

Gabriel Evangelou*

The Cicero-Appius reconciliation and Pompey's pivotal role as mediator

<https://doi.org/10.1515/tc-2024-0013>

Abstract: The intricacies of the relationships between Roman aristocrats in the age of Cicero has been one of the most popular topics of discussion in modern scholarship. Cicero's letters have drawn considerable attention as an invaluable source for the study of *amicitiae* in the late Roman republic. Nevertheless, the methods that Cicero and his contemporaries used to reconcile with their former enemies is an area that remains rather unexplored. This paper aims to shed light on the significance of letter writing as a medium for the reconciliation between Romans with an active public life and to underscore the role that mediators played in the conciliatory efforts that both parties made to restore their relationship chiefly in the public eye. The investigation focuses on Cicero's well-attested reconciliation with Appius Claudius Pulcher. It argues that, while it was not the first instance in which Pompey instigated a reconciliation between two of his allies, its uniqueness lies in the ingenious and complex use of letter writing to effect and maintain their renewed relationship as well as in the combination of frankness and tactful manoeuvring in Cicero's letters to him.

Keywords: *amicitia*, Pompey, politics, politeness, frankness

During Cicero's political career, particularly after his exile in 58 and subsequent return in 57, he faced complex political dilemmas that influenced his approach to reconciliation.¹ The period following his return was marked by significant shifts in political alliances, particularly with Pompey and the other two members of the triumvirate. By April 56, the political landscape had changed dramatically, and Cicero found himself under pressure to mend relationships with several individ-

¹ This research is co-financed by the "Onisilos" funding scheme. I am deeply indebted to Jon Hall and David Konstan, who generously took the time to read an earlier draft of this paper. Their invaluable insights and constructive feedback have greatly improved the final version, and I am grateful for their guidance.

***Corresponding author: Gabriel Evangelou**, Ionian University, Corfu, Greece,
E-Mail: gevangelou@ionio.gr <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5470-1097>

uals who had played detrimental roles in his banishment.² This situation was exemplified by Pompey's own reconciliation with Clodius,³ which necessitated that Cicero make concessions to restore his political standing. Among those he had to address were Gabinius, whose actions during his consulship in 58 Cicero had vehemently opposed, and Crassus and Appius Claudius, both of whom were associated with adversaries from Cicero's past conflicts. In navigating these reconciliations, Cicero had to carefully manage his public actions – such as defending Gabinius in court and seeking rapprochement with Crassus and Appius Claudius – to align with Pompey's expectations and secure his own position within the political sphere.

Because of the public dimensions of his disagreements with these men, Cicero had every reason to be fearful of the scrutiny that he would face from people who would accuse him of vacillation.⁴ Publius Clodius Pulcher was not merely Appius' brother, but also Cicero's bitter enemy, who successfully orchestrated Cicero's exile (*Att.* 3.1, 3.4), inflicting permanent damage on the trajectory of Cicero's political career.⁵ Appius repeatedly supported his brother in efforts to undermine Cicero politically, socially, and even financially upon his return (*Pis.* 35). Cicero's decision to defend Milo in 52 for the murder of Clodius exacerbated the already strained relationship between Cicero and Appius, making the prospect of a public reconciliation between the two men highly improbable.

Their reconciliation is addressed repeatedly in their correspondence, though only thirteen of Cicero's letters to Appius are extant.⁶ Likely in an attempt to justify his decision to restore his relationship with Appius despite their history, in a letter from June 51 Cicero lists a series of reasons that brought him closer to Appius (*Fam.* 3.4.2). First, he states that his esteem for Appius has changed considerably ever since he noticed Appius' regard for him. The more Appius displayed his respect

² Luibheid 1970, 91–92 explores the significance of the conference at Luca and its impact on Cicero.

³ On the debate over Pompey's reconciliation with Clodius, see the discussion of Seager 2002, 228 n. 1 with relevant bibliography. According to Tatum 1999, 124, their reconciliation must have been genuine.

⁴ On Cicero's considerations of such an accusation, see his remark to Lentulus Spinther in December 54 (*Fam.* 1.9.11).

⁵ For a discussion of Cicero's family becoming collateral damage during his banishment, see Evangelou 2023, 40–41.

⁶ Direct references: *Fam.* 3.8.7, 3.10.8, 9. A reference to their reconciliation can also be found in Cicero's letter to his brother (*QFr.* 2.11). Constans 1921, 34–51 discusses Cicero's reconciliation with Appius, though without focusing on the strategies of reconciliation that the orator uses or on the efforts that he made to maintain their renewed relationship. A brief examination of their reconciliation can also be found in Schuricht 1994, 19–23.

for him, the stronger their association became. In other words, Cicero denies that their decision to reconcile was forced or that it was made instantaneously, but rather something that happened organically because of Appius' attitude towards him. Notably, he does not attempt to distort reality completely, as he brings up the persons who played a vital role in their reconciliation, i. e. Pompey and Brutus.⁷ Since he cannot admit that Pompey put considerable pressure on him⁸ to reconcile with Appius, a simple reference to him and Brutus can at least give some verisimilitude to his story of events, as does his remark about appreciating Appius' approval of his election as augur.

At first sight, the medium of letters would not appear to be the most effective means to display publicly their reconciliation. Instead, their restored relations could easily be advertised in a public speech which would reach a much wider audience. Nonetheless, Cicero chooses to make a reference to it both in his defence of Scaurus in 54⁹ and in his pseudo-private letters to Appius.¹⁰ One explanation for the use of the latter is the particularly public nature of the communication between Roman aristocrats. Copies of letters were made both by the sender and the receiver and could easily be distributed to others, as Cicero tended to do with the letters that he received by men such as Antony or Caesar and forwarded to his close friend and confidant,¹¹ Atticus.¹² However, there is another possibility that needs to be explored. Unlike his reconciliation with Crassus which had taken place before the composition of his letter to Crassus (*Fam.* 5.8) – since the letter simply confirmed their renewed relations – his letters to Appius were an active part of their reconciliation. The two men did not simply decide to put their differences aside and reconcile publicly following Pompey's admonition, but their reconcilia-

7 *Fam.* 3.4.2, 3.7.5, 3.8.10, 3.9.2, 3.10.2, 10, 3.11.3, 4.

8 As Dugan 2014, 12 points out, Cicero also pressured Pompey to support him publicly after the end of his consulship, because of the criticism that his decision to execute the five Catilinarian conspirators was attracting. On Cicero's suppression of the conspiracy, see Mitchell 1979, 223–240.

9 *Hic ego Appium Claudium consulem fortissimum atque ornatissimum virum mecumque, ut spero, fidei in gratiam reditu firmitque coniunctum nullo loco, iudices, vituperabo* (*Scaur.* 31). Gruen 1995, 353 notes that their reconciliation in 54 was superficial. As Constans 1921, 34 points out, the precise date of their reconciliation is unknown.

10 Hoffer 2003, 93 also argues that the letters between political allies were not truly private, as they were written with wider circulation in mind.

11 e. g., Antony's (*Att.* 10.8A), Caesar's 49 (10.8B), and Caelius' letter in April 49 (*Att.* 10.9A) and Antony's again in 44 (14.13A). Wilcox 2012, 27 raises a similar point by arguing that whether Appius or Cicero would circulate the letter, Cicero would still succeed at depicting himself as a worthy friend.

12 Fuhrmann 1992, 151 asserts that Atticus was the only person with whom Cicero felt comfortable to reveal his inner thoughts and thus had no reason to pretend in his letters to him.

tion was possible to a great extent because of the way in which each one addressed the other's concerns and complaints.¹³

The 13 extant letters that Cicero sends to Appius between the end of 53¹⁴ and August 50 address a series of problems that they faced with each other's conduct and tried to resolve through their letter exchange. While, as mentioned above, their first reconciliation had already taken place in 54, two main incidents almost led to a complete dissolution of their publicly restored *amicitia*, namely Appius' conduct after the end of his term as governor of Cilicia and his prosecution by Cicero's son-in law, Dolabella. Unlike his reconciliation with men like Atticus (*Att.* 3.15.4–8) and Crassus (*Fam.* 5.8), which is addressed in a single letter, his correspondence with Appius provides insight into the reconciliation process over a long period in which several problems arise and are confronted in substantially different ways.

Unsurprisingly, Cicero's language in most of his letters to Appius is distinctively polite.¹⁵ The orator seems at pains to maintain a cordial relationship with him chiefly in order to please Pompey¹⁶ and to a certain extent Brutus, as Appius' daughter was married to Pompey's son,¹⁷ and his other daughter to Brutus.¹⁸ His

¹³ As the discussion that follows will demonstrate, their reconciliation was rather atypical for fellow politicians and strongly resembles Cicero's with Atticus in August 58, in which Cicero spoke with frankness about the issues that he had with his friend's behaviour and thus their friendship was properly restored. Conversely, he was never able to express openly to Pompey his deep disappointment in him in 58 when he allowed Clodius to exile him. Despite their superficial reconciliation in 57, when Cicero was restored to Rome largely thanks to the efforts of Pompey, in 49 it is revealed in a letter to Atticus that he resented Pompey for his decision to sacrifice him for fear of jeopardising his *amicitia* with Caesar (*Att.* 10.4.3).

¹⁴ Or perhaps the beginning of 52, according to Shackleton Bailey 2001, 273.

¹⁵ For discussions of the skilful use of politeness in Cicero's letters, see Miller 1914, esp. 45–46 and Hall 2009.

¹⁶ Constans 1921, 34 states that Cicero's reconciliation was effected thanks to the efforts of Pompey “qui se servit pour cela de plusieurs Grecs” based on the following remark in Cicero's letter to Quintus: *Graios omnes convocet, per quos mecum in gratiam rediit* (*QFr.* 2.11.3). However, Shackleton Bailey 2002, 122–123 n.5 convincingly argues against the literal interpretation of Cicero's quotation from the non-extant Latin play and suggests that the orator refers to the mediators responsible for his reconciliation, i. e. chiefly to Pompey. Hofmann 1951, 89–90 also advises caution in the study of Cicero's correspondence, because of his tendency to use phrases and expressions that should not be taken literally.

¹⁷ Tatum 1991, 122 argues against the commonly held view of their marriage taking place in 54 and suggests 56 as a more likely date.

¹⁸ This was a well-known fact that was also stressed by Cicero in a letter from June 51 to Appius (*Fam.* 3.4.2). Tempest 2011, 154 asserts that Cicero's amiability towards Appius was influenced not only by his consideration of Appius' family connection with Pompey and Brutus, but also by his desire to avoid clashing with yet another person from Claudius' family. On the importance of Appius' connections, especially with Pompey and Brutus, see also Gruen 1995, 97–98, 353 and Mün-

correspondence with Appius differs considerably from his conciliatory letter to Crassus, in which there is no direct reference to Pompey, as, despite the fact that Pompey acted as a mediator in both cases, his connection with Appius was undoubtedly stronger.¹⁹ He repeatedly refers to Pompey and Brutus in his letters to Appius and even quotes Pompey (*Fam.* 3.9.2). Though he speaks highly of both of them, his compliments focus on Pompey²⁰ and strike a highly deferential subordinate pose.²¹ The fact that in his first reference to them he states that he holds them in high regard suggests that he expected them to receive copies of those letters or at the very least to be informed about their content from Appius or Appius' men. In order to demonstrate to Pompey that he was a reliable ally, he had to make it abundantly clear to him that he was doing everything in his power to remain in Appius' good graces. If Appius were to reject Cicero's efforts, Cicero would still have shown Pompey that he had performed his duty to him. An act of deference to Appius would be perceived as sign of respect to Pompey.²² It follows that the role that Pompey and Brutus played in the reconciliation process was not limited to the initial agreement between Cicero and Appius to become allies in the public eye. On the contrary, the strong likelihood of them reading the letters between the new allies functioned as a constant reminder, especially to Cicero, to be at his best behaviour. As a result, when Cicero's son-in-law, Dolabella, prosecuted Appius, Pompey, who was keeping close oversight of their association, foresaw their imminent quarrel and intervened. Cicero reveals that Pompey sent him a letter which made him feel obliged to work with Appius. He argues that even if he had harboured any resentment for him – which he denies, as he claims to consider him an intimate friend – he would abandon it, in order to honour Pompey's wishes (*Fam.* 3.10.10). His remark seems to suggest that Pompey put considerable pressure on him to be on good terms with Appius, especially because of the debt that Cicero owed Pompey for being chiefly responsible for his return from exile.²³

zer 1999, 312. An interesting account of Appius' role in politics can be found in Gruen 1995, 352–355. For a more extensive discussion of Appius' life, see Constans 1921 and Schuricht 1994.

19 Lintott 1968, 14 n.4 asserts that Cicero wanted to avoid saying anything that Appius would perceive as insulting, because he was worried that he “may summon Pompeius and other supporters of the triumvirate to defend him”.

20 *quanti Pompeium, quem unum ex omnibus facio, ut debeo* (*Fam.* 3.10.2).

21 *tum alterius omnium saeculorum et gentium principis, alterius iam pridem iuventutis, celeriter, ut spero, civitatis* (*Fam.* 3.11.3).

22 Bernard 2015, 9 detects striking similarities in Cicero's letters to Appius and to Lentulus Spinther, all three of whom served as governors of Cilicia, and argues that the orator chose to express himself with such deference because they were men of high rank.

23 On Cicero's debt to Pompey and its effect on his decisions, see also *Red. Pop.* 17 and *Att.* 7.12.3.

One of the main strategies that Cicero uses in his letters to secure Appius' cooperation is polite overstatement or flattery.²⁴ His truly private correspondence with Atticus²⁵ reveals that his remarks to Appius were most certainly disingenuous,²⁶ though necessary between Roman aristocrats.²⁷ In all 13 extant letters he praises Appius for his personal qualities²⁸ and his achievements. Most of his positive remarks appear to centre around Appius' *existimatio* and *dignitas* (*Fam.* 3.4.1).²⁹ The reciprocity that Cicero and Appius display appears to expedite their efforts for reconciliation and to play a decisive role in the maintenance of their public *amicitia*.³⁰ In at least some of the non-extant letters that Appius sent to Cicero, he apparently used equally affectionate language.³¹ According to Cicero, one letter that was

24 The use of flattery is common in his correspondence. In a letter to Atticus, he admits that he uses flattery in his letters to his other correspondents, but claims that he refrains from so doing in his letters to Atticus (*Att.* 12.3.1). According to Nicholson 1992, 112, Cicero's use of flattery in some instances "borders on the ridiculous".

25 For Cicero's remarks about Appius in his letters to Atticus, Quintus, and Caelius Rufus, see *Att.* 5.16.4, 5.17.6, 5.21.10, 6.1.2, 6.2.10, 6.6.2, 8.1.3–4, *QFr.* 2.11, 3.2, and *Fam.* 2.13.2 respectively. According to Tempest 2011, 154, "Cicero's complaints about his predecessor were for Atticus' eyes only". While, based on the extant letters, this appears to be technically true, his response to Appius' accusations that he had received reports, according to which Cicero had been criticising him to others (*Fam.* 3.8.5–6), clearly shows that Atticus was not the only person with whom he trusted his thoughts on Appius.

26 Lintott 2008, 259 observes the disingenuousness in a letter that Cicero wrote to Appius in October 51, considering his contradictory remarks to Atticus (*Att.* 6.1.2). Wilcox 2012, 26 also argues that Cicero's declaration in his last extant letter to Appius (*Fam.* 3.12.2) appears to be "breath-takingly disingenuous".

27 Hall 1996, 19 emphasises the pressure on Roman politicians to display aristocratic manners in their correspondence. Thus, Cicero's praise of Appius' couriers arguably helps to establish him as a man of generous goodwill and sophistication.

28 e. g., *ingeni* (*Fam.* 3.1.1), *tuaque singulari humanitate* (*Fam.* 3.2.1), *humanitas* (*Fam.* 3.2.2), *summa prudentia*, *multa etiam doctrina*, *plurimo rerum usu*, *addo urbanitatem* (*Fam.* 3.7.5), *liberalitas tua* (*Fam.* 3.8.8), *tuam pristinam urbanitatem* (*Fam.* 3.9.1), *tua sapientia et humanitas* (*Fam.* 3.12.2). Conversely, in a letter that Cicero wrote to Atticus in February 49 he claims that he considers no one less reliable than Appius (*nemo nec stultior est quam L. Domitius nec inconstantior quam Ap. Claudius*, *Att.* 8.1.3–4). Gruen 1995, 59, 148 n. 115, 352 repeatedly refers to Appius as a self-serving opportunist and a "devious politician" who "utilized marital links with other noble houses when they were profitable, discarded them when they were inconvenient".

29 Verboven 2011, 9 provides an insightful discussion of *existimatio* and its importance for Romans in Cicero's time. Similarly, on the significance of *dignitas* in the relations between Roman politicians, see, Hellegouarc'h 1963, esp. 388–393.

30 Tempest 2011, 154 also observes Appius' reciprocity in Cicero's efforts to repair their relationship.

31 In July 51, for example, Cicero responds to Appius' letter in which Appius states that reading Cicero's letter and his reference to the services that they have provided to each other gave him pleasure (*de nostris officiis ego ad te scripserim, etsi tibi iucunda fuerint*, *Fam.* 3.5.1).

delivered to him by Appius' freedman, Phantias, was *plenas et amoris et offici* (Fam. 3.1.2).³² In the course of time from 54 to 50, Appius was able to show his good will towards Cicero in public, which Cicero claims to have noticed and appreciated.³³ An excellent opportunity arose when Cicero was elected to the College of augurs, as Appius had in the previous years. Appius enthusiastically approved of his election (Fam. 3.4.2) and even made a grand gesture by dedicating to Cicero a volume on augury (Fam. 3.4.1), thereby publicly cementing their reconciliation. Additionally, in June 51, when they made plans to meet, Appius displayed collegiality by informing Cicero that he would not move until they met.³⁴ Cicero was evidently pleased and expressed his gratitude to him (Fam. 3.4.2). In order to compensate for their fallout, Cicero knew that he had to exceed everyone's expectations of him, including Appius', hence his constant reminder of the kind of services that he has provided and will continue to provide for him, as well as their frequency and magnitude.³⁵ Nonetheless, Appius was not always in complete agreement with Cicero in regards to the references to their exchange of services. Even though he claimed that he was pleased to read Cicero's letter, he noted that he found it unnecessary to discuss matters long passed. Cicero replied politely by agreeing with him, but also by seizing the opportunity to twist Appius' remark into something positive: Appius was indeed correct that it is superfluous to discuss past exchange of services precisely because they have nothing to prove to anyone; their *amicitia* is not only genuine (*vera*) and strengthened (*confirmata*), but, most importantly, tried over the years, hence the apparent bond of trust that they have built with one another (Fam. 3.5.1). This level of diplomatic subtlety allows Cicero to maintain the carefully crafted narrative of their relationship as an intimate and long-lasting *amicitia*.³⁶ Despite his insistence that their relationship was not a strictly political alliance, but

32 Hall 2009, 140 argues against the view that Cicero's remark about Appius' letter indicates a closer relationship between the two men. On the contrary, it suggests that their reconciliation was not complete, as their renewed relationship was still fragile, hence the use of "affiliative politeness".

33 e. g., *mihi ... demonstravit me a te plurimi fieri; quod egomet multis argumentis iam antea iudicarum* (Fam. 3.4.1). Constans 1921, 51 observes that, while Cicero's first surviving letter to Appius suggests the existence of a friendship between them, the rest of the correspondence reveals that afterwards their relations deteriorated.

34 According to Hunter 1913, 87, not only did Appius have no desire to see Cicero, he also wanted to insinuate that all the blame should be attributed to Cicero for their failure to meet.

35 Fam. 3.1.1, 3.4.2, 3.5.1, 3.5.4, 3.7.1, 3.8.10, 3.10.8.

36 Hall 1996, 22 asserts that some of Cicero's remarks are misconstrued and considered insincere, because modern scholars fail to understand the usage of the language between Roman politicians in Cicero's time.

a personal friendship,³⁷ through his constant references to the exchange of services between them, it becomes apparent that, at its core, their *amicitia* was a mutually beneficial association.³⁸ Its utilitarian nature is first hinted at by Cicero in his efforts to convince him that his assistance during the transfer of power would be in the best interest of both, since Cicero would repay him by offering similar support. His remark *quod si tu quoque eandem de mea voluntate erga te spem habes, ea te profecto numquam fallat* (*Fam.* 3.2.1) betrays an intention for *quid pro quo*.³⁹

In addition to expressing his friendly sentiments and affection towards Appius,⁴⁰ Cicero speaks of *malevoli homines*, i. e. people who try to influence their opinion of each other.⁴¹ Such a vague reference can also be found in his efforts to reconcile with Crassus (*Fam.* 5.8.1–2) and with Pompey (*Dom.* 28). In both cases Cicero shifts the blame to unnamed persons in an attempt to justify his well-known fallout with these men. With his remarks, he implicitly denies that there were any inherent problems between them and suggests that their *amicitia* would not have been ruptured had he not listened to the words of certain devious men (*Fam.* 3.8.4, 6). In Appius' case, though, he chooses a distinctively different approach. He emphatically notes that there were indeed several men who attempted to sway his opinion of Appius with their claims. Nonetheless, Cicero states that he refuses to believe their reports about Appius.⁴² He thus proves to be a trusting friend whose shared experiences with Appius have made him feel confident that the claims about his dear friend could have been nothing more than fabrications.⁴³ While

³⁷ Baraz 2012, 152 n.10 underscores the wide range that the term *amicitia* had in Cicero's time, considering that it was used in reference both to men like Atticus, who was his dearest friend, and Appius, with whom he solely had "formal and distant connections".

³⁸ Brunt 1965, 4 considers Cicero's decision to depict his relationship with Appius as a relationship that was more than a strictly political association conspicuous. However, as Powell 1990, 22 remarks, "Cicero professes warm personal feelings for those whom he privately distrusts or despises". Hoffer 2003, 93 n.2, 94 n.7, 99 n.17, makes several comparisons between Cicero's letters to Appius and to Metellus Celer and notes (101 n.19) that the orator's statements in *Fam.* 3.7.6 and *Fam.* 5.2.10 indicate that his relationship with both men is presented as conditional. Only if Appius and Metellus desire Cicero's goodwill, is he going to keep expressing it to them.

³⁹ Wilcox 2012, 26, 28 also views their relationship as utilitarian, but stresses that the denial that his friendship with a political ally was based on benefit constitutes one of Cicero's "euphemistic rhetorical tactics".

⁴⁰ Similarly, Hutchinson 1998, 38 points out that Cicero uses affectionate language in a letter to Quintus (*QFr.* 1.3) in attempt to persuade him.

⁴¹ *Fam.* 3.6.4, 6, 3.8.3, 5, 3.9.1, 3.10.6–7.

⁴² As Hall 2009, 143 notes, Cicero refers to these reports as rumours, in order to avoid a direct confrontation with Appius.

⁴³ His remarks are in line with his professed philosophical views of friendship in *De amicitia*, in which he argues that one must not believe the accusations made against a friend (*Amic.* 65). Brunt

a comparison of Cicero's earlier claims about Crassus and Pompey with his statements about Appius allows him to elevate his *amicitia* with the latter into a unique relationship for men who are actively involved in politics, it also lends itself for a second comparison between Appius' and Cicero's conduct. Cicero explicitly and repeatedly informs Appius about the disturbing reports that he is receiving concerning Appius' remarks about Cicero. He wittily addresses these reports not only by claiming that he refuses to believe them, but also by adding that, even if they were indeed true, Appius would be doing him a favour (*Fam.* 3.6.5).⁴⁴ Regardless of how Appius replies to the reported accusations, Cicero has absolved him of any wrongdoing. The orator succeeds in implicitly informing his predecessor that he finds his behaviour unacceptable, without offending him, since he gives Appius the opportunity to deny it and refrain from acting as if he were still the governor of Cilicia at least henceforth.⁴⁵

One element that features prominently throughout their correspondence and plays an integral role in their efforts for reconciliation is calculated tact.⁴⁶ Bending of truth and niceties between Roman aristocrats were especially common in their letter exchange and naturally the letters of reconciliation are no exception. After deciding to end their quarrel publicly, in order to appease common allies or because of personal considerations, Roman politicians, such as Cicero and Appius, attempted to create an illusion around their association. Cicero's letters to Appius indicate that he sets out to establish their relationship as a strong *amicitia* that is grounded in *benevolentia* (*Fam.* 3.1.1).⁴⁷ The reader of the letters, whether it is

1965, 3–4 also points out parallels between statements that Cicero makes in his letters to Appius and his professed views of friendship in *De amicitia* (e. g., *Fam.* 3.10.7–9 and *Amic.* 22). Conversely, Powell 1990, IX considers some of Cicero's remarks about *amicitia* in his philosophical treatise hypocritical.

⁴⁴ Shackleton Bailey 2001, 276–277 n. 1, notes that Cicero's claim that he was not interested in the position of governor of Cilicia appears to have been genuine. Lintott 2008, 253 n. 1 provides a list of references to Cicero's expressed desire to avoid a prolonged command of Cilicia: *Att.* 5.9.2, 11.1, 5, 13.3, 14.1, 15.1, 3, 17.5, 18.1, *Fam.* 2.7.4, 10.4, 3.8.9, 15.9. Indeed, as Rawson 1978, 18 n.53 notes, Cicero did not wish to be away from Rome and, when he was forced to, he “felt only partly alive”. According to Hunter 1913, 73, Cicero viewed his appointment as governor nearly as bad as an exile. As soon as he arrived in Cilicia, he complained to Atticus about the road being *aestuosa* and *pulverulenta* (*Att.* 5.14.1).

⁴⁵ On Appius' scrupulous performance as governor and Cicero's reaction to it in his letters to Atticus, see Tempest 2011, 153–154.

⁴⁶ Baraz 2012, 73 rightly observes that when there is benefit involved in Cicero's correspondence, it is less likely to find sincerity in his claims.

⁴⁷ Cicero's portrayal of his association with some of his allies as a relationship with more depth than a mere political alliance is common in his correspondence. Bernard 2015, 7 detects a similar intention in Cicero's letters to Lentulus Spinther, in which he constantly stresses the bond of *amic-*

Appius, Pompey, Brutus, one of Appius' men, or a fellow politician, is given the impression that Cicero's bond with Appius cannot easily be severed. The use of superlatives becomes imperative and an absolute expectation in their references to their *amicitia*.⁴⁸ In fact, in May 51 Cicero urges Appius to show everyone through his actions that he considers no one a closer friend than Cicero (*Fam.* 3.3.1). Two months later, in another letter to Appius, he claims that they are bound by a strong bond of *amicitia*, which Cicero desires first to be known by Appius and then to be believed by everyone else (*Fam.* 3.5.2). Appius knew all too well that such a personal friendship between them did not exist, but he is, nonetheless, invited to act in public as if he considers Cicero a dear friend. The fact that both of them attempt to keep up the façade for as long as they possibly can allows them not only to remain on good terms publicly, but, more importantly, to address certain issues that arise between them by avoiding clashing with one another.

When Cicero was about to succeed Appius as governor of Cilicia in 51, he desired to ensure a smooth transition of power by sending him a letter in which he attempted to oblige him to act in a proper manner. In his second extant letter to Appius, Cicero begins by admitting that he was not pleased with his appointment as governor of Cilicia and stresses that the decision was made against his will (*Fam.* 3.2.1). Considering Cicero's constant efforts to remain in Rome, his fellow politicians and allies could safely assume that his remark was indeed genuine. At the same time, his opening statement enables him to remind Appius that he cannot truly assign any blame to him for taking up Appius' position. If Cicero were allowed to make a decision for himself, he would have most certainly remained in Rome. This is an important point that he reiterates by stressing that the senatorial decree obliges him to begin his tenure as governor (*Fam.* 3.2.2). Since both men are displeased with this decision and thus find themselves in an awkward position, Cicero suggests that the best course of action is to help one another by making the transition less troublesome for each party. After promising Appius that he will be a friendly successor, he expresses his delight in the fact that he is taking over from

itia that unites them. Williams 2012, 235 argues that Cicero's relationship with Pompey was also chiefly an alliance, despite his intention to present it as a personal relationship.

48 e. g., *carissimum te mihi esse* (*Fam.* 3.1.1), *pro nostra summa coniunctione* (*Fam.* 3.2.1), *successori coniunctissimo et amicissimo ... pro nostra consociatissima voluntate* (*Fam.* 3.3.1), *tuam mihi existimationem et dignitatem carissimam esse* (*Fam.* 3.4.1), *ad me amantissime scriptum suavissimum misisti* (*Fam.* 3.4.1), *reliqui scire possint me tibi esse amicissimum* (*Fam.* 3.5.2), *ut me tibi amicissimum esse* (*Fam.* 3.6.6), *me tibi non amicum modo, verum etiam amicissimum existimes velim* (*Fam.* 3.7.6), *liberalitas tua, ut hominis nobilissimi* (*Fam.* 3.8.8), *gratissimum mihi feceris* (*Fam.* 3.9.2), *tibi, cui sum amicissimus* (*Fam.* 3.10.10), *duo mihi illa ex tuis litteris iucundissima fuerunt* (*Fam.* 3.11.3), *sicut tu amicissime et suavissime optas* (*Fam.* 3.12.2). In his 13 extant letters to Appius, Cicero uses the noun *amicitia* and the adjective *amicus* 27 times.

a man *qui mallet eam quam maxime mihi aptam explicatamque tradere* (Fam. 3.2.1). With the way in which Cicero phrases his belief that Appius will be cooperative, he implicitly suggests that failure to do so would reflect badly on Appius in the public eye. A further step that Cicero takes, in order to secure Appius' support, is an appeal to the close bond (*summa coniunctione*, Fam. 3.2.1) that they have forged.⁴⁹ He makes a similar remark at the end of the letter, by stressing its brevity and arguing that it is in line with the expectations of their *amicitia*.

In his efforts to ensure a working relationship with Appius that would please their allies, he chose to assume the role of the inferior party in his communication with Appius.⁵⁰ This conscious decision that he made first appears in his second extant letter when he asks for Appius' cooperation as outgoing governor. After praising him for his kindness to Cicero himself as well as to others and pledging his support of him, instead of demanding his assistance or stating with certainty that Appius will provide it, he stresses that Appius himself needs to decide on his own (*tui consili est*, Fam. 3.2.2) how he is going to act and whether or not he will grant Cicero's request. Cicero continues to use similar language in his letters to Appius, by constantly trying to accommodate Appius' needs, even at his own expense. The letter that he sends to him in July 51 constitutes a prime example of the lengths that he was willing to go to for them to appear united in the public eye. It concerns their plans to meet, as customary between governors, for the transfer of power. Cicero shows a clear intention to Appius or any other reader of the letter that he is doing everything in his power to make their meeting as convenient as possible for Appius. He begins by noting that when he saw Appius' freedman, Phantias, at Brundisium, he assured him that he would gladly travel to any part of the province that Appius would prefer. After Phantias informed Cicero that it would be more convenient for Appius to travel by boat and meet at Side, Cicero immediately concurred. He ended up listening to L. Clodius, who informed him that Appius was at Laodicea. He adds that he chose that route not only because it was shorter and more convenient for himself, but also because he was under the impression that it would be preferable for Appius. Nevertheless, Appius' plans changed without anyone notifying Cicero (Fam. 3.5.3). Instead of showing any kind of annoyance or exasperation with the mis-

⁴⁹ It appears that an appeal to the close association between two men was a common tactic that Roman aristocrats used to oblige their fellow politicians. A distinctively similar example can be found in Caesar's letter to Cicero in 49, in which he asks him to remain neutral in the civil war in the name of their *amicitia* (Att. 10.8B.1).

⁵⁰ As Münzer 1999, 235 points out, Appius was considered the head of the Claudian family at the time. Mitchell 1991, 222 also observes the power dynamics in Cicero's correspondence with Appius and argues that Appius' disposition towards Cicero clearly indicates a patrician talking down to a *homo novus*.

communication that prevented them from finally meeting, Cicero displays notable understanding and suggests that Appius make a decision on how to proceed. He even reassures Appius that he will constantly keep him informed with detailed reports on where he is and what routes he is planning on taking, in order to facilitate Appius' plans of meeting him (*Fam.* 3.5.3). The language that Cicero uses gives the impression of someone who works for Appius rather than his equal. When he praises Appius *liberalitas*, he attributes it to his *nobilitas*, and claims that he is more generous than Cicero (*Fam.* 3.8.8).⁵¹ He even seems to show some signs of fear to speak frankly and thus upset a superior when he notes that *oneris tibi imponere nec audeo quidquam nec debeo* (*Fam.* 3.5.4).⁵² In his efforts to avoid offending Appius, he underlines the importance for both of them to meet before Appius' departure, but only *quod commodo tuo fieri possit* (*Fam.* 3.5.4). It follows that, if Appius decides that he does not wish to meet him,⁵³ Cicero has already declared that he will not be offended. On the contrary, he refers to the possibility of Appius' inability to see him as *casus* (*Fam.* 3.5.4), i. e., an "unexpected event" or a "misfortune", thus further providing excuses for Appius' possible unfriendly conduct and again absolving him from blame.

Cicero's best efforts to persuade Appius notwithstanding, their correspondence indicates that Appius proved reluctant to comply with his requests. Consequently, Cicero was forced to change tactics. While he does not abandon politeness in his letters to Appius, he gradually changes his tone in the hope of stressing the severity of Appius' actions, without coming into conflict with him, as one of his main concerns appears to have been to maintain their reconciliation in the public eye. He was well aware that, if he were to attack Appius, his conduct would be strongly disapproved of by Pompey, Brutus, and even Atticus.⁵⁴ As a result, in his third extant letter, written about three months after *Fam.* 3.2, he attempts to make a second

51 An intention to flatter his political ally through a comparison to himself can also be found in his often-quoted letter to Pompey in which he refers to Pompey as a man greater than Africanus and himself as someone not much inferior to Laelius (*Fam.* 5.7.3). Brunt 1965, 5 also notes the similarities between Cicero's letter to Pompey and his letters to Appius.

52 Another possible explanation is that Cicero demonstrates deferential respect towards a *nobilis*, signalling his acute awareness of the boundaries of social appropriateness.

53 Hunter 1913, 81 points out Appius' unwillingness to meet Cicero. Nonetheless, it is important to consider the possibility that Appius' unpredictable travels during Cicero's first month as governor of Cilicia were driven primarily by a desire to conclude various financial operations before leaving the province, rather than by an intentional avoidance of his successor.

54 Bianay 2014, 74 observes that Atticus also played a role in Cicero's conduct with Appius, as in a letter from February 50 he admits that he showed self-restraint knowing that it would win Atticus' approval (*Att.* 6.1.2). Atticus' praise of Cicero's conduct towards Appius is also stressed by Hall 2009, 32.

appeal to their *amicitia*, though with two notable differences. He politely⁵⁵ begins by reminding him of his earlier request about his assistance with the transfer of power. The repetition of the request after the passing of such a long period of time clearly shows that Appius was unwilling to provide the assistance that Cicero had requested. While in his second extant letter to Appius he had shown deference to him by leaving the decision of how Appius would act entirely up to him, in this letter he makes an interesting addition. He claims that whatever Appius decides to do, it will have his approval, but also, in an attempt to oblige him, he expresses certainty that Appius will not fail to grant his request.⁵⁶ More importantly, he implicitly reminds Appius that there is an obvious problem of optics that needs to be borne in mind, since Appius' inappropriate conduct is at variance with their public relationship.⁵⁷ Even though he does not name anyone specifically, the phrase *ut omnes intellegant* (Fam. 3.3.1) works as a strong reminder of the very public dimension of their association. A similar statement can be found in a letter from July 51, in which he stresses that, apart from Appius and Appius' people, the rest of the world also needs to believe that such an intimate friendship exists between them.⁵⁸ Many people are watching closely how Cicero and his predecessor will act, in order to confirm their suspicions over the sincerity of their association.⁵⁹ Therefore, Appius needs to take certain measures to act in a way that shows solidarity with Cicero, rather than hints of possible dissension. In June 51 Cicero claims that on his part he has demonstrated repeatedly his zeal for Appius through the services that he has provided for him, but stresses the importance of this commitment to be well known publicly, hence the use of the verb *declaro*.⁶⁰ Appius is thus invited to follow Cicero's example through his actions and decisions as well.

As the months went by and Appius' treatment of Cicero became increasingly insulting, Cicero must have realised that the overt politeness that he had been displaying in his letters was not as effective as he expected it to be. Hence, in July 51

55 *velim* (Fam. 3.3.1). On the use of the polite subjunctive in Cicero's letters, see Hall 2009, 55, 74, 111, 131, 143, 157, 228 n. 137.

56 *sed te quoque confido ea facturum, quae mihi intelliges maxime esse accommodata* (Fam. 3.3.2). An interesting parallel can be found in Cicero's continuous requests to Atticus to join him in his journey to exile. After Atticus fails to make concrete plans to overtake him, Cicero notes *si id non feceris, mirabor; sed confido te esse facturum* (Att. 3.3).

57 Constans 1921, 41, in his study of Cicero's communication with Appius after March 51, underscores Cicero's great concern for public opinion and his continuous attempts to conceal his disagreements with Appius under the guise of friendship.

58 *tuique omnes, deinde ut etiam reliqui* (Fam. 3.5.2).

59 Lintott 2008, 224 notes that, while Lentulus Spinther raised no opposition to Cicero's reconciliation with Appius and Caesar, he expressed concerns over his defence of Vatinius (Fam. 1.9.4).

60 *in iis maxime declarabo quibus plurimum significare potuero* (Fam. 3.4.1).

he sends to Appius another effusive letter, but ends it by implicitly accusing Appius of lying to him. Appius claimed to have instructed Scaevola to work in his place as governor while he was away until Cicero took office. However, when Cicero met Scaevola at Ephesus, he stated that he had received no such instructions from Appius. Instead of making a direct accusation against Appius, he suggests that it was a matter of miscommunication and simply expresses his wish for Scaevola to have performed the task which he was assigned. The following three extant letters that he sends to Appius (*Fam.* 3.6, 3.7, 3.8) are of particular import, because of the frankness that he displays in them.⁶¹ A dramatic shift in tone can be observed from the very beginning of the letter that he sent to Appius in August 51.⁶² He explicitly accuses him of lack of reciprocity in his efforts to maintain their *amicitia*.⁶³ Though he still addresses several issues politely, his dissatisfaction with Appius for the first time becomes apparent thanks to the public nature of letters between politicians. He explains how through his actions Appius gives the impression not of a close friend, like Cicero himself does, but of someone who is simply indifferent.⁶⁴ He notes that he could use harsher words to describe him, but that he refrains from doing so.⁶⁵ With such a remark, he issues a stark warning to Appius that if his conduct does not improve, it will lead to a conflict between them that neither of them would desire. At the same time, after experiencing Appius' discourteous behaviour, the fact that he displays such restraint must be appreciated by their allies. Appius' conduct is not simply demeaning to the new governor, but a matter with serious legal ramifications. Cicero's references to the *lex Cornelia* (*Fam.* 3.6.3, 6), according to which the outgoing governor had thirty days to depart the province, underscore the severity of this ordeal. He raises two further, but equally important, issues: three cohorts are still missing from his forces and he has not even received a letter from Appius informing him about his whereabouts and when he plans to see Cicero. In order to

61 Hunter 1913, 87 argues that the letter that Cicero sent to Appius in August 51 (*Fam.* 3.6) is perhaps "the nearest approach to an unpleasant letter that Cicero ever brought himself to write". However, I maintain that the most unpleasant letter that Cicero felt compelled to write was *Att.* 3.15, sent on 17 August 58, in which he reproaches his most intimate friend and makes a series of accusations against him for his conduct before Cicero left Rome to save his life.

62 Gruen 1995, 353 also points out that Cicero's letters strike a different tone from August 51 on and also between April and August 50. Hall 2009, 141 makes a similar observation and notes that in certain instances Cicero is quite "acerbic".

63 *cum meum factum cum tuo comparo, etsi non magis mihi faveo in nostra amicitia tuenda quam tibi, tamen multo magis meo facto delector quam tuo* (*Fam.* 3.6.1).

64 Gruen 1995, 353 argues that, with his refusal to meet Cicero in Cilicia, Appius "pointedly snubbed" him.

65 Mitchell 1991, 222 considers the restraint that Cicero displays in his replies to Appius' angry letters as an attempt to avoid antagonising such a powerful man.

rectify the situation, Appius is implicitly urged to voice no objection to D. Antonius who will be tasked with taking over the cohorts from Appius. He is also asked to set a date for their meeting based on the information that Cicero provides him about his itinerary, but also considers the possibility that Appius will find it unnecessary. However, if they do not, in fact, meet, everyone will know that all the blame should fall on Appius.⁶⁶

Similarly, when Appius reproaches Cicero for the claims that he made against him in the presence of others, Cicero adopts an even more disgruntled tone in his replies.⁶⁷ He underscores the sharp contrast between his own dismissal of reports against Appius with Appius' consideration of the validity of reports that paint Cicero in a negative light and argues that, as a friend, Appius should not have listened to sycophants, as his trust in his friend should have been enough.⁶⁸ It is worth noting that because of the public nature of their correspondence, Cicero was aware that he would have to convince both Appius and the rest of the likely readers – including Pompey and Brutus who expected him to maintain a working relationship with Appius – that the reports were false. However, by reminding him that Cicero himself has repeatedly dismissed similar claims, he encourages him to follow his example and demonstrate trust in his friend's word over reports made by third parties.⁶⁹ Even if Appius refuses to accept Cicero's proposal, Cicero has already presented himself as the magnanimous friend and Appius as an intransigent man. Pompey, who is constantly on Cicero's mind can only be displeased with Appius'

⁶⁶ Hunter 1913, 88–89 considers the possibility that in the end the two men met and argues that, based on the extant evidence, it would appear that they did succeed in seeing each other in person.

⁶⁷ Constans 1921, 34 detects an intention of Cicero to attack Appius, though without angering him. Hall 2009, 151 interprets Cicero's reproaches towards Appius "as a deliberate and calculated show of aggression".

⁶⁸ *Fam.* 3.6.1–3, 3.8.4–6, 3.10.7, 3.11.5. Hall 2009, 238 n. 23 follows Shackleton Bailey 1977, 364 who suggests that Cicero appears to be hypocritical in his criticism of Appius reporting accusations against him made by others as he does the same. However, there is a fundamental difference in the way that Cicero phrases his concerns. Not only does he dismiss some of the reports, while stressing that his friendship with Appius does not allow him to believe that they are true, but even in the unlikely case that they are true, he accepts Appius' behaviour and provides excuses for it. Therefore, their approach is distinctively different and Cicero presents himself as the better friend who does not allow third parties to have an impact on their *amicitia*.

⁶⁹ An interesting parallel can be found in Antony's effusive letter to Cicero in May 49. In his attempt to dissuade Cicero from publicly supporting Pompey in the civil war, Antony claims that he refuses to believe the reports that he has received that Cicero is planning on leaving Rome to join Pompey (*Att.* 10.8A.1). The emphasis on his and Caesar's love (*Att.* 10.8A.2) and affection for Cicero is used to oblige him to remain neutral, thereby proving to them that they were correct to place their trust in him.

conduct, based on Cicero's letters.⁷⁰ Cicero's harsher approach and display of frankness⁷¹ combined with politeness seems to have aided their efforts to reconcile, as evident in the letter that he sent to him in February 50 (*Fam.* 3.9). More importantly, in April 50, Cicero claims in a letter to Atticus that he harbours no ill will towards Appius (*Att.* 6.2.10). By May 50, in a letter to Caelius Rufus, he expresses that he has even developed a genuine regard for Appius following their reconciliation, and that Appius' conduct towards him suggests the feeling is mutual (*Fam.* 2.13.2).⁷²

Three out of the last four extant letters from their correspondence (*Fam.* 3.10, 11, 12) deal with Dolabella's decision to prosecute Appius as well as Cicero's continuous efforts to convince him that he was not in any way involved in that decision and that he did not approve of it or even his daughter's union with such a man (*Fam.* 3.12.2–3). In the longest letter from their correspondence (*Fam.* 3.10)⁷³ Cicero responds to a letter that he had received from Appius, in which Appius casts doubt on Cicero's sentiments towards him. Cicero explicitly states that his intention in the letter is to exculpate himself and to remove any doubt from Appius' mind that Dolabella's actions reflect in any respect on how Cicero perceives his relationship with Appius (*Fam.* 3.10.6–7).⁷⁴ Apart from criticizing Dolabella and expressing his disapproval of him (*Fam.* 3.10.5), thereby distancing himself from his son-in-law, his letter encompasses all the main methods of reconciliation that he had used in his previous letters to Appius to maintain their working relationship. More specifically, his letter displays the same strategic narrative that the rest of the correspondence with Appius does, which ostensibly gives the impression that it was written aimed

70 Hunter 1913, 89 n.2 rightly points out that Cicero had further reason to reconcile his differences with Appius, i. e. his desire to secure Appius' support for his *supplicatio*. Wilcox 2012, 27 notes that, by supporting Cicero's bid for *supplicatio*, Appius was repaying Cicero for his support of Appius' claim in 53.

71 *haec ad te scripsi liberius* (*Fam.* 3.7.6).

72 Apart from stressing the significance of the influence that Appius exerts, through a series of rhetorical questions he explains in detail what about Appius has attracted him to form and maintain an alliance with such a man: *iam me Pompei totum esse scis, Brutum a me amari intellegis. quid est causae cur mihi non in optatis sit complecti hominem florentem aetate, opibus, honoribus, ingenio, liberis, propinquis, adfinibus, amicis, collegam meum praesertim et in ipsa collegi laude et scientia studiosum mei?* (*Fam.* 2.13.2). Brunt 1965, 4 stresses the importance of the fact that he makes such remarks not only publicly to Appius, but also in a letter to Caelius Rufus, a close friend.

73 Hoffer 2003, 93 n.2, in his discussion of Cicero's long reply to Metellus Celer's short letter to him argues that the length of Cicero's letter is indication of the difficult position in which he was both as a *homo novus* and as someone who was facing heavy criticism for the execution of the Catilinarian conspirators. Cicero, thus, once again had to adopt the role of the inferior party.

74 Tempest 2011, 154 refers to Cicero's letter to Appius as a "grovelling letter of apology". Even though he does not apologise to Appius for his conduct, he does try to defend himself from the accusations that Appius made against him.

at anyone but Appius himself who was well aware that Cicero's claims were mere exaggerations or even constituted a complete distortion of the truth. A significant part of his argumentation revolves around Pompey, to whom both are closely attached as allies. After praising Pompey repeatedly and stressing the kind of *amicitia* that he has developed with him over the years, he even claims that he had Pompey's blessing in Milo's defence.⁷⁵ He, nonetheless, appeals to Appius' *ratio* by raising a valid question: would Cicero truly do anything that would jeopardize his relationship with such an important friend and ally (*Fam.* 3.10.10)?

The remainder of his strategy to achieve reconciliation is consistent with his previous efforts. It includes further strategic communication, highlighting their mutual enjoyment in reading each other's letters,⁷⁶ the pleasure Cicero derives from Appius' happiness,⁷⁷ and the important similarities in their character and political views that brought them together (*Fam.* 3.10.9). Additionally, Cicero employs courteous exaggeration (*Fam.* 3.10.9)⁷⁸ and offers praise of Appius.⁷⁹ Additionally, he blames again persons whom he does not name for their misunderstanding (*Fam.* 3.10.6–7). His invitation to Appius to follow his example and deny the existence of a real disagreement between them reaches its climax when he tells Appius that if he reads a letter in which he finds Cicero's language in any way insulting, he should simply assume that it is spurious (*Fam.* 3.11.5). His reference to

75 As Shackleton Bailey 2001, 328 n.9 observes, on the contrary, Pompey opposed Cicero's decision to defend Milo and his men even tried to intimidate Cicero to affect the outcome of the trial.

76 *Fam.* 3.1.2, 3.5.1, 3.11.1, 3.

77 *Fam.* 3.10.4. Brunt 1965, 3 notes that adjectives like *iucundus* and *suavis* are frequently used in reference to friendships between Romans in Cicero's time. Indeed, in his letters to Appius Cicero uses *iucundus* and *iucunditas* seven times: when he heard Appius' friendly sentiments towards him through Cilix (*Fam.* 3.1.2), in reference to Appius' pleasure from reading Cicero's letter (*Fam.* 3.5.1), to express his joy in learning that Appius can count on the support of a great number of people (*Fam.* 3.10.4), in his reference to their *amicitia* as a pleasure (*Fam.* 3.10.4), for the pleasure that he derives from his association with Pompey (*Fam.* 3.10.10), in reference to Appius' bond with Pompey's son as his father-in-law (*Fam.* 3.10.10) and for the pleasure of reading Appius' letter (*Fam.* 3.11.3). He also uses *suavis* and *suavitas* in four instances: in his expressed admiration for Appius (*Fam.* 3.1.1) as well as in reference to the dedication that Appius included in his book on augury that he gave Cicero (*Fam.* 3.4.1), to their personal friendship (*Fam.* 3.10.9), and to Appius' warm wishes for a happy marriage between Tullia and Dolabella (*Fam.* 3.12.2). Similar remarks can be found in his correspondence with Atticus concerning the pleasure that he experienced from reading Atticus' letters (*Att.* 9.6.5, 9.7.2, 9.9.1, 10.13.1, 12.39.2, 11.11.1, 12.4.1).

78 Miller 1914, 46 discusses Cicero's reference to Appius' censorship in the same letter and detects an intention to pay him a compliment, since he had not yet been elected censor. Shackleton Bailey 2001, 321 n. 4 provides a similar interpretation by arguing that it was a polite -and accurate- assumption that Appius would soon be elected.

79 *Fam.* 3.10.3, 3.11.2, 3.12.2. Gruen 1995, 354 notes that the letters that Cicero sent to Appius at the time were "excessively generous" with "exaggerated compliments".

their past exchange of services (*Fam.* 3.10.6) and his pledges for support (*Fam.* 3.10.1, 3.11.3, 5) are also a crucial part in Cicero's efforts to convince Appius to disarm his resentment, by reminding him of the utilitarian nature of their association. Seemingly in an attempt to complete their reconciliation and to make it official publicly once again, Cicero had asked Appius to complete his work on augury and send him a copy of it; seeing that Appius was preoccupied, he suggests that he writes it at a later time (*Fam.* 3.11.4).⁸⁰ Cicero's attempts to restore their relations were successful, as revealed in the last letter from their extant correspondence.⁸¹ He no longer has to explain himself to Appius, though he chooses to stress the dual nature of their *amicitia*, as a strong bond both publicly and privately (*Fam.* 3.13.2).

As the discussion has demonstrated, Cicero's reconciliation with Appius and the maintenance of an amicable relationship with him, both in public and in private, was a long and challenging process. Pompey played an integral role in their renewed association from the outset. He first compelled Cicero to reconcile with Appius, then closely monitored their public interactions, likely even by reviewing their letter exchanges, and later encouraged Cicero to repair the damage that Dolabella's prosecution had caused to their *amicitia*. Given Cicero's indebtedness to Pompey for his return to Rome in 57, and his desire to avoid jeopardizing his *amicitia* with both Pompey and Brutus, he chose to establish an *amicitia* with Appius that was grounded in strategic diplomacy. Appius could indubitably discern Cicero's tendency to bend the truth by depicting their relationship as both a strong alliance and an intimate friendship. Nevertheless, he preferred to follow his example by reciprocating the affection that Cicero was showing in their letters, though to a lesser extent than Cicero. Because of his family name and his connections, Appius acted as the superior friend in his *amicitia* with Cicero. He chastised

⁸⁰ Baraz 2012, 166 n.40 considers it unlikely that Appius ever completed it.

⁸¹ Tempest 2011, 154–155 also points out Cicero's remarkable ability to persuade men like Appius through his letters. Wilcox 2012, 28 attributes Cicero's success in maintaining an amicable relationship with Appius to the orator's "hard work" and perseverance. However, Lintott 2008, 260 raises an excellent point by noting that Appius' adoption of a more friendly attitude in his letters to Cicero before and while being prosecuted could have been a decision that he made in order to avoid antagonising Cicero, whose support he required against the charges that he was facing (*Fam.* 8.6.1). According to Gruen 1955, 354 Cicero also needed Appius' assistance, in order to return to Rome. Hall 2009, 152, 239 n.40 rejects the possibility that through his stern language and pointed remarks in his letters Cicero managed to change Appius' attitude, as he considers it more likely that some of Appius' associates in Rome influenced his perception of and disposition towards Cicero, after informing him about Cicero's conduct while he was governor of Cilicia. Similarly, Hoffer 2003, 101 displays caution in accepting that Cicero managed to reconcile his differences with Metellus Celer solely through their correspondence, as he argues that external circumstance likely played a part in their restoration of relations.

Cicero for the reports that he was receiving and expressed his dissatisfaction with him. In his letters to Appius, Cicero defends himself by expressing his thoughts with more frankness than one usually finds in Cicero's correspondence. He compares his refusal to believe any negative reports about Appius with Appius' tendency to trust the words of men who desired to create a rift between them. By openly addressing the issues that they had with each other's conduct, they were able to improve their relationship and achieve a more meaningful reconciliation. At the same time, being perfectly aware of the importance of appearances, Cicero used polite overstatement in his constant praise of Appius. He made several references to their services rendered and pledges for his political support of Appius. The volume on augury that Appius dedicated to Cicero was further testament of their restored relationship and of their commitment to each other. The public exchange of favours and Appius' gift allowed them to show a united front in the eyes of their allies, but also to enjoy each other's support, as their *amicitia* was indeed mutually beneficial. Ultimately, Cicero's letters to Appius reveal that their letter exchange aided their efforts for reconciliation significantly. It enabled Cicero to display deference to Appius and Pompey and to deny the reports that Appius was receiving. As a result, he was able to resolve his disputes with Appius without any apparent underlying strong feelings of resentment from either side.

Bibliography

- Baraz, Y. (2012), *A Written Republic: Cicero's Philosophical Politics*, Princeton.
- Bernard, J.-E. (2015), "Amitié et officium épistolaire: les lettres de Cicéron à P. Cornelius Lentulus Spinther", in: *Interférences* 8, 1–13.
- Bianay, M. (2014), *Atticus et ses amis: étude sur une politique de l'ombre au dernier siècle de la République*, PhD Diss., Université Paul Valéry Montpellier III.
- Brunt, P. A. (1965), "Amicitia in the Late Roman Republic", in: *Cambridge Classical Journal* 11, 1–20.
- Constans, L. A. (1921), *Un correspondant de Cicéron: Ap. Claudius Pulcher*, Paris.
- Dugan, J. (2014), "Non sine causa sine fine. Cicero's compulsion to repeat his consulate", in: *CJ* 110, 9–22.
- Evangelou, G. (2023), "Loss of self, desperation, and glimmers of hope in Cicero's letters from exile", in: I. Deligiannis (ed.), *Cicero in Greece, Greece in Cicero*, Berlin, 31–53.
- Fuhrmann, M. (1992), *Cicero and the Roman Republic*, Oxford.
- Gruen, E. S. (1995), *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*, Berkeley.
- Hall, J. (1996), "Cicero Fam. 5.8 and Fam. 15.5 in the light of modern politeness theory", in: *Antichthon* 30, 19–33.
- Hall, J. (2009), *Politeness and Politics in Cicero's Letters*, Oxford.
- Hellegouarc'h, J. (1963), *Le vocabulaire latin des relations et des partis politiques sous la République*, Paris.
- Hoffer, S. E. (2003), "Cicero's 'friendly disagreement' with Metellus Celer (Fam. 5.1–2)", in: *Scripta Classica Israelica* 22, 93–101.
- Hofmann, J. B. (1951), *Lateinische Umgangssprache*, Heidelberg.

- Hunter, L. W. (1913), "Cicero's journey to his province of Cilicia in 51 B.C.", in: *JRS* 3, 73–97.
- Hutchinson, G. O. (1998), *Cicero's Correspondence: A Literary Study*, Oxford.
- Konstan, D. (1997), *Friendship in the Classical World*, Cambridge.
- Lintott, A. W. (1968), *Violence in Republican Rome*, Oxford.
- Lintott, A. W. (2008), *Cicero as Evidence*, Oxford.
- Luibheid, C. (1970), "The Luca conference", in: *CPh* 65, 88–94.
- Miller, A. B. (1914), *Roman Etiquette of the Late Republic as Revealed by the Correspondence of Cicero*, Lancaster.
- Mitchell, T. N. (1979), *Cicero: The Ascending Years*, New Haven.
- Mitchell, T. N. (1991), *Cicero the Senior Statesman*, New Haven-London.
- Münzer, F. (1999), *Roman Aristocratic Parties and Families*, trans. by T. Ridley, Baltimore-London.
- Nicholson, J. (1992), *Cicero's Return from Exile. The Orations Post Reditum*, New York.
- Powell, J. G. F. (ed.) (1990), *Cicero, On Friendship and the Dream of Scipio*, Warminster.
- Rawson, B. (1978), *The Politics of Friendship: Pompey and Cicero*, Sydney.
- Rosillo-López, C. (2017), *Political Communication in the Roman World. Impact of Empire 27*, Leiden-Boston.
- Seager, R. (2002), *Pompey the Great: A Political Biography*, Oxford.
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R. (ed.) (1977), *Cicero, Epistulae Ad Familiares*, I, Cambridge.
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R. (ed.) (2001), *Cicero, Letters to Friends*, I, Cambridge, MA-London.
- Schuricht, R. (1994), *Cicero an Appius (Cic. fam. III): Umgangsformen in einer politischen Freundschaft*, Trier.
- Tatum, J. W. (1991), "The marriage of Pompey's son to the daughter of Ap. Claudius Pulcher", in: *Klio* 73, 122–129.
- Tatum, J. W. (1999), *The Patrician Tribune Publius Clodius Pulcher*, Chapel Hill-London.
- Tempest, K. (2011), *Cicero. Politics and Persuasion in Ancient Rome*, London-New York.
- Verboven, K. (2011), "Friendship among the Romans", in: M. Peachin (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Social Relations in the Roman World*, Oxford-New York, 404–421.
- Williams, C. A. (2012), *Reading Roman Friendship*, Cambridge.
- Wilcox, A. (2012), *The Gift of Correspondence in Classical Rome*, Madison.