she and Crassipes had divorced. In 50, however, Tullia *ipsa* announced to an absent and astonished father her engagement to P. Cornelius Dolabella (cos. 44). A third marriage followed but ended in divorce in 46, closely followed in 45 by Tullia's death (probably from puerperal fever) when she was thirty. These, in skeletal form, are the known "facts" of Tullia's marital history.¹

The concern of this paper is the sequel to Tullia's second betrothal, the putative marriage to and divorce from Furius Crassipes.² For although the assumption is widespread that a marriage took place and that it was followed at some point before 51 by a divorce, there is in fact no direct attestation of either. Shackleton Bailey states: "the marriage [to Crassipes] followed within a year or so . . . but did not last long,"³ while other scholars, perhaps feeling a long period of celibacy to be unlikely, assume that a marriage closely followed the engagement.⁴ But there is no consensus with

¹For Tullia: *RE* 7A.2 (1948) 1329–36, s.v. Tullius (60); see also standard biographical studies of her father, for example Elizabeth Rawson, *Cicero: A Portrait* (London 1975); D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero* (London 1971). Estimates of Tullia's age are based on a conjectural birth date of 76/75 B.C., argued by G. V. Sumner, "The *Lex annalis* under Caesar," *Phoenix* 25 (1971) 246–271, at 258, n. 30, now generally accepted.

²For Furius Crassipes (praenomen unknown): *RE* 7.1 (1910) 351–352; "a rich patrician who reached the quaestorship" (S. M. Treggiari, "*Digna condicio*: Betrothals in the Roman Upper Class," *EMC/CV* 3 [1984] 419–451, at 441).

³D. R. Shackleton-Bailey, *Cicero's Letters to Atticus* (Cambridge 1965), *Att.* 4.5.3 (SB 80) *ad loc.* For the numbering of the paragraphs of this letter see Shackleton Bailey's *corrigenda*, vol. VII 94. I use Shackleton Bailey's editions (and numbering system) of Cicero's correspondence throughout, and, where relevant, his translations.

⁴See especially Treggiari (above, n. 2) 441–443 and cf. Michel Humbert, *Le Remariage à Rome* (Milan 1972) 81; A. S. Gratwick, "Free or Not So Free? Wives and Daughters in the Late Roman Republic," in *Marriage and Property*, ed. E. M. Craik (Aberdeen 1984) 32; Jane E. Phillips, "Roman Mothers and the Lives of

respect to the timing of the subsequent divorce. The view that Crassipes became the second husband of Cicero's daughter is certainly plausible and defensible, but it has not always been held.⁵ It may serve a cautionary purpose now to re-examine the evidence in order to test the viability of the majority view.

Our information about Cicero's family life during the years 57 to 51 suffers from the fact that the extant letters to Atticus are sporadic for 56 and 55 and come to a complete stop in November 54. From that date until May 51 the two men were together, either in or near Rome, and their correspondence resumed only with Cicero's departure for Cilicia. The *Epistulae ad Familiares* contain some fifty letters from these years, many of them of political and prosopographical interest, but family matters do not figure in them to any great extent. However, most of the surviving letters Cicero wrote to his brother Quintus fall between 57 and 54, and these do contain some domestic details, notably the announcement of Tullia's betrothal to Crassipes (QFr. 2.6[5].1-2 [SB 10]). But rather surprisingly they contain little further evidence about Tullia or her marriage. In the correspondence as a whole, therefore, we have a few specific remarks about Crassipes either from well before 51 or from after 51; a handful of oblique references to Tullia during the period in question; and one letter from Cicero directly addressed to Crassipes but undatable.⁶ There is nothing here, consequently, to prove the reality of the second marriage. On the evidence of Cicero himself it is thus an open question as to when, for how long, or even if Tullia and Crassipes were ever married.

More than a century ago two pieces of evidence, one from Asconius' *Commentaries* and the other from Plutarch's *Life of Cicero*, evoked the suspicion that the marriage to Crassipes may never have taken place.⁷ First, Asconius (*Pis.* 5.9-11):

Their Adult Daughters," *Helios* 6 (1978) 69-80, at 72; Suzanne Dixon, *The Roman Mother* (London and Sydney 1988) 31; but cf. Suzanne Dixon, "A Family Business: Women's Role in Patronage and Politics at Rome 80-44 B.C.," *CI Med* 34 (1983) 104, in which (without discussion) Tullia's "second marriage" is the one to Dolabella.

⁵T. Petersson, *Cicero: A Biography* (New York 1963) 524 expresses a rare note of caution: "It is not certain that they were married."

⁶For convenient reference a chronological listing of the relevant letters is appended (below, 38).

⁷W. von Voigt, "Cn. Lentulus und P. Dolabella," *Philologus* 64 (1903) 352-357, revived the earlier position of J. N. Madvig, *De Q. Asconii Pediani et aliorum veterum interpretum in Ciceronis orationes commentariis disputatio critica* (Hauniae 1828) 68, that Tullia did not in fact marry Crassipes: a Corrado . . . reprehensus est Asconius cum Plutarcho, quod Tulliam Ciceronis post mortem Pisonis Lentulo Dolabellae nupsisse scribunt . . . Sed quum horum testimonio accedat silentium Ciceronis, qui filiam Crassipedi desponsam saepius, nuptam nusquam scribit, eas nuptias nunquam factas arbitror. Recent objections to Madvig's view from Bruce A. Marshall, *A Historical Commentary on Asconius* (Columbia 1985) 92, are discussed below.

Cicero filiam post mortem Pisonis generi P. Lentulo collocavit, apud quem illa ex partu decessit.

Cicero, after the death of his son-in-law Piso, gave his daughter in marriage to P. Lentulus, in whose home she died as a result of childbirth.

Secondly, Plutarch (*Cic.* 41.7–8):

γίμναι δ' αὐτῷ μετ' οὐ πολὺν χρόνον ἢ θυγάτηρ ἀπέθανε τίκτουσα παρὰ Λέντλῳ· τοῦτ' ἄρ' ἐγαμήθη μετὰ τὴν Πείσανος τοῦ προτέρου ἀνδρὸς τελευτήν.

And when he had married, his daughter died not a long time afterwards in childbirth in the house of Lentulus (this was the man she married after the death of Piso, her former husband).⁸

That Crassipes is not mentioned by Asconius and Plutarch is not in itself proof that Tullia failed to marry him, but it is nonetheless a puzzling omission if the marriage actually took place. The convincing suggestion has been made that both authors were here using a common source, namely the biography of Cicero written by his freedman Tiro, a man long intimate with the domestic *arcana* of Cicero's household. If so, it is hard to imagine that Tiro neglected to mention the marriage and in turn that both Asconius and Plutarch did likewise.⁹ But it is better to leave the question of "error" open and to see what may reasonably be gleaned on the topic from Cicero's correspondence, our only source of direct information about Crassipes and Tullia.¹⁰

⁸Plutarch: *The Life of Cicero*, tr. J. L. Moles (Warminster 1988) 129; see also 191, note.

⁹Marshall (above, n. 7) 93, although taking the position that the marriage to Crassipes did take place, nevertheless admits that "it is hard to conceive of Tiro making such a mistake. . . ." (cf. also 57 and 65). For Tiro's intimate familial role: *Att.* 15.15.3 (SB 393); *Fam.* 16.21 (SB 337), 16.25 (SB 338); see also S. M. Treggiari, *Roman Freedmen During the Late Republic* (Oxford 1969) 259–263; W. C. McDermott, "M. Cicero and M. Tiro," *Historia* 21 (1972) 259–286.

¹⁰Asconius and Plutarch have been accused of making two mistakes about Tullia: not only is the marriage to Crassipes omitted, but the place where Tullia died soon after childbirth is incorrectly identified (see now Marshall [above, n. 7] 92, 93 and Moles [above, n. 8] 191). It has been persuasively argued that Tullia gave birth to her child in Rome, was moved to Cicero's villa at Tusculum and died there (Y. G. Lepage, "Cicéron devant la mort de Tullia d'après sa correspondance," *Les Études Classiques* 44 [1976] 245–250, following J. Carcopino, *Les Secrets de la correspondance de Cicéron* 1 [Paris 1947] 277, n. 1; see also Voigt [above, n. 7] 359). Based largely upon Cicero's emotional reactions to that villa after her death, this explanation is now generally accepted. However, where the birth actually occurred is unknown and it is this lack of knowledge which perhaps underlies the confusion in our two sources. For a pregnant woman recently divorced after a sequence of separations and reconciliations, whose father too had recently divorced her mother and remarried a much younger woman, and whose child, should it survive, was to remain within its father's *domus*, the decision about where to bear the child may well have admitted of several possibilities. The households of Cicero

Furius Crassipes is first mentioned by Cicero in connection with marriage arrangements in a letter to Quintus of March 56 (QFr 11.4.2 [SB 8]):

de nostra Tullia tui mehercule amantissima spero cum Crassipede nos confecisse. <sed> dies erant duo qui post Latinas habentur religiosi (ceterum confectum erat Latiar), <et> erat exiturus.

I hope we have settled matters with Crassipes about our Tullia, who loves you very much indeed. But it is two days after the Latin Festival (now ended), which are holy days, and he is just leaving town.

Arrangements having been settled, Cicero wrote again to Quintus to announce that Tullia had been betrothed to Crassipes on April 4, 56. He further related that on April 6 he had held the *sponsalia* for Crassipes, to which Crassipes had responded two days later with a *cena* of his own (QFr 2.6[5].1-3 [SB 10]). No further mention is made of Crassipes until late June or July of 56, when at the end of a long letter to P. Cornelius Lentulus Spinther, then governor of Cilicia, Cicero remarked (Fam. 1.7.11 [SB 18]):

quod mihi de filia et de Crassipede gratularis, agnosco humanitatem tuam speroque et opto nobis hanc coniunctionem voluptati fore.

It is very kind of you to offer me your congratulations on my daughter's engagement to Crassipes. I hope and pray that the connection will bring us pleasure.

The term *coniunctio* may be used of either a betrothal, that is an agreement of intent to marry, or of the formalized marriage alliance. In this passage stress is clearly laid upon the future (*spero, opto, fore*): an engagement (the standard translation) is still being discussed.¹¹ And indeed Tullia was apparently still within her father's household at this time for at the end of June 56 she is attested with Cicero at Antium, where she was hoping for a visit from Atticus and his young wife Pilia (Att. 4.4a.2 [SB 78]).

or Terentia were options, as was a house belonging to Dolabella or to his adoptive family, the Lentuli. (Voigt [above, n. 7] 359 suggests one provided by Dolabella; Gratwick [above, n. 4] 37, the house of the Lentuli.) Thus the birth may indeed have taken place παρά Λέντιῳ, Tullia's death elsewhere, and the two events have been conflated in one of the lost biographies of Cicero—perhaps that of Cornelius Nepos (Moles [above, n. 8] 29, but see Marshall [above, n. 7] 58). This interpretation mitigates to some extent the blanket charge of multiple error in Asconius and Plutarch.

¹¹Cicero's phraseology here closely resembles his remark to Caelius on Tullia's engagement to Dolabella: *spero fore iucundum generum nobis* (Fam. 2.15.2 [SB 96]). For *coniunctio* in the context of betrothal see OLD, s.v. *coniunctio*, 3c; and cf. W. Glynn Williams's translation of this passage in the Loeb edition (Cicero, *The Letters to his Friends* [London 1927-29]). See also S.H.A. Aurel. 7.8, and Nepos Att. 19.4, with comment *ad loc.* by N. Horsfall, *Cornelius Nepos: A Selection, Including the Lives of Cato and Atticus* (Oxford 1989). Horsfall notes that the term carried strong political overtones, citing J. Hellegouarc'h, *Le Vocabulaire latin des relations et des partis politiques sous la république* (Paris 1963, 1972²) 81-82.

Shortly after, but still in the early summer of 56, when planning his return to Rome, Cicero wrote a letter to Atticus containing the remark, *viaticam Crassipes praeripit* (*Att.* 4.5.3 [SB 80]). This was once understood to imply some financial concern about the payment of Tullia's dowry, but Shackleton Bailey has convincingly demonstrated that it is part of a discussion about dinner arrangements upon Cicero's return. A stop en route at the wealthy Crassipes' suburban villa "seems more convenient" (*commodius*; Shackleton Bailey, *ad loc.*). We are not told whether Tullia returned with Cicero at this time or stayed in the house at Antium; in fact she is not mentioned.¹² Nor is she referred to in the letter which Shackleton Bailey puts immediately subsequent to this, *Att.* 4.12 (SB 81), in which Cicero again proposed a stop on his way home, "to dine at Crassipes' place in the suburbs in lieu of an inn, and thus cheat the decree?"—presumably a sumptuary decree.¹³ However, month and year are impossible to establish for this letter, and the dinner at *Att.* SB 81 could well be totally unrelated to the dinner suggested at *Att.* SB 80.¹⁴

Although dinner parties feature prominently in Cicero's references to Crassipes, then, they inform us more about the type of relationship which existed between Cicero and the obscure Crassipes than the latter's marital status. Political manoeuvring in this age was largely conducted in informal social gatherings such as *cenae*, where news was assessed and communicated and decisions made in the context of dinner conversation.¹⁵ Cicero more than once refers to Crassipes' dinners as part of a sequence of political and legal business affairs: after one such occasion he left to meet with Cn. Pompeius, and on another, in an act of semi-public reconciliation made at the instigation of both Pompeius and Julius Caesar, he appears to have been either host or co-host to the powerful M. Licinius Crassus.¹⁶ Despite whatever family bond there may have been between Cicero and Crassipes, political ties (perhaps their mutual support of Pompeius), were evidently

¹²Cicero seems to have left his country villas under the care of competent *matronae* as a matter of course, for example, Pilia at Cicero's Lucrine villa, *Att.* 14.16.1 (SB 370), 14.17.1 (SB 371).

¹³The place of this letter in the sequence of the correspondence is problematical. L. R. Taylor, "On the Chronology of Cicero's Letters of 56–55 B.C.," *CP* 44 (1949) 217–221, assigned it to a month shortly before November 55, but it has been attached to the correspondence of the spring of 56 by Shackleton Bailey largely on the grounds that the "reference to dinner at Crassipes' *horti* ties up neatly with 80 (IV.5).[3]." See Shackleton Bailey (above, n. 3, volume 2) Appendix II, 234.

¹⁴Spring to early fall of 55 is a possibility especially if the allusion is to the sumptuary legislation mooted (and abandoned) by Cn. Pompeius and M. Licinius Crassus in 55; cf. Dio 39.37.2–4.

¹⁵For discussion of the *cena* see J. H. D'Arms, "Control, Companionship, and *Clientela*: Some Social Functions of the Roman Communal Meal," *EMC/CV* 3 (1984) 327–348.

¹⁶QFr. 2.6[5].3 (SB 10); *Fam.* 1.9.20 (SB 20); cf. *Att.* 4.12 (SB 81).

more important. For even much later on, during the civil war (when Tullia had married another young man), a disillusioned Crassipes visited Cicero at Formiae to report on the state of the Pompeians he had left behind in Brundisium.¹⁷

The dinner which Cicero, or Cicero and Crassipes together, held for Crassus took place in November 55, shortly before Crassus' departure for the East. It was described by Cicero a year later in a letter to P. Cornelius Lentulus Spinther, dated December 54 (*Fam.* 1.9.20 [SB 20]):

... *Crassusque, ut quasi testata populo Romano esset nostra gratia, paene a meis laribus in provinciam est profectus; nam, cum mihi condixisset, cenavit apud <me> in mei generi Crassipedis hortis.*

And Crassus, as though to make all Rome witness of our reconciliation, set out for his province virtually from my doorstep. He offered to dine with me, and did so at my son-in-law Crassipes' place in the suburbs.

This letter has been the focus of debate among scholars in their attempts to resolve the Crassipes-Tullia marriage situation, for it is in this letter, but this letter alone, that Cicero refers to Crassipes as *gener* (son-in-law). The term raises two problems: the first is whether it is being used in the strictly literal sense, meaning a man married to one's daughter, or whether it has the looser sense of a *prospective* son-in-law, as seems, on the evidence of both Ulpian and Pomponius, often to have been the case:

... *generi et nurus appellatione sponsus quoque et sponsa continetur: item socii et socrus appellatione sponsorum parentes contineri videntur.*

... A man or woman who is betrothed is also included in the term son-in-law or daughter-in-law; likewise, the parents of the betrothed appear to be included in the term father-in-law and mother-in-law. (*Ulp. Dig.* 38.10.6.1)

Servius recte dicebat socii et socrus et generi et nurus appellationem etiam ex sponsalibus adquiri.

Servius rightly held that the names of father-in-law, mother-in-law, son-in-law, and daughter-in-law are acquired also from the time of the betrothal. (*Pompon. Dig.* 38.10.8)

Put another way: were Crassipes and Tullia married, or still engaged, in December 54? Is it conceivable that Cicero was using the term *gener* proleptically eighteen months (at least) after Tullia and Crassipes were betrothed?¹⁸

¹⁷ *Att.* 9.11.3 (SB 178). D. R. Shackleton Bailey, "The Roman Nobility in the Second Civil War," *CQ* 54 (1960) 253-267, at 259, and see Hellegouarc'h (above, n. 11).

¹⁸ Marshall, *ad Asc.* 5.9-11 (above, n. 7, 92), recognizes that *gener* may be used of a prospective son-in-law but, citing Verg. *Aen.* 12.31 and 12.55, asserts that it is "always in a context of futurity." This observation is perhaps valid for *Aen.* 12.31, where *promissam* is functional, but at *Aen.* 12.55, as at 2.344 and 12.658, the term itself includes futurity:

The second problem is a matter of chronology. *Fam.* 1.9 (SB 20) was written to Lentulus Spinther in December 54 and describes a situation in November 55. If the term *gener* was being applied in its strictest sense, would it be appropriate for Crassipes in 55 and in 54, or in 55 only, after which came the putative divorce? Or it is to be understood loosely and *in prospectu* still in 55, but literally in 54? These questions are unanswerable of course, but perhaps worth raising to augment the cautionary purpose of this paper.

Certainly it is entirely possible that Cicero was using *gener* here in its strictest sense; for between June 56, when Tullia was apparently still at home, and November 55, there would have been ample time for the marriage to have taken place and, as has been noted, our domestic information is limited by the fact that Cicero's correspondence for the latter half of the fifties is lacunose. Still, a dozen letters to Atticus and half a dozen to Quintus are extant from the period between the engagement and the dinner with Crassus and it is curious that in none of these is there any reference to a family wedding or, as might have been expected, to a subsequent pregnancy.¹⁹ There is, however, some circumstantial evidence consonant with the idea that *gener* in 55 was still being applied loosely and that the match with Crassipes, for one reason or another, may have been delayed and ultimately abandoned.²⁰

First, there is the tone and intent of *Fam.* 1.9 (SB 20), a long letter that is rhetorically contrived and politically motivated. It is, in fact, "an elaborate defence of the writer's political record since Luca," in which Cicero

see R. D. Williams, *The Aeneid of Virgil: Books 1-6* (London 1972) ad *Aen.* 2.344 where *gener* carries the sense "would-be-son-in-law"; cf. also Plautus *Cist.* 753; *Trin.* 622; and note particularly Hor. *Epodi* 6.13, where *gener* is used of a partner in a broken betrothal. For Cicero's ambiguous use of the term for Piso and Dolabella see Treggiari (above, n. 2) 442-443, n. 102 and 450, n. 125. I am grateful here for the comments of the anonymous reviewers for *Phoenix* who stressed the importance of the fact that Pomponius was citing Cicero's contemporary, Servius Sulpicius Rufus, and who suggested other literary uses of the term for fiancés and former fiancés at *Tac. Ann.* 5.6.2 and 6.8.6.

¹⁹ Observe in sharp contrast the frequent reference to childbirth and grandchildren in the correspondence following Tullia's marriage with Dolabella: for example *Att.* 10.18.1 (SB 210); *Fam.* 6.18.5 (SB 218); *Att.* 12.18a.2 (SB 256), 12.28.3 (SB 267), 12.30.1 (SB 270).

²⁰ Among the elite broken engagements are well attested (e.g., Suet. *Iul.* 1; *Aug.* 62), as are lengthy betrothals (e.g., *Nepos Att.* 19.4; *Dio* 60.5.7), particularly when one of the partners was very young. It seems clear, however, that divorce was often followed by swift remarriage (sometimes scandalously so: *Fam.* 8.7.2 [SB 92]) and that this was also a pattern for those widowed (see M. Humbert [above, n. 4] 76-112). Yet this pattern was not universal—we do know of one widow, Pudentilla, who was wealthy, of child-bearing age and proven fecundity, and who allowed herself to be betrothed, but who for her own reasons evaded the marriage for thirteen years (*Apul. Apol.* 68, 69; cf. also 27, 67, and for Pudentilla's age, 89).

is clearly concerned to demonstrate to Lentulus the personal nature of his connections with each of Rome's three strong men: it is for this reason that he stresses the intimacy with which he received M. Licinius Crassus.²¹ We can only speculate about the reasons for the choice of Crassipes' *horti* for the dinner: a "neutral" territory belonging to a man whose personal connections made him mutually acceptable may have been all that was required.²² The hyperbolic phrasing with which Cicero described the scene was noted long ago.²³ Crassus set out for Syria *paene a meis laribus* and *ut quasi testata populo Romano esset nostra gratia*. Just as Cicero was, in this letter, deliberately stressing the closeness of his rapprochement with Crassus, so too his exaggerated rhetoric may have expanded to embrace the facilitator and "son-in-law" Crassipes (Voigt [above, note 7] 356). Here the personal, even familial, aspects of the *cena* with Crassus have been inflated by Cicero in an attempt to deflate any impression either of stark political compulsion—or opportunism.²⁴ In such a context the proleptic use of *gener* for Crassipes is completely comprehensible.

Reasons for delaying the match may have been financial, political, or a combination of the two. The correspondence from the years subsequent to his exile provides evidence both of financial over-extension on the part of Cicero, and his brother Quintus, and of a great deal of fast political footwork.²⁵ Both brothers were badly in debt, but partly as investments and partly to restore their respective *dignitas* each embarked on a vast programme of building, rebuilding, and acquiring new properties.²⁶ Between 56 and 54 workmen were continuously engaged on their properties in Rome and at their country villas, and in 54 Quintus joined Caesar in Gaul and Britain for motives which were partly political but which also reflected a continuing

²¹Shackleton Bailey *ad loc.*; see also T. N. Mitchell, "Cicero Before Luca (September 57–April 56 B.C.)," *TAPA* 100 (1969) 295–320, at 320, who emphasizes Cicero's need to magnify the importance of his political reconciliation for the benefit of Lentulus and other *boni*.

²²*apud <me>* is not necessarily evidence that Crassipes was elsewhere at the time (*contra* Shackleton Bailey *ad loc.* and his introductory note *ad Fam.* 13.9 [SB 139]). The two may well have been co-hosts, for Cicero was apparently away from Rome during much of the activity surrounding Crassus' departure (*Att.* 4.13.1–2 [SB 87]) and may simply have used Crassipes' suburban house as a convenient meeting place, as he had done at other times (*Att.* 4.5.3 [SB 80]; 4.12 [SB 81]).

²³Voigt (above, n. 7) 356. Note too Cicero's stress on publicizing the very personal nature of his *fides amicitiae* in the letter to Crassus, *Fam.* 5.8.2 (SB 25).

²⁴Contrast the less constrained references to Crassus at *Att.* 4.13.2 (SB 87).

²⁵Cicero described his resources after exile as *fracta, dissipata, direpta* (*Att.* 4.1.3 [SB 73]) and considered the financial recompense voted by the Senate for the rebuilding of the properties destroyed by Clodius to be grossly inadequate: *Att.* 4.1.7–8 (SB 73), 4.2.2–5 (SB 74), 4.3.6 (SB 75); *Fam.* 1.9.15 (SB 20).

²⁶QFr. 2.4.2 (SB 8); 2.5[4.3–7].1 (SB 9), 2.6[5].3 (SB 10), 2.9[8].2–3 (SB 12), 3.1.1–7, 14 (SB 21), 3.3.1 (SB 23), 3.7[9].7 (SB 27).

financial embarrassment.²⁷ In view of the unambiguously attested financial strains of re-establishing himself and his family in his "second life," it is quite conceivable that Cicero deferred the additional demands of Tullia's dowry for an indefinite interval.²⁸

In addition to financial uncertainty, the turbulent political realignments of the years 57 to 55 might also have caused Cicero to hesitate in committing himself to the link with Crassipes. Alternately buoyed up by hopes and dashed down by realities, Cicero was subject to intense personal pressure from both Caesar and Pompeius.²⁹ After a series of strategic miscalculations he was reduced in 56 to composing his famous "palinode" and saw political freedom vanish utterly in 54, with his defence of Aulus Gabinius. After this he increasingly tried to extract himself from the political arena.³⁰ Cicero's relationship with Crassipes in these years seems to have gradually deteriorated in tandem with his political fortunes. There is explicit evidence of a still functioning camaraderie, an intact *adfinitas* in 55 (the Crassus dinner) and perhaps in 54, although the letter to Lentulus Spinther is not a reliable indicator of the current relationship between the two men. However, the only extant letter from Cicero to Crassipes himself (*Fam.* 13.9 [SB 139]) may well belong to this period.³¹ Of this the letter heading is familiar (*Crassipedi*) but the tone is cool and formal.³² There are few relevant letters for

²⁷ *QFr.* 2.15[14].2 (SB 19); cf. Quintus' financial strain, *Fam.* 1.9.24 (SB 20).

²⁸ See also Voigt (above, n. 7) 356–357. R. P. Saller, "Roman Dowry and the Devolution of Property in the Principate," *CQ* NS 34 (1984) 195–205, at 205, concludes that the relatively small dowries of Roman aristocratic families—normally equivalent to one year's income—"usually did not play a very large part either in aristocrats' strategies for financial success or their financial ruin." Clearly, however, dowry payments were of pressing concern to Cicero during Tullia's marriage to Dolabella (Saller, 203, n. 45; cf. I. Shatzman, *Senatorial Wealth and Roman Politics* [Brussels 1975] 331–332). At this time, the marriage a *fait accompli*, he was prepared to borrow to meet them (*Att.* 11.2.2 [SB 212]). See Shatzman (416–417) on the irregularity of Cicero's income and cf. also 421 and 227.

²⁹ *Fam.* 1.9.19–20 (SB 20); *Att.* 4.5.1–3 (SB 80), 4.8a.4 (SB 82), 4.6.1–2 (SB 83), 4.13.1 (SB 87); *QFr.* 3.2.2 (SB 22), 3.3.2–3 (SB 23); 3.4.1–3 (SB 24).

³⁰ *Att.* 4.18.1–2 (SB 92); *QFr.* 3.4.1–3 (SB 24), 3.5[5–7].4–5 (SB 25). D. L. Stockton, *Cicero: A Political Biography* (London 1971) 194–226, gives an excellent description of these years.

³¹ See Shackleton Bailey's introductory note *ad loc.* Previously assigned to the correspondence of Cicero's proconsulate (51–50), this letter asks for Crassipes' support as quaestor for a consortium of tax-farming companies whose members were *familiares* of Cicero. Internal evidence suggests that a date earlier than the traditional one is more plausible—possibly 54–53, but Shackleton Bailey finds a year earlier or later feasible.

³² J. N. Adams, "Conventions of Naming in Cicero," *CQ* NS 28 (1978) 145–166, at 164, designates this form of address (by one name only) as "informal" rather than "intimate"; it is not the usual "formal" mode of address for Cicero's letters of commendation (Adams 148–149) yet the letter itself does not exhibit any of the more familiar features of his style when writing to close friends and family (e.g., vocatives with or without *mi*; Adams 162–163).

the years 54–51, but when the correspondence with Atticus resumes in the spring of 51 we find that Cicero is in the midst of an anxious search for a new husband for Tullia. In addition, tension is evident between Cicero and Crassipes: in his comprehensive campaigning for support for a triumph on his return from Cilicia, Cicero deliberately avoided writing to only two people, C. Lucilius Hirrus, his detested rival for the augurate in 53, and Furius Crassipes (*Att.* 7.1.8 [SB 124]). Relations recovered and reached a level of superficial amiability (with perhaps a veiled hint of animosity) in 49 when Crassipes visited Cicero with his report on the state of Pompeius' troops.³³ And finally, at a long-standing textual crux in *Att.* SB 219, there is the last possible reference to Crassipes: now, in 48, he had become an outright enemy and joined the ranks of those in Caesar's camp who were slandering Cicero.³⁴

The traditional interpretation of this sequence of events is that Tullia and Crassipes had divorced. Cicero's silence on the matter has been explained as an unwillingness to speak about important matters by letter when Atticus was in Rome.³⁵ Perhaps so. Yet such silence does not necessarily indicate divorce proceedings (the negotiations surrounding which were often protracted if Cicero's own two and Tullia's from Dolabella are any indication): it may equally cloak a decision by either one of the parties to break off the engagement.³⁶

There are no extant references to Tullia after June 56 until the spring of 54. At this time, it seems, Cicero was regularly discussing his day to day undertakings with her. He told Atticus that Tullia would be pleased at his negotiating some of Pilia's affairs in Atticus' absence, and he confided that he had refrained from making politically provocative comments because Tullia was unwell and he did not want to distress her further by incurring the anger of his old adversary P. Clodius Pulcher.³⁷ We cannot infer from this that Tullia was definitely at home, but it is possible. Furthermore, at the end of 54 Cicero, who was at Tusculum, remarked casually in a letter to Quintus that in Rome there was exceptionally heavy flooding and that a great many residences and shops had been swept away, including Crassipes'

³³ *Att.* 9.11.3 (SB 178); see Shackleton Bailey *ad loc.* for the possible pejorative nuance.

³⁴ *Att.* 11.8.2 (SB 219). Furnius, the name of Cicero's enemy as given in the manuscripts, is corrupt. Tyrell and Purser suggested Furius (Crassipes) and Shackleton Bailey agrees that this is tenable. V. Marek's suggestion ("Cicero *ad Att.* 11.8.1 Furnius oder Fufius?", *Listy Filologické* 95 [1972] 1–2) of the orator's brother Quintus is unconvincing.

³⁵ Drumann-Groebe, *Geschichte Roms*² (Berlin 1899–1929) 6.616: "... er schweigt in den Briefen von wichtigeren Dingen, wenn Attikus gerade in Rom war."

³⁶ Betrothals were terminated frequently and with relative ease by either party in the late Republic, usually from political motives: see Jane F. Gardner, *Women in Roman Law and Society* (London and Sydney 1986) 45; also Dixon ("A Family Business," above, n. 4) 107.

³⁷ *Att.* 4.16.4 (SB 89), c. July 1, 54; *Att.* 4.15.4 (SB 90), July 27, 54.

promenade (*ambulatio*; *QFr.* 3.5[5-7].8 [SB 25]). Again there is no mention of Tullia, although one would have expected paternal concern from the usually solicitous Cicero if she were in the midst of such an apparently large-scale disaster area. Possibly then she was still within Cicero's household at the end of 54—perhaps having divorced, perhaps (although unlikely) because her husband (or fiancé) was in Bithynia, or perhaps because an extended betrothal had in the end come to nothing.

It is clearly impossible to say categorically whether or not Tullia's marriage to Crassipes ever took place. But it is important simply not to assume that it did. Many factors may have conspired to prevent it and our information is both ambiguous and insufficient to provide a definitive judgment on the matter. On the axiom that "a *communis opinio* decreases in plausibility each time it is dogmatically restated without argument,"³⁸ may we not entertain the strong likelihood that Asconius and Plutarch were correct when they wrote that Cicero's daughter, after Piso, married Dolabella?³⁹

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA
VICTORIA, B.C.

CHRONOLOGY

<i>QFr.</i> 2.4.2 (SB 8)	March 56	Tullia's betrothal
<i>QFr.</i> 2.6[5].1-2 (SB 10)	April 56	Betrothal confirmed
<i>Att.</i> 4.4a.2 (SB 78)	ca June 20(?), 56	Tullia at Antium
<i>Att.</i> 4.5.3 (SB 80)	June 56	Cicero dines with Crassipes (<i>commodius</i>)
<i>Att.</i> 4.12 (SB 81)	June/July 56(?), possibly late 55	Cicero dines with Crassipes (cheats decree)
<i>Fam.</i> 1.7.11 (SB 18)	late June/July 56	Lentulus on betrothal
<i>Fam.</i> 1.9.20 (SB 20)	December 54	Account of dinner with Crassus (November 55)
<i>Fam.</i> 13.9 (SB 139)	54(?) or 51-50	To Crassipes (Bithynia)
<i>QFr.</i> 3.5[5-7].8 (SB 25)	October 54	Crassipes' <i>ambulatio</i>
<i>Att.</i> 7.1.8 (SB 124)	October 16, 50	Cicero omits writing to Crassipes
<i>Att.</i> 9.11.3 (SB 178)	March 20, 49	Crassipes reports to Cicero re Pompeians at Brundisium
<i>Att.</i> 11.8.2 (SB 219)	December 23(?), 48	Crassipes as <i>inimicissimus</i> (?)

³⁸E. Badian, "Waters of Strife? Further Reflections on Cicero *QF* 2.7(6).2," *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 5.7 (July 1981) 177.

³⁹This article is an extract from my M.A. thesis, "Personal Relationships in the Roman Family: A Profile of the Family of M. Tullius Cicero" (University of Victoria 1985). I would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for *Phoenix* for the extremely thoughtful and instructive comments they gave to an earlier draft of this article. I am especially grateful to Keith Bradley for his timely advice, patience, and encouragement.