Leanne Jansen

Bruni, Cicero, and their Manifesto for Republicanism

Was Cicero a worthy man of state? With the rise of the humanist movement in the fourteenth century, the vicissitudes of Cicero's political career became a prominent topic of debate.[1] Scholars either expressed fascination for Cicero as a role model for Republican ideologies, or refused to accept this new, realistic image by which the Roman orator unavoidably became liable to criticism.

This paper will examine the biography of Cicero written by the Florentine chancellor and historian Leonardo Bruni. The *Cicero nouus* (1413)[2] is an attempt to compose an adequate translation of Plutarch's *Cicero* as well as to rewrite Cicero's political life. On the one hand, Bruni wished to restore Cicero's status as a literary model; according to him, an earlier translation of the *Cicero* into Latin, published around 1401 by Jacopo Angeli da Scarperia, was inadequate.[3] On the other hand, Bruni wrote the biography in response to contemporary Florentine politics, particularly the ideology of a free Republic: Cicero's life offered a framework to set out Republican ideals. The biography should therefore not be read merely as a piece of antiquarian scholarship. Rather, as several modern scholars have already pointed out, it is an important historical document by reason of its political celebration of (Florentine) republicanism.[4]

Although the political nature of the *Cicero nouus* has been illustrated quite well, one important theme in the biography is generally overlooked: the interaction between Cicero and Caesar. I will argue here that Bruni is able to put a new spin on the merits of Cicero's political life by analysing the conflict between these two men. A large part of the *Cicero nouus* is dedicated to Caesar's rise to

1 It is not until the late fifteenth and sixteenth century that the discussion takes an explicit rhetorical and stylistic turn: the exclusive emphasis on Ciceronian style, or 'Ciceronianism', was not typical of early humanism; cf. Grafton 2010. For general overviews of Cicero's popularity in the Renaissance, see Marsh 2013; Ward 2013 treats the rhetorical side of this discourse.

2 For this dating, see Hankins 2008, with Ianziti 2012, 29 n. 8.

3 Bruni, *Cic.*, 416: *Itaque indolui equidem Ciceronis uicem, et mecum ipse indignatus sum quod in eo uiro littere nostre adeo mute reperirentur, qui uel solus ne mute forent sua diligentia prestitisset*. All citations from *Cicero nouus* are taken from Viti 1996, to which the page numbers are referring. Cf. Botley 2004, 21–23; Takada 2007, 183–185; and Ianziti 2012, 12–13, 48–53 on the preface.

4 Baron 1988, 121–122; Viti 1992, 343; Gualdo Rosa 1997, 193; Ianziti 2012. Ward 2013, 186 notes that with the *Cicero nouus* Cicero truly becomes "the avatar of the humanist ideal", i.e. an educated man devoting his knowledge to the management of the state.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110716313-011

power and the aftermath of his assassination; this particular historical scope gave Bruni the opportunity to examine closely Cicero's (heroic) role in the final phase of the Republic. Bruni's investigation of the relationship between Caesar and Cicero, partly through the innovative use of the *Letters to Atticus*, leads to a strong antithesis in which Caesar represents tyranny and the abuse of political rights and Cicero stands for civic freedom and self-determination.

A second focal point of my paper will be Bruni's concern with freedom itself —*libertas*, the chief concept underlying western Republican thought from the moment Cicero gave it a prominent place in his political theory. Importantly, I have chosen the *Cicero nouus* as a *primary* source for explaining Bruni's Republican convictions, whereas previous scholarship has tended to select his more overtly theoretical treatises.[5] The *Cicero nouus* has further been employed on a secondary level to illustrate Cicero's symbolic status within Renaissance humanism,[6] but this has unfortunately produced an incomplete and static picture. Little to no attention has been paid to the role that the *historical reconstruction* of Cicero's career played within Florentine Republican thought. It is true that the presentation of Cicero as the ultimate literary and civic model for the humanists is a salient feature of the biography, but that is certainly not all there is to it. The *Cicero nouus* illustrates, as we will see, that Cicero was actually perceived by Bruni as one constituent element in the machine that was the Roman Republic; the (re-)contextualization of his life and work is arguably the most rewarding outcome of Bruni's project.[7] The biography further enables us to see which episodes of Cicero's life were particularly persistent in influencing his historical reputation. It should be noted that Bruni's biography was an enormously influential work especially in the fifteenth century, surpassing even the success of Plutarch's *Life*.[8] As a result, Bruni's portrayal of Cicero must to a large extent have defined the scholarly understanding of the orator's historical import. Hoping to provide more insight into Bruni's contribution to Cicero's post-antique story, I will demonstrate how the humanist cleverly deploys the concept of *liber-*

5 Studies ranging from Rubinstein 1986 to Hankins 2019, who ironically makes a similar observation regarding Bruni's *History of the Florentine People* (271). I will refer briefly to most of these treatises below.

6 Following the seminal ideas of Baron 1966 and 1988.

7 Ianziti 2012, 12–13 argues similarly that the biography offers a complete reinterpretation of Cicero's life which results in a heroic picture of the orator. I would propose to steer away from this traditional emphasis on the portrayal of Cicero *per se* and focus on the process of reconstructing his public reputation.

8 Pade 2007, 154–165, for the transmission and popularity of the *Cicero nouus*; cf. Ianziti 2012, 45. See Pieper in this volume for Bruni's presence in commentaries on the *Philippics* of the late fifteenth century.

tas in order to turn the figure of Cicero into a bridge between ancient Rome and humanist Florence, presenting him simultaneously as the father *and* the timeless personification of Republican liberty.

Cicero as political role model in early Renaissance Italy

Whereas in the Middle Ages scholars had mostly concentrated upon the spiritual and edifying (potentially Christian) aspects of Cicero's writings, from the thirteenth century a reorientation took place that lent a greater emphasis on his character, public career, and political death.[9] An early source for this discussion is a biography written around 1300 and transmitted in *codex Trecensis* 552, a collection of Cicero's writings.[10] This "Epitome of the life, deeds, outstanding scholarship and books as well as the death of the most famous and illustrious man Marcus Tullius Cicero" (*Epythoma de uita gestis scientie prestancia et libris ac fine uiri clarissimi et illustris Marchi Tullii Ciceronis*) consists of a general account of Cicero's life and a detailed discussion of his writings.[11] The biography is remarkable because it presents an image of the Roman orator that is highly socially oriented:

> Licet autem Tullius in re publica administranda et defende<n>da tantum insudauerit tociensque pro amicis declamauerit tantumque pro suorum emulorum elidenda inuidia pugnauerit ut uires ei incredibile sit suppeditasse humanas, sapientie tamen desiderio adeo feruens fuit ad studium et scribendum ut mirum sit quomodo potuerit tantam utrisque operam exhibere.[12]
>
> However, although Tully put so much sweat into managing and defending the state, so often defended his friends and fought so hard to counter the envy of his rivals that it seems scarcely believable that the powers that drove him were human, his desire for wisdom still made him burning after study and writing to such an extent that it is miraculous how he could exhibit such a great fervour in both areas.

9 MacCormack 2013; Baron 1988, 102–108; and Mabboux in this volume.

10 Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale, ms. 552. It contains a miscellany of Ciceronian philosophical works, political speeches, and rhetorical treatises; see Tilliette 2003, 1054 n. 11. According to Tilliette, there are three fifteenth-century manuscripts containing the same *Vita Ciceronis*, abridged but textually superior; the *codex Trecensis* might offer a first 'version'.

11 An introduction to and a transcript of the biography are found in Tilliette 2003.

12 *Ciceronis Vita Trecensis*, in: Tilliette 2003, 1068. All translations are my own unless otherwise indicated.

Despite the fact that this early biography almost exclusively contains information available in ancient and medieval authors (in the words of the editor, it is a "fatras informe"),[13] the compiler is aiming at a civic reading of Cicero's life. The choice of sources indicates that he was interested especially in Cicero's consulship, his role as a governor of the Republic, his social relations, and his death.[14] The compiler's concern with Cicero's political reputation is clear from the passage above, which is not a quotation but an authorial observation.

Some decades after the production of the *Vita Trecensis*, Petrarch started to engage with Cicero's civic life in a similar vein. Despite his initial dislike of Cicero's political pursuits when he discovered the *Letters to Atticus*, Petrarch soon used them to give information about events and social relations in the late Republic. His biography of Caesar, *De gestis Cesaris*, incorporates material from the letters written in the year 49 BCE, because, as Petrarch explains, these provide illustrative facts about Caesar's life.[15] The main point of mentioning the letters in respect to writing Caesar's life is that according to Petrarch the reading of them enabled an equal judgment of Pompey's and Caesar's ambitions.[16] In quoting at length Cicero's reflections on the behaviour of the two generals, Petrarch introduces him as a historical witness, a *testis*, rather than as a literary model:

> Multa sunt id genus in illius epystolis, ab homine non solum doctissimo sed amicissimo in Pompeium dicta, ut scilicet undique fides constet. Sed ego hec pauca et ad rem de qua agitur spectantia et e locis secretioribus eruta libenter apposui, ut utriusque partis merita non usque adeo ut putantur imparia et utrunque, sicut dictum est, regnare uoluisse magno ac fide digno teste constaret.[17]
>
> Many remarks of this sort are found in his letters, expressed by a man who was not only very learned but also a close friend of Pompey, clearly with the aim of affirming his overall faithfulness. But I have gladly added these details, which pertain to my account and which

13 Tilliette 2003, 1062.

14 Consulship at Tilliette 2003, 1065–1066; role as governor: 1066–1067, demonstrated by a long quotation from August. *De ciu. D.* 3.30, where Cicero is called *artifex regendae rei publicae*, and remarks by Seneca and Cicero himself about the difficulty of making political alliances; social relations are manifest throughout the biography through the prevalence of personal names, but especially at: 1067–1068, where excerpts from Macr. *Sat*. 2.3 discussing Ciceronian humour (*urbanitas*, *mordacitas*) are presented, with special attention to Cicero's witticisms at the expense of Pompey and Caesar; death: 1072–1076.

15 Ianziti 2012, 58, indeed suggests that *De gestis Cesaris* is an important forerunner of the *Cicero nouus* with regard to its scope and handling of the classical sources.

16 Petrarca, *Gest. Ces.*, ed. Martellotti 1955, 266. Petrarch poses the question: *Quid tu lector ex his uerbis iudicas? Quantoque iustiorem Pompeii causam reris esse quam Cesaris?*

17 *Ibid.*, 266.

> are derived from more obscure places, with the goal of demonstrating, by the words of a great and trustworthy witness [*sc.* Cicero], that the merits of both men are not as dissimilar as it is believed, and that either, as stated, wanted to reign.

Whilst introducing Cicero's judgment on the political conduct of the generals, Petrarch is also discreetly offering a political interpretation. He places Pompey and Cicero on one side of the conflict by emphasizing their *amicitia*; Caesar then, being their enemy, clearly stands on the other side.[18]

In the generations after Petrarch, the discussion of Cicero's public life gained a more explicitly political character; Cicero fulfilled an important role within the development of humanist political theory.[19] Leonardo Bruni, in close competition with his master Coluccio Salutati, was the first systematic expounder of fifteenth-century Florentine Republican ideology,[20] though his ideas tied in with a long-standing civic ideology defining state government from the twelfth century onward.[21] In determining the role of the individual in society and the best organization of the city state the ruling aristocracy used Cicero's *De officiis*, *De amicitia*, and *De oratore*, together with Aristotle's *Politics*, as guides.[22] Bruni, however, was the first to promote Cicero to the role of prime model within this ideology,

18 Cf. *ibid.*, 265: *Quid refert igitur quid de illo sentiat Pompeius et Cicero cum perraro de hoste quisquam bene sentiat?*

19 Marsh 2013 presents an overview of Cicero's popularity in the Renaissance. Struever 1970, 115, notes: "It is neither Cicero the amoral formalist, nor Cicero the sage removed from worldly affairs, but Cicero the orator who employs form to persuade on public issues who is the archetype, who 'can just as properly be called the father of our eloquence and letters as father of his country,' and it is Cicero's *De officiis* which is the handbook of the 'civic Humanism' of the Renaissance". Grendler 1989, 212–229, questions the importance of the philosophical works at 216–217; Mabboux in this volume argues that Cicero was hardly ever read as political philosopher until the end of the fourteenth century.

20 Witt 1971 *contra* Black 1986, Rubinstein 1982 and 1986; cf. Najemy 2006. The thesis that Bruni was the central force in the manifestation and expression of Florentine republicanism was first suggested by Baron 1966. From Salutati's *De tyranno* 3.3–10 and 4.11–18, where Cicero's political analysis of the Caesarian regime is refuted at large, it becomes evident that there is a difference between Salutati, who employs Cicero as an authoritative source of information on Republican government, and Bruni, whose claim is that Cicero *personifies* the Republican government. See Mabboux in this volume for Salutati's 'apolitical' approach to Cicero; cf. Baldassarri 2014, xx.

21 Cf. Holmes 1973; Boutier/Sintomer 2014/2016 provide a splendid overview of the development of the so-called Republic of Florence between the twelfth and sixteenth century.

22 Cf. Rubinstein 1982, 167; focusing on virtuous citizenship in particular is Hankins 2019, 45–48.

presumably partly inspired by the image of Cicero as it appears from the work of Brunetto Latini, where the orator emerges as a champion of civic leadership.[23]

Bruni's general thoughts on *libertas* and the Republican constitution can be gleaned from his epideictic speeches and his *History of the Florentine People*. A popular text within studies of Bruni's Republican views is his *Praise of the City of Florence*. In this oration, he famously rejects the imperial regime, for only in the pre-Caesarian age was there freedom:[24]

> Nondum Cesares, Antonii, Tiberii, Nerones, pestes atque exitia rei publice, libertatem sustulerant, sed uigebat sancta et inconcussa libertas, que tamen, non multo post hanc coloniam deductam, a sceleratissimis latronibus sublata est.[25]
>
> Not yet had tyrants like Caesar, Antony, Tiberius, Nero, the pests and destruction of the Republic, taken freedom away, but freedom reigned inviolable and unshaken, which however, not long after this colony [*sc.* Florence] had been founded [*sc.* by Sulla], was stolen by the most criminal brigands.

In the *History of the Florentine People*, Bruni's negative attitude toward Caesar is articulated even more clearly by his remark that the Roman imperium started to crumble as soon as the "Caesarian name fell upon the state".[26] "For", Bruni claims, "liberty has made way for the imperial title, and after liberty virtue disappeared".[27]

Bruni's concern with *libertas* was a consequence of his own historical background. The wars fought in the late 1300s against the Milanese count Giangaleazzo Maria Visconti provided fertile ground for a revival of liberty as the key concept of Florentine propaganda against foreign imperialism.[28] Here Cicero proved to be an essential source of ideas. Bruni's political analysis of Florence is

---

23 Yet in Latini's *Tresor* and *Rhetorica* his civic qualities are illustrated mainly by way of quotations and discussions of passages from his rhetorical and philosophical writings. Cf. Viti 1996, 415; Mabboux in this volume.

24 For the thought in Salutati's *Missive*, see De Rosa 1980, 121, 140–141.

25 Bruni, *Laud*. 34, ed. Baldassarri 2000.

26 Bruni, *Hist*. 1.38, ed. Hankins 2001: *[*sc. *Aliquis] negare non poterit tunc romanum imperium ruere coepisse, cum primo caesareum nomen, tamquam clades aliqua, ciuitati incubuit. Cessit enim libertas imperatorio nomini, et post libertatem uirtus abiuit.*

27 Cf. Baldassarri 2000, xxii, on the presence of the theme in *Laud*. *Flor.* 41.5–6. Cicero himself had complained of the lack of perseverance on the part of the conspirators against Caesar, and expressed his fear that *libertas* had not been recovered, nor had the constitution been restored: *Att*. 14.5.2, 10.1, 12.1, 13.6 (*redeo enim ad miseram seu nullam potius rem publicam*), 14.2 (*sublato enim tyranno tyrannida manere uideo*).

28 See e. g. Baron 1966; De Rosa 1980, esp. 87–160; Najemy 2006, 188–218; Hankins 2019, 225, 232.

couched in Ciceronian terminology: his concept of liberty is one in which *libertas* and *iustitia* are two parts of the same medal, while *ius* is the guiding principle. Cicero emphasizes the combination of freedom with justice in his speeches and treatises; for him the Roman law was the pillar on which this liberty and justice rested.[29] As Bruni claims in the *Funeral Speech for Nanni Strozzi:* "This is true liberty, this equality within the state: that the violence of no one, the injustice of no one is being feared, that there is legal equality among the citizens, and equality in governing the Republic".[30]

Cicero nouus: the antagonism between Caesar and Cicero

The *New Cicero* is an attempt to rewrite all the previous biographies of the orator. At first sight, Bruni follows the Plutarchan storyline quite closely, sometimes word for word, but as the biography progresses the structure and author's voice increasingly deviate from those of the Greek *Cicero*. In the preface, we read that Bruni took pride in having collected as much information on Cicero's life and works as he could find, thereby surpassing Plutarch's rendering of the orator's life.[31] The main reason behind creating such an elaborate platform,

29 One of the clearest instances where this idea is expressed is Cic. *Clu.* 146: *Hoc enim uinculum est huius dignitatis qua fruimur in re publica, hoc fundamentum libertatis, hic fons aequitatis: mens et animus et consilium et sententia ciuitatis posita est in legibus.* Wirszubski 1950 has shown that the localization of liberty in the system of law is originally Ciceronian. De Rosa 1980 demonstrates how Salutati adapts this Ciceronian interpretation of republicanism in the Florentine context, thereby greatly influencing Bruni's concept of liberty.

30 Bruni, *Or. Strozzi* 21: *Hec est uera libertas, hec equitas ciuitatis: nullius uim, nullius iniuriam uereri, paritatem esse iuris inter se ciuibus, paritatem rei publice adeunde.* Compare this epideictic oration with Bruni's more formal Greek analysis of the city state, Περὶ τῆς πολιτείας τῶν Φλορεντίνων, a speech held in 1439, where he notes that ἰσηγορία is the driving force behind the appointment of offices, and that ἐλευθερία is the τέλος and σκοπός of the entire polity; cf. Rubinstein 1968.

31 Bruni, *Cic.*, 418: *Nos igitur et Plutarcho et eius interpretatione omissis, ex iis quae uel apud nostros uel apud Grecos de Cicerone scripta legeramus, ab alio exorsi principio uitam et mores et res gestas eius maturiore digestione et pleniore notitia, non ut interpretes sed pro nostro arbitrio uoluntateque, descripsimus.* Bruni's wide reading is seen in his expansive treatment of the Catilinarian conspiracy, where the phrasing is reminiscent of Sallust's account. Cf., e.g., Sall. *Cat.* 29: *Ea cum Ciceroni nuntiarentur [...] quod neque urbem ab insidiis priuato consilio longius tueri poterat [...] rem ad senatum refert*, and Bruni, *Cic.*, 436: *Cicero, quod priuato consilio longius rem publicam sustinere non poterat, et quod motus iam ex Etruria nuntiabatur, [...] totam rem ut cognouerat in senatu patefecit.* Another instance constitutes the transition (signalled by ablative

Bruni states, was that Cicero had been the "parent and leading man of our letters" (*parens et princeps litterarum nostrarum*). The appropriation of Cicero as a forefather to the Florentine community forms the pivot of Bruni's expression of Republican ideology and the interpretation of political liberty in this biography.[32] As we will see, Cicero is more than a literary example: he is also a 'father' in the political sense, one whose *res gestae* form an important model for behaviour.[33] One might go as far as saying that the *mos maiorum*, which formed a central motivational force for all social and cultural action in Roman Antiquity, produced an offshoot as far as the fifteenth century.

As noted above, the *Cicero nouus* celebrates the Republican institution and Cicero's defence of it. Aiming to sharpen the contrast between liberty and autocracy, Bruni has constructed a subtle narrative in which Caesar and Cicero are systematically opposed.[34] The first moment in which the two men are seen to be politically involved is the period after the Catilinarian conspiracy, where Caesar and Crassus are said to ruin Cicero's *amicitia* with Pompey.[35] A little further

absolute constructions) to the episode at the Milvian bridge, which is rendered accordingly at *Cat*. 45: *his rebus ita actis, constituta nocte qua profiscerentur, Cicero per legatos cuncta edoctus (L. Valerio Flacco et C. Pomptino praetoribus imperat)* and *Cic*., 440: *His rebus ita paratis, constituta nocte qua profiscerentur, Cicero per legatos cuncta edoctus (eos capi [...] iussit)*. The structure of the account in Bruni's biography also strongly resembles that of Sallust, yet the historians differ with regard to details and names. Cf. Fryde 1980, who first addressed the various sources underlying the *Cicero nouus*.

32 The Roman *maiores* and the gentilician concept take an important place in Bruni's Republican theory, e. g. *Laud*. 30 – 47; cf. Najemy 2006, 210 – 218. Possibly the perception of Cicero being one of the *maiores* has larger repercussions for Bruni's political theory in general, but that is beyond the scope of this article.

33 Bruni uses the term *res (magnifice) gestae* once with reference to Cicero's (rather controversial) military achievements during his proconsulate in Cilicia, see *Cic*., 456. Here Cicero is definitely presented as a heroic man of action.

34 McLaughlin 2009 signals a broader trend in the early fifteenth century in which Cicero is associated with the language of revival and Caesar with that of decline. He situates the roots of this thought in the Florentine chancellors Salutati, Bruni, and Poggio Bracciolini, the latter two being the most outspokenly anti-Caesarian (cf. Canfora 2001). Bracciolini's comparison of Scipio and Caesar resulted in a heated debate about Caesar's reputation in the 1430s, in which Bruni also became involved. Cf. Schadee 2008, with ample bibliography.

35 *Cic*., 446. Bruni describes the constitution of this friendship between Pompey and Cicero in reference not only to Plutarch, but also to Cicero's own account of the events of 63 BCE: *Quin immo illi gratias egit, affirmans se frustra triumphum reportaturum fuisse, nisi urbs a Cicerone seruata esset, in qua triumphare posset*. This rather demagogic observation is taken from Cic. *Off*. 1.78: *Mihi quidem certe uir abundans bellicis laudibus, Cn. Pompeius, multis audientibus, hoc tribuit, ut diceret frustra se triumphum tertium deportaturum fuisse, nisi meo in rem publicam beneficio ubi triumpharet esset habiturus*; cf. Cic. *Cat*. 4.21.

on, Bruni for the first time declares that Caesar stood opposed to Cicero with regard to their ideological views. In the period when Clodius was prosecuting Cicero for his execution of the Catilinarian conspirators, Crassus, Caesar, and Pompey refused to come to his aid; according to Bruni, Caesar failed to do so because he "thought differently about the Republic".[36]

The tone is set, and Bruni takes the time to describe the tension between Caesar and Cicero around 50 BCE.[37] Rome is now on the outbreak of civil war. Following Plutarch's account, Bruni tells how Cicero travelled to Rhodes and Athens after his proconsulate had ended, and how he decided to hurry back to Rome as soon as tidings reached him that the city was in turmoil.[38] Plutarch and Bruni both explain that Cicero tried to calm things down by writing letters to Caesar and Pompey. Bruni further elaborates on the information given by Plutarch; he does so on the basis of the letters themselves. They induce him to analyse Cicero's political role as a mediator between Pompey, Caesar, and the state: "yet as a kind of mediator, and favouring neither of them, he did not stop being an initiator of peace" (*tamen ut medius quidam nec alterutri affectior, pacis auctor esse non destitit)*.

Apart from his constant appeal to Caesar and Pompey, Cicero gave many speeches in prevention of civil discord, advising the people and the senate to preserve harmony.[39] Bruni's novel use of the epistles is clearly seen halfway through the biography.[40] There, he first reproduces the dialogue between Cicero and Caesar (preserved in *Att*. 9.18) on the issue of sending Caesar's troops to Spain in order to fight Pompey's legions in 49 BCE.[41] Next, a letter of the same year from Caesar to Cicero is incorporated.[42] Despite its length the letter is copied in entirety. On the basis of the dialogue and the letter Bruni is able to demonstrate that Caesar was putting pressure on Cicero either to support him actively or stay neutral and resort to a life of study. Indeed, this moment of interaction

36 *Cic*., 448: *Cesar diuersa in re publica sentiebat*.

37 Already in Antiquity, the events of the civil war can be seen as greatly affecting Cicero's reputation in the final years of his career: see La Bua in this volume.

38 *Cic*., 458–460. Bruni has used a similar storm metaphor to Plutarch: (*ciuiles*) *procelle* vs. φλεγμονή (Plut. *Cic*. 36.6).

39 *Cic*., 460: *Multa statim ad Cesarem super hoc ipso, multa etiam ad Pompeium scribens, multa postquam in urbem rediit in eam rem disserens: et in senatu et apud populum concordiam suadebat*.

40 *Cic*., 462. Cf. Fryde 1980, 543; 549.

41 Which would result in the battle of Ilerda; the exchange shows that Cicero refused to support Caesar openly in the senate. Viti 1996 omits any reference to *Att*. 9.18. For the chronology, see *Eph. Tull. ad loc*.

42 Cic. *Att*. 10.8B.

serves as a foreboding of the actual retreat of Cicero from political life in 46–44 BCE, which is recounted later.

Bruni explains that the letter from Caesar is meant to "admonish and ask" Cicero not to sail to Pompey, and to "advise" him to stay out of the war by remaining neutral, *medius*.[43] It should be noted that nowhere in his original letter Caesar uses the terms *medius* or *neuter*. Instead he uses the term *amicitia* (twice): by supporting Pompey's side Cicero would do grave harm to their relationship.[44] The letter expresses the unmistakable threat not to choose the wrong, i.e. Pompey's, side. Bruni does not comment upon either the argument or the threatening tone, and merely concludes that it "suited Caesar if Cicero would stay neutral".[45] It is plausible that Caesar's words are mainly employed to emphasize Cicero's efforts as mediator: the use of the term *medius* in Bruni's introduction of the letter links this episode to his earlier analysis of Cicero's neutral position in the ante-war period. The psychological stress Cicero is subsequently said to experience at that moment, in particular his anxiety about attracting criticism from the other senators, reflects perfectly well the ambiguous message of Caesar's letter.[46]

A skilful narrator, Bruni makes the interaction between Caesar and Cicero lead up to a climax. After Caesar has won the civil war and has *humanissime* received Cicero back into his exclusive circle of friends, there is nothing left for Cicero to do except retreat from the forum into a life of study and philosophy. Although Bruni has said nothing to denounce Caesar, his rejection of the dictatorship shines through in his lauding of Cicero, who is shown to be the true victor of the political conflict. For, despite the suppression of his political qualities and personal freedom, Cicero is able to remain useful to his fellow citizens and the state. Caesar's domination leads to the unambiguous affirmation of Cicero's exemplary embodiment of Roman citizenship and civic virtue:

> Homo uere natus ad prodessendum hominibus uel in re publica uel in doctrina: siquidem in re publica patriam consul, et innumerabiles orator seruauit. In doctrina uero et litteris non ciuibus suis tantum sed plane omnibus qui Latina utuntur lingua lumen eruditionis sapientieque aperuit. [...] Ita solus, ut credo, hominum duo maxima munera et difficillima

43 *Cic.*, 462: *Ad eum scripsit monens atque rogans ne quo progrederetur, suadensque ut procul a bellorum curis medius, ut facere cepisset, alicubi conquiesceret.*

44 Cic. *Att.* 10.8B.1: *Nam et amicitiae grauiorem iniuriam feceris et tibi minus commode consulueris, si non fortunae obsecutus uideberis [...] nec causam secutus [...] sed meum aliquod factum condemnauisse: quo mihi grauius abs te nil accidere potest.*

45 *Cic.*, 464: *Satis ergo erat Cesari ut cum neutro esset.* This observation is not in Plutarch.

46 *Cic.*, 464: *Hec [i.e. rumours about Cicero's cowardice] tandem quasi tormenta quedam uirum expugnarunt, ut non modo Cesaris amicitie uerum etiam tuto otio bellum periculosum desperatumque preferret.*

> adimpleuit, ut et in re publica orbis terrarum moderatrice occupatissimus plura scriberet quam philosophi in otio studioque uiuentes; et rursus studiis librisque scribendis maxime occupatus, plura negotia obierit, quam ii qui uacui sunt ab omni cura litterarum.[47]
>
> A man truly born to be of benefit to men either state-wise or in the realm of education: since indeed in the public sphere he saved the fatherland as consul and innumerable people as orator. But intellectually and in his writings, he revealed the light of erudition and wisdom not only to his fellow citizens but indeed to all who use the Latin language. [...] This is how, I believe, he alone fulfilled the two greatest and most difficult tasks of men, that while he was kept very busy by the state which was mistress of the world, he wrote more than the philosophers who spend their time in leisure and study. And the other way round, when he was most busy studying and writing books, he met more obligations than those who are free from any concern with books.

We recognize the commonplace idea, also expressed in the *Vita Trecensis* (see p. 157), that Cicero's special merit lies in the fact that he was able to combine the *uita actiua et contemplatiua* successfully.[48] The debate about the active vs. the contemplative life was an important theme within Bruni's work. While modern scholars usually attribute the popularity of this topic to the efforts of Salutati and Bruni,[49] the passage from the *Vita Trecensis* above demonstrated that Cicero's career *per se* invited scholars to reflect upon the question. In fact, the ancient historians already show proof of such reflection, partly because Cicero himself had put the matter up for debate in his philosophical works, partly because of his equal reputation as writer and politician, which the historians were eager to explain.[50] The double-sided career that Cicero conducted, therefore, was traditional subject matter in the historical tradition. At the same time, however, Bruni breathes new life into the discussion by associating it closely with the conflict between Cicero and his antagonists, particularly Caesar.[51] We should realize

47 *Cic.*, 468–470.

48 Cf. Viti 1992, 343 – 346, for a historical analysis of these passages in the *Cicero nouus*. Takada 2007 interprets these passages and the subsequent review of Cicero's writings as evidence of Bruni's desire to restore Cicero's ambivalent political reputation. Bruni similarly discusses the ideal balance between the *uita ciuilis* or *negotiosa* and the *uita otiosa* in the *Isagogicon moralis disciplinae* (Baron 1928, 39 – 40; see his note on p. 39); in his *Vita di Dante* Bruni ridicules men who believe scholars should isolate themselves from society (Baron 1928, 53); and the dual relationship between study and civic action is also an important part of Bruni's interest in Aristotle's *Politics* (Baron 1928, 72 – 73).

49 Garin 1972; Rubinstein 1982; cf. Baron 1988, 122 – 123. Cf. Viti 1992, 339 – 363, on the theme in Bruni's work and in particular his private letters.

50 Famous historiographical *loci* where Cicero's double-faced authority is highlighted, are Vell. Pat. 2.66; Plut. *Cic.* 5 and 13; Dio Cass. 38.18 – 29.

51 Witt 1971, 198 – 199. Ianziti 2012 argues that we should forget terms like Republican or 'civic', and read the *Cicero nouus* as an interpretation of Cicero's life that distances itself from the type

that the praise of Cicero comes at the particular point in the narrative when Caesar's dictatorship has just fully materialized.[52] There would scarcely have been a more effective way of debunking Caesar and his ideals. It is Cicero who is remarkable for his *diuina magnitudo ingenii*, for his vigilant nature, and for having devoted all his wisdom and learning to the Republic.[53] With the narrative creating a direct link between Caesar's dictatorship and the fulfilment of Cicero's eternal value for Roman literature and society, it is difficult *not* to read this characterization of 'divine' Cicero as silent criticism of Caesar, who would, as every reader knows, in reality become *diu(in)us*.[54] While Plutarch merely notes that Cicero abstained from political life, tried to avoid Caesar, and kept to himself and his writing,[55] in the *Cicero nouus* the orator has retained his function within Roman society and civic life. His writings serve as a proxy for actual participation in politics.

The praise of Cicero signals a complete abandonment of the structure of Plutarch's biography. Bruni lapses into a long survey of all Cicero's writings[56] to illustrate his claim that Cicero is both the *parens patriae* and the *parens eloqui et litterarum nostrarum*.[57] When the historian picks up the political narrative of 44 BCE, Caesar is dead (*interfecto Caesare*), freedom has been restored, and Cicero is again *princeps* in the senate. This sudden transition from Cicero's private activities to post-Caesarian Rome, in which Cicero regains his public position, confirms to the reader the idea that Cicero and Caesar could not thrive in the same political arena.

---

of moral biography Plutarch wrote; he proposes a new type which is "uncompromisingly political" (60).

52 This is actually an inversion of the traditional (Ciceronian) thought, cultivated by Sallust and Tacitus, and followed by Bruni in his other works, that with the loss of *libertas*, *uirtus* dissipates as well. Cf. La Penna 1966 on the presence of Sallustian views in Bruni's *History* and epideictic speeches; Pocock 2003, 167 on the influence of Tacitus' senatorial pessimism.

53 *Cic.*, 470.

54 The deification of Caesar is left unmentioned in the *Cicero nouus*.

55 Plut. *Cic.* 40.

56 Dividing them into separate categories. Bruni actually gives numbers: there are 163 books in total, he says, of which 58 pertain to literary studies and philosophy, 33 speeches are on the Republic, 29 are forensic speeches, and 43 books are on *res familiares* (by which he must mean the letters). The invented category of 'Republican' or 'constitutional' speeches is especially interesting regarding the topic of this paper.

57 *Cic.*, 468. On the phrase *parens litterarum nostrarum*, see above (p. 162).

Cicero nouus: mediating for peace after the Ides of March

Had Bruni characterized Cicero earlier as *medius* and an *adiutor* for peace in the conflict between Pompey and Caesar, his call for concord is now essential to rescuing what is left of the ruins of Rome after the Ides. Although Bruni's Cicero and Caesar on the individual level represent rather opposing forces, after the dictator's death Cicero shows himself—again—to be taking the middle ground on behalf of the *res publica*. He is able to persuade the Caesarians and the assassinators, who have occupied the Capitol, to make peace. Bruni explains this call for peace by rehearsing the famous line from the first paragraph of Cicero's first *Philippic Oration:*[58] *Memoriam pristinarum discordiarum obliuione sempiterna delendam censuit*.[59] Then, when Mark Antony begins to behave increasingly like a tyrant, Cicero initiates the opposition by performing the first *Philippic*, which Bruni explicitly names as the cause for the increasing enmity between Antony and Cicero.[60] Acting on behalf of the Republic, Cicero finally finds himself pulling the political strings again: *Hic est iam Ciceronis uelut optimi poete extremus actus, et certe meo iudicio omnium fortissimus et pulcherrimus* ("this now is the final act of Cicero, as if the final act of a splendid poet, and surely to my opinion the bravest and most beautiful of all", *Cic*. 488). Cicero, as if he were a tragic poet, orchestrates the final events in the play that is the history of the Roman Republic. Does *extremus actus* refer only to Cicero's last year, or also to the end of the Republic, by now (again) led by Cicero?

Bruni tells us that Cicero now possessed the highest power in the city, which was initially reinforced by his reaching an alliance with Octavian. It was a father-

58 At this point in the narrative, Plutarch, Cassius Dio, and Appian instead refer to the speech for amnesty Cicero is known to have given, but Bruni clearly wanted to select a more accessible intertext considering the fact that the amnesty speech is not extant. See Vell. Pat. 2.58; Plut. *Cic*. 42.2; Dio Cass. 44.22–34. See La Bua in this volume on Cassius Dio's version of the amnesty speech.

59 Bruni, *Cic*. 486. Bruni removed *omnem* before *memoriam* in Cicero's original speech and added *pristinarum* to *discordiarum*.

60 *Cic*., 488: *Antonius enim manifeste sibi tyrannidem parabat*. Compare this statement with Cicero's portrayal of Antony as tyrant or dictator in the letters: *Att*. 14.9.2; 15.4.1, 20.2, 21.1. Bruni dates Cicero's speech to 1 September, which is why we know for sure he is referring to the first *Philippic* here, although its exact date was 2 September (cf. Ramsey 2003, 81). Bruni might have become confused by a remark in *Phil*. 5.19 (*huc nisi uenirem Kalendis Septembris*), where Cicero dates Antony's speech in the senate, which proposed a supplication for Caesar, to the first of September, and his own reply to the second (*postridie*).

ly friendship, Plutarch and Bruni insist, strengthened by the fact that Octavian was born during Cicero's consulship. The alliance made Cicero's (Republican) cause much stronger.[61] Cicero also personally advised the Liberators: Bruni recounts how he privately sent letters to Brutus to advise him on the best course of action, and encourage him not to wait for the *auctoritas* of the senate to preserve the *libertas et salus populi Romani*.[62] Thus Cicero, guardian of the liberty and safety of the people, tried to control the power play in the state. Yet, as we all know, he was outshone by the more powerful Octavian and Antony. Whereas the ancient historians point to Cicero's vanity and his delusion as the reason for his failure,[63] Bruni—persistently cynical about the imperial regime—places the cause with Octavian:

> Nam Octauianus adolescens ubi consules e medio sublatos et se solum ducem in tantis copiis relictum aspexit, mutata iam et ipse mente, de dominatione cogitare cepit, quod illis uiuis nunquam facere potuisset. sed hec postea apparuerunt.[64]
>
> For the young Octavian, when he saw that the consuls were taken from their midst and he alone was left supported by such large troops, he himself experienced a change of mind and began to think about autocracy, something that he could never have done while they were alive. But this all manifested itself later.

It is in his portrayal of the relationship between Cicero and Octavian that Bruni deviates most from Plutarch's interpretation of events. Both agree that Octavian has used Cicero to his own advantage and out of a desire for power; yet Plutarch laid the blame entirely on Cicero for being deceived by Octavian, while Bruni emphasizes Octavian's hidden designs and his personal ambition to gain ultimate power, omitting any reference to Cicero's own responsibility.

Plutarch's opinion might be a better representation of ancient views on Cicero's choice to follow Octavian: the historian mentions a letter to Atticus from Brutus in which the latter derides Cicero's faith in Octavian.[65] Brutus believes that by courting the young man Cicero is betraying his former opinions about Republican liberty and the fatherland. Plutarch appears to agree, for he states:

---

61 *Cic.*, 490: *Hac igitur coniunctione adeo superior facta est Ciceronis res, ut tandem Antonius territus urbem reliquerit.*

62 E. g. Cic. *Ad Brut.* 1.3.3; 1.9.4–5; cf. 1.5.1–2.

63 Apart from Plutarch's statement (see below), see e. g. App. *B Ciu.* 3.61; Dio Cass. 38.12.6–7, 38.29, 46.43.4–5.

64 *Cic.*, 492.

65 Plut. *Cic.* 45.2; Cic. *Ad Brut.* 1.17.5, cf. 1.4a.2. For the reception of *Ad Brut.* 1.17, and its contested authenticity, see Shackleton Bailey 1980, and *Eph. Tull. ad loc.*

> Ἐνταῦθα μέντοι μάλιστα Κικέρων ἐπαρθεὶς ὑπὸ νέου γέρων καὶ φενακισθεὶς καὶ συναρχαιρεσιάσας καὶ παρασχὼν αὐτῷ τὴν σύγκλητον εὐθὺς μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν φίλων αἰτίαν εἶχεν, ὀλίγῳ δ' ὕστερον αὐτὸν ἀπολωλεκὼς ᾔσθετο καὶ τοῦ δήμου προέμενος τὴν ἐλευθερίαν.[66]
>
> Yet here more than ever Cicero was led on and cheated, an old man by a young man. After he helped him in canvassing for the elections and recommended him to the senate, he was blamed right away by his friends, but only later did he recognize that he had ruined himself, and had betrayed the freedom of the people.

In Plutarch's biography, in a final cathartic moment, Cicero realizes that it was his own naivety and the subsequent betrayal of himself, his political ideas and the Republic that ruined him. The orator's blindness and his lack of foresight is also highlighted by Augustine in *De ciuitate Dei*; the idea continued to exist in the Middle Ages as attested by the *Vita Trecensis*, where Augustine's verdict is quoted at length.[67] Bruni was familiar with the view, either through Plutarch alone or also through Augustine and later sources, but deliberately chose to present a new one (in line with his aim of writing a *Cicero nouus*) in which Octavian was ultimately responsible for Cicero's downfall.[68] The key to understanding the humanist's version of the story is found in his conception of Republican *libertas*, which is in fact expressed most clearly in his discussion of the death of Caesar and Octavian's final betrayal of Cicero.

Contrary to Plutarch, Bruni does not mention the allegations against Cicero about his complicity in the assassination of Caesar;[69] instead, the murder is interpreted from a constitutional point of view, placing Cicero at the centre of the action. Bruni explicitly associates the death of Caesar with the return of *libertas*, Republican freedom,[70] making clear that it is the condition under which Cicero regained his position in the Forum and his freedom of speech. From the murder of Caesar onwards Cicero will be associated with the right kind of constitution, and the Caesarians with unrightful domination and the overthrow of the Republic. Although the *Praise of the City of Florence* and the *History of the Florentine People* locate the start of the Republic's deconstruction in Caesar's reign, in the *Cicero nouus* a slightly more optimistic view occurs, for in this treatise polit-

66 Plut. *Cic*. 46.1.

67 August. *De ciu. D*. 3.30; *Ciceronis Vita Trecensis*, in: Tilliette 2003, 1074.

68 See also Keeline in this volume.

69 Plut. *Cic*. 42.1: Τῆς δ' ἐπὶ Καίσαρα συνισταμένης πράξεως οὐ μετέσχε, καίπερ ὢν ἑταῖρος ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα Βρούτου καὶ βαρύνεσθαι τὰ παρόντα καὶ τὰ πάλαι ποθεῖν πράγματα δοκῶν ὡς ἕτερος οὐδείς.

70 Bruni, *Cic*., 486: *Interfecto Cesare cum recuperata libertas uideretur statim princeps in senatu apparuit*.

ical decision-making can again take place in an at least temporarily restored Republic.

In accordance with Bruni's negative view on autocracy, Octavian, just as his adoptive father, is presented as the one to be blamed for sabotaging both *libertas* and Cicero. The narrative of events prior to Cicero's death is constructed in such a way as to lead up to Octavian's ultimate betrayal. After Mutina, Antony flees to the Alps with his army but needs to turn in his tracks, because Decimus Brutus' army is advancing; Antony persuades Lepidus to make an alliance with him. Octavian, himself possessing a large army, had already decided to opt for sole government, as we have seen above. This is the moment where he "turns the troops and the command he has received from the senate against the senate itself, having now truly dismissed liberty as well as Cicero" (*tandem uero et libertatem et Ciceronem missos faciens, copias et fasces quos a senatu receperat contra senatum conuertit*, *Cic.*, 494). The relative nonchalance of the remark underscores the logic behind the equation. Octavian dismisses *libertas et Cicero* as if they stood in his service—the military metaphor in *missos facere* cannot be coincidental. This remark refers to Octavian's successful wish to obtain *dominatio* over the Roman citizens and the state in its entirety. The rhetorical collocation of liberty and Cicero brings completion to the identification of Cicero with republicanism. Cicero belongs to liberty just as liberty belongs in his civic thought; they are two parts of the same, a hendiadys for the Republic.

The history of two Republics

Bruni's later works present an organic and consistent political theory.[71] It would be wrong, therefore, to regard the *Cicero nouus* as an isolated biographical project. Bruni's adjustments to the storyline and the interpretation of Caesar's and Cicero's relationship convey an innovative message to the humanist audience

71 Compare Witt 1971 with Hankins 1995, who believes that it is "an anachronism" (325) to recognize ideological, political concepts in Bruni; according to Hankins, he was only a rhetorician in service of the state, an argument he in fact comes back from in Hankins 2019. Whether Bruni actually brought his ideas into practice is not the concern of this paper. I am interested in the Republican discourse that Bruni reconstructs on the basis of Cicero's political theory, and how this discourse affects humanist learning and civic ideology. Bruni himself acknowledges in *De militia* that there is a difference between the ideal (Platonic), literary state and its practical organization or day-to-day management. He makes no claim about which of these he values higher. See *Mil.* (in: Viti 1996, 658): *Forma uero ciuitatis duplex est: una limatior a sapientibus cogitata, litteris solum et ingenio constans, altera qualem usu et re uera ciuitatem uidemus.* Cf. Hankins 2019, 238 – 253.

of the biography. The *Cicero nouus* is the tale of two Republics. Although several historians have pointed to the ambiguous and often unconstitutional use of the term *libertas* in the Florentine sources,[72] from Roman Antiquity onward the term was a synonym for republicanism. Its meaning was located somewhere between autonomous government and an official Republican constitution, but could be used informally as any kind of rule that was not based on domination, and recognized the rights of the citizen.[73] The novelty of the *Cicero nouus* is that it frames *libertas* as both a political and Ciceronian concept *in opposition to* Caesar's and, finally, to Octavian's rule.

The negative portrayal of Caesar in *Cicero nouus* is easily explained by the Florentine obsession with the protection of their civic rights in reaction to foreign threats. Yet, there is more to explore here. Within the reinvention of civic philosophy based on Cicero's writings the historical career of Cicero also has a significant role to play. Caesar's dictatorship instigated the culmination of Cicero's theoretical genius; the result was the successful articulation of the value of *libertas* for a healthy Republic. *De officiis*, one of the canonical texts about political leadership in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Florence, repeatedly revisits the Caesarian regime as an example for the prototypical repressive reign of terror, in order to demonstrate the power of a polity governed by the principles of *libertas* and *aequitas*.[74] The subsequent conflict with Mark Antony and then Octavian gave further relief and urgency to these ideas. Cicero articulated his political thought mainly in reaction to the powerful individuals interfering with the traditional form of government in the first century BCE. Bruni may have been more heavily influenced by this personal vision informing *De officiis* than we have hitherto realized.

In fifteenth-century Florentine propaganda Ciceronian theory was an authoritative means to argue for the defence of liberty. However, in the biography, Bruni wants to do more than to acclaim Cicero as the classical authority for Republican beliefs or the perfect patriot who knows how to root political leadership in personal virtue and intellectual power. The biography offers a historical reconstruction of Cicero's mature political theory, formed at a point in time when the Republican system was staggering. It is not for reason of knowledge display or the typical humanist desire for comprehensiveness that Bruni inserts the episto-

72 Pocock 2010; Rubinstein 1986.

73 Wirszubski 1950.

74 *Off.* 1.26, 2.23; cf. 3.83, with Dyck 1996 *ad loc.* According to Dyck, "[t]he conflict between the old and new Roman political culture is largely personalized as a conflict between Cicero and Caesar" (32). Salutati also cites *Off.* 1.26 and 2.23 in *Tyr.* 3.1–2, a treatise which Bruni must have known well.

lary exchange between Caesar and Cicero in the *Cicero nouus* (see p. 163). The dialogue between Caesar and Cicero reflects the change in the position that civic individuals traditionally enjoyed within Rome's Republican government. Just as Cicero wrote in reaction to Caesar, the actions of Bruni's Cicero are defined by the relationship with Caesar, and, to a lesser extent, other power addicts like Mark Antony and Octavian.

As we have seen, Bruni states that the *extremus actus* of Cicero in 44–43 BCE, during his struggle against Mark Antony, was the most beautiful.[75] The side-comment "as if he were a poet", makes it clear that the term is used metaphorically. If Cicero's life was imagined to be a play, the altercation with Antony would be his final moment on stage, while his death is rapidly approaching. Bruni envisaged a tragic narrative in restaging Cicero's political life and constructing a hero of liberty and a saviour of the Republic. *Actus*, however, has multiple meanings. It must in this context also signify the public defence of Roman liberty. Additionally, the remark that Cicero as a tragic poet[76]—not actor!—wrote the *actus* himself suggests that the term alludes to his writings as well.[77] The political speeches (*Philippics*) would definitely come into play here, but Bruni might also have had in mind Ciceronian theory on the value of a Republican government in antithesis to a tyrannical rule.

I do not think we are meant to decide on a single meaning. Within Bruni's argument, it would be inappropriate to differentiate the literary and political achievements of Cicero, since all were performed with the same public goal. The praise of Cicero as embodiment of Roman citizenship, even when he was not allowed to partake in political life, has made that clear. It is nearly impossible to separate the man from the Republican Idea; his eloquence, his writings, and his personality have all been blended together in Bruni's concept of republicanism. The 'new Cicero' has become the personification of *libertas*—a *libertas* the ancient Cicero himself had defined and popularized. The Cicero Bruni is particularly interested in and is reshaping in the biography is the Cicero of the last days of the Roman Republic, which were also the last days of liberty in Bruni's view and in the view of the ancient historians. Exploring Cicero's life, then, was equivalent to exploring the possibilities of freedom and of Republican rule. This rewriting of an individual life story into a tale of subversion and repression turned it into an instructive piece which led its readers to understand Cicero's

75 See above p. 167.

76 The order of the words, *Ciceronis uelut optimi poete extremus actus*, suggests to me that *optimi poete* should be read as an apposition to *Ciceronis*.

77 *Actus* can mean either business of state, public employment, or the oral delivery of public speeches; see *OLD*[2] s.v. *actus* 7–8.

magnificence better. Finally, it encouraged them, inspired by their ancestor's exemplary acts, to fulfil their own civic aspirations.

I have shown that Bruni's vision on Cicero's public career and authority was directed by the events of the later years. In his description of the life of Cicero, Bruni was led by the actual demands of Florentine politics, which were marked by a vehement debate on the character of the *res publica Florentina*. A product of this humanist discourse, Bruni revealed not only Cicero's personal ambitions and achievements, but also the historical background to the Ciceronian concept of liberty that has since Antiquity been the hallmark of western republicanism.[78]

78 Research for this chapter has been made possible by a VIDI grant of the *Dutch Research Council* (NWO), funding no. 276 – 30 – 013.