

Dariusz Słapek
Maria Curie-Skłodowska University, Lublin
e-mail: slapekdariusz@gmail.com

**Lucius Antonius – *gladiator Asiaticus*.
Gladiatorial Episode Seen Through the Eyes
of M. Tullius Cicero**

In a theoretical reflection on the nature of the Roman invective, particularly the Ciceronian, masterly and simultaneously exemplary, exists a unique unanimity on its definition. This consensus appears to be obvious both in regards to the attempts at determining the fundamental structure of the invective and to its fundamental function¹. It is also in vain to see the important disputes in a compilation of subjects, contents (*loci*), issues, spheres and areas appropriate for the invective as tools for personal acts. At most, the invention, particularly of philological nature, of some of the scholars implies a subtle expansion in the mentioned range of substantive contents of this specific genre in relation to the ancient, Greek and Roman theory of *vituperatio*².

There is, however, a lack of consensus on the matter of relationship between invective and truth, nature of the genre and realisms, and historical reality. Discussion on this matter goes beyond strictly philological discourse because its effects prove to be the most important for historians. For it indeed revolves around credibility and reliability of the invective as a historical source. Within the context of this discourse dominated for a relatively long time a far-reaching skepticism³, which at times, however, is still and mostly based on a conviction that the invective was merely a part of political and judicial games, recalling constantly the same *topoi* but only with different severity and intensity of the attacks. Therefore, the invective has more convention, formalization and

¹ Koster 1980, 39; Novokhatko 2009, 12–13; Geffcken 1973, 66; Arena 2007, 149–150; Corbeill 2002, 199–200. Relatively complete review of the definition is given by Hammar 2013, 58.

² Novokhatko 2009, 13–14; Craig 2004, 188–190; Corbeill 2002, 200–201; Koster 1980, 16–21; Nisbet 1961, 192–197; Süß 1975, 245–262; Merrill 1975, 203–204; Opelt 1965, 129–164; Achard 1981, 186–355.

³ See e.g. the opinions already formulated by Syme 1939, 151; Pocock 1926, 80; Gruen 1974, 137.

rhetorical performances, first and foremost calculated to evoke specifically defined emotions of – the generally educated in the art of that specific “sophistic eristic” – audience than to care for reality. Thus, seeking truth in it is as risky a task as historical verification of motives and themes (events, situations, personalities, characters) present in the Greek comedy, Roman satire and epigrams, and even in the street *graffito*⁴.

It is, however, worth to notice in the invective the presence of at least a substitute of truth, which Anthony Corbeill, in his way of estimating its presence while following Nisbet, described as *plausibility*. For the greater is this plausibility of evoking truth in the invective, the greater is the power of *vituperatio* persuasion, and a kind of “power of influence”, effectiveness and productivity of its usage increase. Public dimension of the invective instigated a situation in which even a mere suspicion of this “plausibility”, dressed in a costume of invective, turned out to be an effective weapon particularly in a political struggle. It constituted an important tool for public censorship, exclusion, humiliation and stigmatization of those whose even *possible* behaviours, deeds and attitudes violated commonly accepted norms of the Roman social life. Thus, the Roman recipients and addressees of the invective received *à rebours* the essence of qualities and canons of behaviour, which were approved and promoted amongst the elites. Therefore, only seemingly perverse is Corbeill’s suggestion that believing in the truth of the attacks included in the invective can turn it into effective means not so much of political struggle only, but of the aforementioned process of excluding and simultaneously accentuating the important role of codes of behaviour, accepted amongst the elite class. In his view, the invective consequently becomes a *moral teaching*⁵.

Although Corbeill’s “cultural perspective” refers only to the Roman evaluation of the invective’s credibility (in fact, the audience’s belief in the truth of the allegations) and his studies do not substantially change the attitude of modern scholars towards the historical reliability of *vituperatio*⁶, his innovative approach in the exegesis of the genre has done a lot in enlivening and promoting, in general already interdisciplinary (i.e. not only purely philological) explorations of the invective as an original histori-

⁴ Nisbet 1961, 192ff. Cf. Novokhatko 2009, 14, *All too often, convincing was more important than the truth of the accusations. At the same time though, the orator wished to elicit pleasure and to amuse his audience*, and 15, *Roman invective had a conventional character and did not pay much attention to historical truth*. On variously explained, but still secondary or even marginal importance of the *historical responsibility* of the invective, see: Craig 2007, 336; Craig 2004, 195–197; Ruffell 2003, 48; Riggsby 1997, 247–248; Arena 2007, 157; Powell 2006, 1–23; Corbeill 2002, 198.

⁵ Corbeill, 1996, *passim*; Corbeill 2002, 198, 204, 211.

⁶ Cf. Craig 2004, 196, *While invective charges need not be perceived as true, invective charges that are perceived as true have a deeper impact on the audience*.

cal source. In a short presentation of a relatively up-to-date state of research on the Roman invective, Christopher Craig regards the method and methodology of Corbeil as innovative and worthy of following. On the other hand, Isak Hammar rightly emphasizes that without *Controlling Laughter. Political Humor in the Late Roman Republic* (Princeton 1996) there would be no modern studies on the Roman ethics, system of values, morality and even sexuality⁷.

The prospect of implementing otherwise fascinating research subjects can be, however, responsible for pushing to the margins somewhat traditional studies, often only causative, on the credibility of the invective. For Corbeil's studies concern the invectives *in gremio* as a specific genre within a source, which should rather never be taken literally, but almost always a bit perversely, non-literally and a little awry. This approach towards the invective is often based on the a priori assumption of, to say the least, the lack of truth in a statement, opinion or judgement⁸. It is, at the same time, forgotten that particularly in the interpretation of Cicero's legacy not all of the personal attacks present in his speeches were, and thus should be still treated as, invectives. Many of the *acts of criticism* can recall real events, realistic situations and, therefore, it is easier to treat them, if only to make some kind of distinction, as a form of *ad hominem* attack⁹.

It seems that interesting observations on that matter are brought by a series of Cicero's information on Lucius Antonius¹⁰, Marcus' brother, as an Asiatic gladiator:

⁷ Craig 2004, 195–197; Hammar 2013, 59–64; particularly 63, where the new approach towards the invective is treated by Hammar as a crucial in understanding Roman culture and politics and, extremely important, (61) to analyze gender, identity and elite anxieties. The necessity to sever a little futile development of, almost exclusively, all sorts of invectives in the studies is postulated also by Tatum 2011, 167 and Steel 2006, 124.

⁸ *Vituperationes* evoke distrust due to their exaggerations and extremes, even though at times these characteristics are ascribed to them only rationally and largely due to common sense since their uniqueness and originality (in terms of content) very often escape verification. In this situation it is possible to refer, particularly on the part of historians, to a kind of *hypersensitivity to invective*.

⁹ Powell 2006, 2.

¹⁰ The case of this historical figure in the context of reflecting on the informative (historical) qualities of invective seems so be all the more important because the political biography of Lucius Antonius – from the perspective of being the most significant, as well as immediate source, enunciation of Cicero – is possible to be reconstructed to a large extent on the basis of the *vituperations*, which are present in the Philippics. There is a lot of correct arguments in the words of Gabba 1971, 146; when it comes to the youngest of the Antonii: *His personality and his political objectives have been partially deformed by Augustan propaganda and historiography, which tended to present him either as a mere instrument...* Similarly, Roddaz 1988, 317. Perhaps this is the reason for rather scanty interest in this historical figure in historiography. The outline of Lucius' life, born most probably between 83 and 81 BC, is also being strongly marginalized in the biographies about Marcus Antonius (i.e. Roberts 1988; Weigall 1931; Pasquali 2009, Southern 1998). Greater interest in the life of the triumvir's younger brother takes place only when he obtained the position of the tribune of the plebs in 44 BC. Cf. Roddaz 1988, 317–346; Nicolet 1985, 799–839; Gabba 1971, 139–160. The exception is the article by Merkelbach

3, 12, 31, *In Galliam mutilatum ducit exercitum, cum una legione, et ea vacillante, L. fratrem expectat, quo neminem reperire potest sui similiorem. Ille autem ex myrmillone dux, ex gladiatore imperator quas effecit strages, ubicumque posuit vestigium!*

5, 7, 20, *Quo die si per amicos mihi cupienti in senatum venire licuisset, caedis initium fecisset a me (sic enim statuerat); cum autem semel gladium scelere imbuisset, nulla res ei finem caedendi nisi defatigatio et satietas attulisset. Etenim aderat Lucius frater, gladiator Asiaticus, qui myrmillo Mylasis depugnarat; sanguinem nostrum sitiabat, suum in illa gladiatoria pugna multum profuderat.*

5, 11, 30, *Lucius quidem frater eius, utpote qui peregre depugnarit, familiam ducit. Sit per se ipse ,sanus, quod numquam erit; per hos esse ei tamen non licebit.*

6, 4, 10, *Quid? ipse si velit, num etiam Lucium fratrem passurum arbitramur? Nuper quidem dicitur ad Tibur, ut opinor, cum ei labare M. Antonius videretur, mortem fratri esse minitatus. Etiamne ab hoc myrmillone Asiatico senatus mandata, legatorum verba audientur? Nec enim secerni a fratre poterit, tanta praesertim auctoritate. Nam hic inter illos Africanus est.*

6, 5, 13, *In foro L. Antoni statuam videmus, sicut illam Q. Tremuli, qui Hernicos devicit, ante Castoris. O impudentiam incredibilem! Tantumne sibi sumpsit, quia Mylasis myrmillo Thraecem iugulavit familiarem suum? quonam modo istum ferre possemus, si in hoc foro spectantibus vobis depugnasset?*

7, 6, 16–18, *Gracchorum potentiam maiorem fuisse arbitramini, quam huius gladiatoris futura sit? quem gladiatorem non ita appellavi, ut interdum etiam M. Antonius gladiator appellari solet, sed ut appellant ii, qui plane et Latine loquuntur. Myrmillo in Asia depugnavit! Cum ornasset thraecidicis comitem et familiarem suum, illum miserum fugientem iugulavit, luculentam tamen ipse plagam accepit, ut declarat cicatrix. Qui familiarem iugularit, quid hic occasione data faciet inimico? et qui illud animi causa fecerit, hunc praedae causa quid facturum putatis?*

12, 8, 20, *Atque idem hic myrmillo Asiaticus, latro Italiae...*

The *gladiator* invective used by Cicero was given quite a lot of attention in the context of both philological and historical studies. The conclusions from these investigations seem to be rather obvious: the epithet is used at the beginning exclusively for judicial and then also political enemies of Cicero¹¹. This

1997, 228–231, even though, to a greater extent, it concerns the functioning of the Roman provincial administration rather than Lucius Antonius. Cf. Campanille 2007, 129–134.

¹¹ For the *Ciceronian gladiators* from his early judicial speeches, see: Imholtz 1972, 228–230; Ville 1981, 342–343; Hammar 2013, 125–127.

invective, based on the Roman ambivalence towards gladiators¹², is relatively easily subjected to a symbolic interpretation. *Ciceronian gladiators* constitute a kind of accumulation of all evil because what stands behind them – in a metaphoric sense – is violence, inclination to murder, brutality and cruelty, social degeneration and moral decay, irrational, bordering on madness, audacity, greed, all depravity, barbarian impulse and impetuosity, a hangman dripping in blood, mugger, cutthroat and bandit... In this regard, it is probably possible to talk about the universality of connotations of this term-epithet and the aims of its usage¹³. Cicero's enemies are also the enemies of the country and all lawfulness, the principles unaffectedly guarded by the Orator. Thus, this invective, a kind of a label or costume for all dangerous enemies, perfectly fits into the Ciceronian "rhetoric of crisis", practiced by the Orator not only in the *Philippics*¹⁴. Legible intentions of the Orator made Cicero invoke this invective relatively frequently, a fact in any case easily noticed by modern scholars. They unanimously emphasize a relatively high frequency or even regularity in using this invective, Cicero's broad knowledge in the field of gladiatorial games and – deriving from exceptional familiarity with the topic – logic in and consequences of applying the epithet *gladiator*. Thence derive opinions about, in a way, favoring this measure for personal attacks, quite universally regarded as one of the most favorite of Cicero's *oratorical situations*¹⁵. It seems that while presenting the Orator's at-

¹² For the whole range of feelings and extreme emotions, from admiration to contempt, and for the reasons for extreme attitudes towards gladiators more broadly, see: Barton 1993, 35nn; Wiedemann 1992, 27ff, 34–39; Carter 1999, 38; Pietsch 1999, 373–378; Robert 1940, 302–305; Ville 1981, 255ff, 339–343; Lendon 1997, 96–99.

¹³ Therefore, it is probably not worth searching for the reasons of using this particular invective in some specific fragments of the speeches, finding them only in a relatively narrow context of Cicero's gladiatorial recollections present in the *Philippics*. Cf. i.e. Mahy 2009, 143, who states that one of the invectives against Marcus Antonius (*Phil.*, 5, 10) was present in this particular part of the speech because Cicero really wanted to have *leges Antoniae* rejected. See also Mahy 2009, 317. A more convincing approach seems to be that of Lessie 2015, 25–26, in accordance to which gladiatorial epithets *in gremio* create a general vision of Antonius' carnality since they blend perfectly even with his physical strength (cf. Huzar 1978, 23). Probably the invectives more often created a general idea about their *characters* than they proved to be useful only in chosen and specific circumstances.

¹⁴ Hall 2002, 283.

¹⁵ This consequence can be seen in comparison to the type of invective which was successively directed against the fiercest political enemies of Cicero – Catiline, Clodius and Marcus Antonius. Cf. Denniston 1926, 95; Opelt 1965, 136; Achard 1981, 70, 341–342; Pina Polo 1991, 147, 149; May 1996, 143–153; Monteleone 2003, 74; Ramsey 2003, 171; Corbeill 2008, 241, 243; Evans 2008, 72; Mahy 2009, 104, 143; Martin 2011, 136–138; Hammar 2013, 125–127; Ott 2013, 123, 324; Ferriès 2014, 349; 360; Lessie 2015, 29, 187–188. Manuwald 2007, 387, lists a total of 11 cases, the vast majority of which is present in the *Philippics*, referring to Marcus Antonius as a *gladiator*. Slightly different and more detailed statistics in this regard are presented by Martin 2011, 141. Hence, Ferriès 2014, p. 359, states that *Antoine est le premier à être gratifié d'une robustesse de gladiateur*.

tention to this invective, it is not enough to rely only on statistics and, in a sense, esthetic categories, for some of Cicero's speeches were created with a clear usage of gladiatorial fights (or other motives strongly associated with *munera gladiatoria*) as an important element in their construction and composition¹⁶.

It seems that the substitutes for gladiatorial theatricality, a kind of *modeling of the communication situation*, as Axer refers to it, and the building of bridges between a political fight and amphitheatric arena, could be also noticed in the Philippics¹⁷. Spectacular interactions can be seen quite clearly, if one is to consequently analyze all of the gladiatorial hints present in these speeches. Cicero found a reason (or rather an inspiration instead of an excuse) for doing so because Antonius referred to him as a *lanista* (*Phil.*, 13, 19, 40)¹⁸. He accepted this convention – he came to terms with a rather strange creation, acquiescently accepting the role of a rational owner and trainer of gladiators¹⁹. However, his cautious actions were to bring death only to evil and formidable gladiators: *'quibus, utri nostrum ceciderint, lucro futurum est, quod spectaculum adhuc ipsa Fortuna vitavit, ne videret unius corporis duas acies lanista Cicerone dimicantis, qui usque eo felix est, ut isdem ornamentis deceperit vos, quibus deceptum Caesarem gloriatus est.'* *Pergit in me maledicta, quasi vero ei pulcherrime priora processerint; quem ego inustum verissimis maledictorum notis tradam hominum memoriae sempiternae. Ego lanista? Et quidem non insipiens; deteriores enim iugulari cupio, meliores vincere. 'Utri ceciderint', scribit, 'lucro nobis futurum'*²⁰. While playing a bit with the *ethos of a gladiator*, the Orator divides the *warriors*, present and active on the political arena, into those who are better and those who are worse (*meliores* versus *deteriores*), the valuable and those deserving contempt: *Quodsi iam, quod di omen avertant! fatum extremum rei publicae venit, quod gladiatores nobiles faciunt, ut honeste*

¹⁶ Axer 1989, 299–31; Axer 1989a, 31–43; Słapek 1998, 37–50.

¹⁷ Axer 1989. Small elements, episodes of gladiatorial spectacle in the Philippics are noticed by Lessie 2015, 30. The entirety of the theatrics is to a large extent included in the canon of a contrafactual story (in the narrative on *what would have happened if...*). On this curious rhetorical method practiced by Cicero see: Orlandini 2002 209–224.

¹⁸ Cicero *lanista* is mentioned only in *Phil.*, 13, but it seems that publically it had come from Marcus Antonius much earlier, Cic., *Phil.*, 2, 1, 1. Cf. Słapek 1992, 141–154. Also earlier, Antonius described Octavian as Spartacus, *Phil.*, 3, 8, 21. This could be some evidence that gladiatorial theatrics did not appear *ad hoc*, but was a rather carefully considered matter and it represented the implementation of a certain concept. Cf. Monteleone 2003 74–75; Hall, 2002, 287. More broadly on the fact that Antonius did not remain idle in the face of Cicero's attacks see: Scott, 1929, 133–141; Charlesworth 1933, 172–177; Huzar 1982, 639–657; Mahy 2013, 329–344;

¹⁹ Earlier, *Phil.*, 2, 3, 7, Cicero declares that he is ready to undertake the role of a gladiator. Ferriès 2014, 359, emphasizes that Antonius' circles are never referred to as *milites*, but *latrones* and *gladiatores*.

²⁰ *Phil.*, 13, 19, 40.

*decumbant, faciamus nos principes orbis terrarum gentiumque omnium, ut cum dignitate potius cadamus quam cum ignominia serviamus*²¹. Cicero unequivocally puts himself at the front of the former group and in the role of their commander he appeals to tighten the ranks of courageous senators-gladicators, who, under Cicero the *lanista*²², are willing to give up their lives for their fatherland in the fight against Marcus Antonius-Spartacus (*Phil.*, 4, 6, 14; 13, 10, 22), the leader of gladicators (13, 9, 20) and another one of their leaders, Lucius (*Phil.*, 3, 12, 31; 5, 11, 30). The potential place of the engagement, the blood-stained arena of a duel, can be the Forum Romanum (*Phil.*, 2, 21; 6, 5, 13). In order to finish this, necessarily only laconic, presentation of arguments in favor of the theatre created by Cicero and played in the amphitheatric entourage, it is worth emphasizing that the division of roles deriving from his screenplay fits perfectly into the abovementioned *rhetoric of crisis*²³, which is primary for the Philippics.

Gladiatorial theatrics, even if once again used by the Orator (perhaps already as a kind of repetitive, somewhat proved convention²⁴) and, after all, based on a sort of amphitheatric knowledge or sensitivity of its spectators (and its creator!), does not mean, however, that the gladicators, Lucius and Marcus, are the same to each other only because they are both the effect of an identical rhetorical creation. Differences in this picture should not be obscured by rather obvious observations that Cicero's gladiatorial epithets are consequently directed against both brothers. From the eristic point of view, turning *gladiature*²⁵ into a *family affair* only enhances Cicero's power of persuasion in terms of disgraceful intentions and plans of his enemies.²⁶

²¹ Cic., *Phil.*, 3, 14, 35. It seems that Cicero refers to this concept of conflict between the good and evils ones in his appeal in *Phil.*, 7, 5, 14: *Quod si non possumus facere, (dicam, quod dignum est et senatore et Romano homine) moriamur* and the vision displayed in *Phil.*, 13, 19, 41. On the concept of *nobilis gladiator*, Monteleone 2003, 99.

²² Hall 2013, 223 and 228, pointed out that in many creations of Cicero as a savior of the fatherland (*Phil.*, 2, 12; 2, 2; 2, 17; 2, 60), there is an interesting motif of a *dux togatus* (*Phil.*, 2, 13), which probably constitutes some kind of a rhetorical figure, which refers to the phrase concerning Lucius: *ex myrmillone dux* (*Phil.*, 3, 31).

²³ It seems that this kind of *spectacle* is more adequate for the *rhetoric of crisis* than equally theatrical creations, the effect of the invective achieved by the comical caricature, captured in the Philippics by Sussman 1998, 114–128; Sussman 1994, 53–83.

²⁴ The argument on the uniqueness of the attack on Lucius is not weakened by Cicero's use of a similar repertoire of gladiatorial terms, concepts, ideas and metaphors, which are present also in his previous speeches. Imholtz 1972, 288ff, proved e.g. the development in the Philippics of previously used and identical motives. In *Pis.*, 27, Cicero declares also a fight against two gladicators, which resembles the conflict between the Orator and the Antonii.

²⁵ *Gladiature* is a French term (used by George Ville 1981), an *épitome*, which describes *munera gladiatoria* as a wide phenomenon, social, cultural and political institution.

²⁶ Lessie 2015, 29. The fact that all the Antonii and their colleagues are the object of Cicero's attack in the Philippics is indisputable. Cicero often mentions, literally and metaphorically, the

Cicero's words from the Philippics show, in a rather unambiguous way, the fundamental difference between the nature of Cicero's gladiatorial accusations of Marcus Antonius, undoubtedly the invective and unrefined epithets, and the Orator's attacks against Lucius Antonius (*Phil.*, 7, 6, 16): *Do you think that the power of even the Gracchi was greater than that of this gladiator will be? whom I have called gladiator, not in the sense in which sometimes Marcus Antonius too is called gladiator, but as men call him who are speaking plain Latin. He has fought in Asia as a mirmillo. After having equipped his own companion and intimate friend in the armour of a Thracian, he slew the miserable man as he was flying; but he himself received a palpable wound, as the scar proves*²⁷.

Some scholars regarded the abovementioned explanations of Cicero as so convincing that they had no doubts about treating Lucius Antonius' fight at the arena as a fact, an actual event. For them it was, therefore, fully justified to refer to the triumvir's brother as a gladiator. It ceased to be an invective and became information, a confirmation of a real situation or rather an allusion to an actual event²⁸. George Ville's opinions in this regard were not based, however, on a meticulous analysis of the Philippics, but only on finding the analogy to an event associated with Lucius in the realities and the state of development of the contemporary Roman *gladiatura*, as well as on shreds of information about the beginnings of Lucius' magisterial career²⁹. *Per analogiam* inference is, however, always carrying a serious risk...

house of the Antonii, *Phil.*, 2, 3, 6; 2, 27, 67; 3, 4, 10; 5, 4, 11; 5, 4, 12, the entire family, *Phil.*, 5, 11, 30; 7, 6, 16. Particularly important in this regard are the words: *Nostis insolentiam Antoni, nostis amicos, nostis totam domum*, Cic., *Phil.*, 3, 14, 34. See also: *Phil.*, 5, 11, 29. It is, however, worth noting that Cicero mentions the two brothers as gladiators at once in only one instance (*Phil.*, 7, 6, 16). On the Antonii and their attendants as the object of the attack in the Philippics see particularly Ferriès 2014, 347–368; Achard 1981, 239–247. This multiplication of enemies certainly enhanced the picture of their threats. Cf. Manuwald 2007, 625; Roddaz 1988, 330; Hall 2002, 284; Myers 2003, 342–344; Hammar 2013, 299, 310.

²⁷ Transl. by C.D. Yonge; M. Tullius Cicero, *The Orations of Marcus Tullius Cicero*, London 1903.

²⁸ Cicero mentioned only one performance of Lucius at the arena with certainty. I also leave out speculations concerning the fact whether it was possible to be a *real gladiator* only episodically, incidentally turning into the role, or meet also other demands of the given profession, if only due to the regularity of performances. It is hoped that in this specific case the *status* of Lucius as a gladiator did not turn out to raise doubts amongst Cicero's audience, even if the combat of the former at the arena was a mere incident. Numerous repeating of the information on this event could have given the impression that Lucius indeed was a gladiator. The historicity of the event, and thus the informative (allusive) nature of Cicero's account (*Phil.*, 7, 6, 16) is accepted by Ville 1981, 343, who states that the concept of the invective *on ne citera pas, en revanche, l'usage de l'épithète gladiator ou myrmillo à l'égard de L. Antonius: elle n'a pas de valeur métaphorique mais constitue une allusion au combat de gladiateur livré par ce dernier à Mylasa*.

²⁹ Ville 1981, 255, 380. Ville's suggestions were followed by other scholars: Carter 1999, 34–35; Mann 2009, 50; Ferriès 2014, 359; Martin 2011, 139. As evidence of the historicity of the events in Mylasa, Manuwald 2007, 625, recognized only the fact that Lucius Antonius was a quaestor and proquaestor in Asia in 50/49 BC (more broadly on the beginnings of Lucius'

Quite a lot of significant doubts still remain when the truth about Lucius-gladiator is searched for also in the Philippics themselves. Cicero's information comes, after all, from a politician in whose interest it was to convince the audience about the credibility of each referenced or recalled event. Secondly, any information about Lucius' gladiatorial episode has only Ciceronian provenance and it is difficult to verify it on the basis of other sources. Cicero's credibility seems to depreciate also the fact that the Orator mentioned Lucius' act evidently *post factum*; somehow he refreshed the memory about it a few years after the episode was repeatedly referenced³⁰. It is also worth noting that an important comment on the earlier (i.e. present in the Third to the Sixth Philippics, which points out also to the chronology of information reaching Cicero's audience) and rather casual information on Lucius-gladiator, appeared only in the Seventh Philippic. It seems that these observations, particularly the scattering of gladiatorial information regarding Lucius throughout a few speeches³¹, could have become a reason for many scholars to treat the reliable information of the Orator

magisterial career in: Roddaz 1988, 325–329; Broughton 1952, 332–333; Nicolet 1985, 816). Ferriès 2014, 359, is convinced by the scale of the presence of technical details concerning Lucius' combat in the Philippics. Merkelbach 1997, 228–231, in fact assumed the historicity of the event. He trusted the fact that the information, numerously repeated by Cicero, about the combat of Lucius made it real, and it was authenticated by additional information about the impetuosity of the youngest of the Antonii, who supposedly threatened to kill Marcus Antonius (*Phil.*, 6, 4, 10). This assumption turned out to be an introduction to identifying an anonymous person, high-born magistrate, whose governance in the province of Asia became considered irresponsible and undignified. A person unknown by name appeared in Cicero's correspondence with the governor of Asia, Quintus Minucius Thermus, (*Fam.*, 2, 18, 2) and in the official letter directed by Thermus to the diocese of the province of Asia (see: Herrmann 1997, 155–156). Merkelbach 1997, linked the criticized, anonymous person from the two letters with Lucius Antonius, whose gladiatorial and scandalous episode known from the Philippics was to become a reason for hostility towards Lucius, which was visible in both formal as well as official correspondence. The hypothesis is not entirely convincing, cf. Carter 1999, 35. For Roddaz 1988, 330, it is *d'un obscur épisode*, which became a reason for Cicero's hostility towards Lucius, although *Il est difficile d'apporter plus de témoignages sur ces faits qui peuvent paraître bien anodins et difficiles à vérifier*.

³⁰ On the other hand, he instantly recorded the shameful event, contemporary with the gladiatorial adventure of Lucius, of fraternizing, as he called it, of the son of Hortensius with gladiators in Laodicea, which was, after all, not too far away from Mylasa, Cic., *Att.*, 6, 3, 9 (a letter from 50 BC). This information, together with the series of those concerning Lucius, gives an inducement to the opinion that the two men were not so much taking part in the public gladiatorial games, but their contacts with gladiators (of what nature?) were limited only to the studies of swordsmanship. Ville 1981, 255, approaches this suggestion with great caution, but it is nevertheless accepted by Carter 1999, 35, 57; Ferriès 2014, 359. Cf. Wiedemann 1992, 27–28. It is generally accepted that Lucius' duel took place in 50 BC, when the youngest of the Antonii was a quaestor in the province of Asia. See n. 28.

³¹ This scattering can persuade to their partial interpretation only within the context of individual Philippics. Their selective treatment can become, however, a certain trap. Cf. n. 13. Therefore, it should be assumed that only their holistic analysis can give a chance for different reading of the nature of Cicero's enunciation on Lucius.

still as invective, some form of rather conventional *ad hominem* attack, a kind of mockery or irony³².

In search of truth about Lucius' youthful episode, it is at first worth to stay close to the analysis which is partially internal because it is limited to the Philippics only. The first of the abovementioned doubts can be resolved most easily as the effectiveness of recalling facts and manipulating them is certainly stronger not only from the efficiency entangled in conventions and only conjectural invective (generally more fruitful in any other discourse of political nature)³³. There is no way to find information other than that given by Cicero, which could be the basis for verifying the gladiatorial episode of Lucius, and which could directly, but independently from the Orator, confirm the participation, particularly of a young, still poorly recognized and aspiring magistrate, in gladiatorial games³⁴.

It seems, however, that it is possible to undertake other attempts to justify why Cicero placed the explanations about the episode in Mylasa (Milas) practically at the very end of the entire sequence recalling *gladiatura* associated with Lucius (the last one, *Phil.*, XII, 8, 20, in relation to the previous, brings nothing new to the case and is clearly a derivative of the earlier examples). It should be considered that this could happen, if anything, for the reasons of composition. Cicero would find it more difficult to use similar epithets towards Antonius (starting with the Second Philippic) if the comment, the gloss, on Lucius was done much earlier, i.e. in this very Philippic. With such measure he would *explicite* admit that the allegations against Marcus Antonius were just ordinary, excogitated on the basis of his behaviour, attitude, physiognomy and personality, calumnies and slanders. With the scale and frequency, with which this invective was applied against the two brothers, the constantly repeated explanation of who and what kind of gladiator one was, would have been very awkward...³⁵.

³² See e.g. Mahy 2013, 313, who thinks that *Cicero's other means of attack against Lucius in this speech employs mockery*. Achard 1981, 342, states that Cicero only compares Lucius to a gladiator: *son frère Lucius qui est comparé à un myrtillo*. Craig 2004, 18, writes: *In this essay, the terms 'ad hominem attack', 'ad hominem argument', and 'invective' are used interchangeably*. However, it is sometimes worth to diversify the used terminology.

³³ See Ramsey's opinion 2004, 162, that *the best propaganda is the exaggeration of a known or credible element*.

³⁴ The occurrence of a likely recollection of this event in another speech of Cicero, *De prov. cons.*, 9, 5, is not a strong argument because it can only prove the Orator's consequence in his presentation of Lucius. Grill 2015, 139, however, believes that the expression *tamquam aliquam Thraecem*, present in the abovementioned speech, as a reminiscence of Cicero's attack on *gladiator-Lucius* from the Philippics. The weakness of this argumentations lies, however, mainly in the fact that in Mylasa, Lucius fought as a *myrtillo* and his anonymous opponent was a *thraex*...

³⁵ It is therefore difficult to fully agree with the opinion of Lessie 2015, p. 29, that *Cicero buttresses his identification of Antony as a gladiator by asserting that the cultivation*

It appears that Cicero differentiated these pictures more subtly. There are seven instances when he talks directly and straightforwardly about Lucius-gladiator/myrmillo, indicating who he was/is. In relation to Antonius, on the other hand, he more often used adjectives, metaphors, and connotations, pairs of synonyms, which were blunt and unambiguous in their meaning. In this way, spectacular and effective for stimulating imagination, he described the characteristics and personality of Marcus (in fact answering the question about what the eldest of the brothers is like)³⁶. Besides, there is a conformity in the interpretation of these vivid descriptions – they are there to illustrate, to convince about Antonius' audacity, his crazy behaviours, brutality, cruelty and determination. *Gladiature* does not seem to be in the center of the attack against Marcus for it is a metaphorical method of presenting the nature of Cicero's mortal enemy, the nature thoroughly different from the traditional Roman virtues and value system. A *gladiator* is only a peculiar, *speaking nickname* of the future triumvir. It turns out to be just one of the puzzles, which serves to present Marcus as *furiosus*, *homo audax*, *infamis*, *tyrannus*, a figure from outside of the Roman world³⁷.

of gladiatorial attire, physiques, and behavior is a family affair; he claims that Antony's brother Lucius took up the armor and accoutrements of a myrmillo and killed a man outfitted as a thrax while in Asia Minor. At the same time, it is undoubted that there is an interesting feedback between gladiatorial depictions of Marcus and Lucius because the sense of the former is difficult to analyze without the depiction of *Lucius-myrmillo*. It can be still assumed that gladiatorial creation of Marcus is to constitute the credibility of the episode in Mylasa. In this part of the Philippics, Lucius is, after all, the main target for the attack. It is also worth noting, however, that Marcus is ultimately the symbolic leader of gladiators (or rather the fraternal and gladiatorial duumvirate), *Phil.*, 13, 9, 20, *ad latronum gladiatorem ducem*, (cf. *Phil.*, 10, 22), despite the fact that before *myrmillone dux*, who *familiam ducit* was Lucius (respectively *Phil.*, 3, 12, 31 and 5, 11, 30).

³⁶ See *Phil.*, 2, 3, 7, *cum uno gladiatore nequissimo*; 2, 25, 63, *ista gladiatoria totus corporis firmitate...*; 2, 29, 74, *Tam bonus gladiator rudem tam cito?*; 3, 7, 18, *at etiam gladiator ausus est*; 4, 6, 15; *Est igitur populo Romano, victori omnium gentium, omne certamen cum percussore, cum latrone, cum Spartaco*; 5, 4, 10, *omnisque audacia gladiatoris amentis auctoritate nostra repudiando est*; 5, 12, 32, *Quae si erunt facta, opinio ipsa et fama nostrae severitatis obruet scelerati gladiatoris amentiam*; 13, 7, 16, *unus furiosus gladiator cum taeterrimorum latronum*; 13, 11, 25, *contra crudelissimi gladiatoris amentiam*. This repertoire of epithets associated with Marcus Antonius-gladiator is precisely a repetition of rhetorical tools which served to attack Clodius or Catiline. There are no extraordinarily original characteristics which would differentiate the Philippics from Cicero's earlier speeches. See e.g.: Pina Polo 1991, 146, 149; Ville 1981, 342–343; Imholtz 1972, 228ff; Craig 2004, 206–213. See also n. 15. It seems that the power or reprimanding and stigmatizing adjectives (e.g. *Phil.*, 2, 63, 28, *ista gladiatoria totius corporis firmitate*) is relatively weaker; something which is only gladiatorial in nature is used, at most, for some comparative measures, although it undoubtedly triggers imagination.

³⁷ Respectively, Lessie 2015, 29, 187–188; Ferriès 2014, 358 Hammar 2013, 295–299; Hall 2002, 287; Mahy 2009, 129, 317. Cf. Achard 1981, 342, who unambiguously treats referring to someone as Spartacus as the epithet *improbis*, *latro* or *percussor*.

The situation about gladiatorial reminiscences concerning Lucius looks thoroughly different. In this case, the Orator does not use epithets and comparisons similar to those used against Marcus. It seems that (particularly in the fragments of *Phil.* 5, 7, 20; 6, 5, 13; 7, 6, 16–18) he, first and foremost, tries to speak and manipulate facts. Authentication of the episode takes place first of all through the presentation of increasingly large number of details which answer the essential questions: who, when, in exactly what role, and with what result was taking part in the recalled event³⁸.

Cicero leaves out only the time of the event. However, it can be assumed that this kind of identifications of the episode – considering the unequivocal qualification of the act (fighting as a gladiator was in itself a shameful act) – had a secondary meaning for him³⁹. It seems that in this respect, the Orator could trust and rely on the memory of his audience. For it is once again worth to consider why the unambiguous and final declaration of Cicero (made in the fragment 7, 6, 16–18) appeared relatively late. It is difficult to agree that already the chronologically first epithet directed against Lucius, *ex myrmillone dux, ex gladiatore imperator* (*Phil.*, 3, 12, 31), would turn out to be a communicational *false start*. The lack of understanding from Cicero's audience of that first and extremely clever rhetorical figure⁴⁰, would have forced the Orator to stumble, with a consequent development of this motif, into a further loss of contact with this audience. The axis and center of Cicero's supposition had to be recognizable. The Orator assumed that in the pivotal point of his attack against Lucius he would remind only the details of the event, which, from the perspective of its ultimate sense, had to be, however, firmly stuck on his audience's mind⁴¹. Before the speech was given, there had not been,

³⁸ The only adjective referring to *Lucius-gladiator* is *Asiaticus*, see: *Phil.*, 5, 7, 20; 6, 4, 10; 12, 8, 20.

³⁹ It would be in vain to assume that Cicero did not know when Lucius had fought in Mylasa as a gladiator, taking into consideration the Orator's surprisingly broad knowledge on many details of this event. Cf. Ferriès 2014, 359.

⁴⁰ Its importance is emphasised by Manuwald 2007, 437. He correctly considers the *intensified repetition* as a spectacular presentation of both the disgraceful beginning of Lucius' metamorphosis as well as the poor qualities of his military competence. *Dux improbus* is for Cicero a term for describing commanders who threaten the safety of the state, cf. Achard 1981, 342–343. Clodius as *rex*, see Tatum 1999, 190–191. It seems that the accuracy of this repetition inspired other, later authors: Eutropius, 4, 16, *Viriatus, ex latrone dux Celtiberorum* and particularly Florus, 2, 8, 8, on Spartacus' career: *de stipendiario Thrace miles, de milite desertor, inde latro, deinde in honorem uirium gladiator*.

⁴¹ On extraordinary frequent need for Cicero's interaction with his audience, see e.g. Manuwald 2004, 53–71; Jakob 2007, 293–311. On *collective memory*, which was often referenced by Cicero, see Pieper 2014, 42–69; Gowing 2005, particularly 15. The role of social control over the elites' behaviours is exposed by Corbeil 2002, 197–217. It is already worth mentioning that the final decision on who is what kind of gladiator (Lucius due to his past and Marcus only *metaphorical*, cf. Manuwald 2007, 878) was to be determined by the circle of those *qui plane et latine loquuntur* (*Phil.*, 7, 6, 18).

after all, too many cases of free men taking part in the arena combats, and all of them – as still extraordinary – appalled the public opinion⁴².

This authentication, based on the internal analysis of all the epithets directed against Lucius, does not take away the quality of an effective *ad hominem* attack from the factual account of the Orator. In the entirety of gladiatorial recollections associated with the tribune of 44 BC, Cicero uses a generous repertoire of rhetorical measures. All the information concerning Lucius-gladiator are dosed in an appropriate way and their true pivotal point takes place only in the fragment of *Phil.*, 7, 16–18⁴³. At the beginning, Lucius was merely a *myrmillo* (*Phil.*, 3, 12, 31), then, I repeat, through the only in the Orator's description of this gladiator adjective, *Asiaticus*, appears a suggestion on the place of the event, which is *expressis verbis* indicated together with the nature of Lucius' act: *qui myrmillo Mylasis depugnat*. The mentioned fight must have been certainly a violent one (*Phil.*, 5, 7, 20). The next information emphatically convinces us about it: Lucius killed a Thracian gladiator. We get to know him better, by implication; he was someone from the close circle of the contemporary quaestor (*Phil.*, 6, 5, 13). All the insinuations which can be, at the same time, treated as a clever way for intensifying the tension, become explained in the final fragment of *Phil.*, 7, 16–18 (although, of course, it is such a dose of knowledge which should be sufficient for Cicero's audience to deem him a gladiator). Here is Lucius Antonius, who fought as a gladiator in the armour of myrmillo in Mylasa in Asia against one of his comrades, who acted in the duel as a Thracian gladiator⁴⁴; Lucius killed the opponent in a disgraceful way as the latter, wounded, had to run away from constantly attacking myrmillo⁴⁵. However, Lucius himself became wounded in this duel⁴⁶. Those of Lucius' personality traits and at-

⁴² They were meticulously recorded by Cicero himself who always added wry comments. The complete list of a few cases of combats of free men at the arena from that period is given by Ville 1981, 255–256.

⁴³ An important role in giving rhetorical qualities to the information about Lucius' Asiatic advantages is also played by the context in which they appear. However, this matter is only indicated here. In accordance with my declarations, I am nevertheless trying to present these attacks as a certain logical collection.

⁴⁴ These facts themselves trigger specific associations in the audience and most likely show the manner, present in Cicero's work, of using debasing motives of slavery which were associated with gladiators (cf. Ferriès 2014, 351, 356). In a symbolic sense, Cicero's conflict with gladiators is also a manifestation of a dramatic choice between freedom and slavery, cf. Hall 2002, 283.

⁴⁵ Killing the opponent who was running away was a disgraceful behaviour in comparison with a certain gladiatorial ethos. This comment (credibility of which we will never be able to determine) fits perfectly into the abovementioned theatrics: Lucius is undoubtedly a *deterior gladiator*. Cf. Manuwald 2007, 626; Ferriès 2014, 359.

⁴⁶ Information about Lucius' wound (*Phil.*, 5, 7, 20) and the scar which remained afterwards (*Phil.*, 7, 6, 16) is used by Cicero at first as one more argument in favor of validity of

titudes, which in gladiatorial recollections had only seemingly the qualities of a metaphor or epithet (*ex gladiatore dux, ex gladiatore imperator, Phil.*, 3, 12, 31; *Lucius [...] familiam ducit, Phil.*, 5, 11, 30; *myrmillo Asiaticus, latro Italiae, Phil.*, 12, 8, 20)⁴⁷ are made plausible thanks to all this information.

It seems, therefore, that Cicero had every right to precede the information accumulated in one fragment of the speech by a declaration which significantly organized his attacks against the Antonii: *quem gladiatorem non ita appellavi, ut interdum etiam M. Antonius gladiator appellari solet, sed ut appellant ii, qui plane et Latine loquuntur*. This concatenating of the gladiatorial motif emphasizes the logic and coherence of Cicero's arguments. It also makes it completely legitimate to clearly introduce to the entirety of the story the elements of counterfactual history (the alternative becomes a tool of fear!) through the words: *quonam modo istum ferre possemus, si in hoc foro spectantibus vobis depugnasset?* (*Phil.*, 5, 7, 20)⁴⁸, and in a much more significant vision, which appears at the time when Cicero could have assumed that he had convinced his audience about Lucius' gladiature: *Qui familiarem iugularit, quid hic occasione data faciet inimico? et qui illud animi causa fecerit, hunc praedae causa quid facturum putatis?*⁴⁹.

gladiatorial accusations against the tribune of 44 BC. Earlier on, he mocked the lack of Lucius' military experience (*Phil.*, 3, 12, 31) and therefore the scar could not have been the result of military advantages of the youngest of the Antonii. Thus, Cicero speaks about the scar as if it was a disgraceful stigma (Manuwald 2007, 879, believes that the scar was a proof of Lucius' deficiency as a gladiator). Cicero's judicial experience must have resulted in using this kind of *corpus delicti*. In this regard, the Orator could have absolutely not given rein to his imagination. The scar was probably an important and visible element of Lucius' identification. Kanz, Grossschmidt 2006, 207–216, argue that gladiators' wounds which did not turn out to be fatal, were most often situated at the front of their heads (for they would start the combat *en face*). Cicero's information was, therefore, subjected to an easy, universal and public verification. A lot in the Philippics was taking place *in populi Romani conspectu, Phil.*, 2, 25, 63. On the public aspect of Cicero's speeches, a kind of transparency and possibility to verify his words by the audience, listeners, witnesses, see Lessie 2015, 30, 40; Mahy 2009, 317. On frequently undertaking by the Orator the motives of physiognomy and his opponents' appearance, see Corbeill 2002, 14–56, 205–208; Dyck 2001, 119–130; Cossarini 1981, 123–134; Lessie 2015, 25–26, 29.

⁴⁷ Although Cicero mentioned with certainty only one of Lucius' performances at the arena, the multiplication of information on this matter (as a rhetorical measure) could have given the impression of almost continuous presence of Lucius at the arena. Cf. Pieper 2014, 43, *being repetitive is constitutive for most processes in which an agent attempts to implement a certain version of the past into the collective memory of his society*. According to Ferriès 2014, 360, the repetition of information about Lucius not only *marque la réalité de la transgression sociale*, but also highlights *le caractère professionnel de la violence chez Lucius*.

⁴⁸ Cf. Manuwald 2007, 626.

⁴⁹ This dramatic vision could not have taken place earlier which argues in favor of the thesis that Cicero could not reveal the whole truth about Lucius already at the beginning of the series of attacks directed against him. According to Martin, 2011, 147–148, the proof, and not so much a prediction, of disasters perpetrated by Lucius-gladiator is a characteristic word play, in

If one considers Cicero as an extremely important and valuable source for the history of the Roman *gladiature* of the late Roman Republic then the detail and quality of that one, real gladiatorial combat demands to treat this account as a document of an utterly unique importance in comparison to, indeed, numerous but frequently laconic, quite enigmatic and usually depersonalized gladiatorial recollections of the Orator⁵⁰.

Some interpretational doubts in the Ciceronian presentation of Lucius remain only with the reference to the adjective *Asiaticus*. It appears in association with the noun *gladiator* (*gladiator Asiaticus*, *Phil.*, 5, 7, 20) and twice together with the name of a gladiator's category (*ab hoc myrmillione Asiatico*, 6, 4, 10; *myrmillo Asiaticus*, 12, 8, 20). The indication of topography of Lucius' combat appears directly in the sentence: *Lucius quidem frater eius, utpote qui peregre depugnarit* (5, 11, 30). It is once again unambiguously present in the statement: *Myrmillo in Asia depugnavit!* (7, 6, 17), and yet it is still two more times when a specific name of the city of Mylasa is given (6, 5, 13 and 5, 7, 20). It is impossible to be persuaded by a suggestion that towards the end of the 1st century BC appeared in Asia Minor a new, and therefore demanding a separate name, category of gladiators referred to as *Asiatic myrmilliones*⁵¹. There are no traces of it either in the epigraphic or archaeological evidence⁵². Furthermore, *Asiaticus* is linked with the noun *gladiator*, which is free, as it were, from "topographical burdens". Therefore, there is no doubt that Cicero was very keen on a thorough explicitness about the fact that the combat took place outside Rome and only in a dramatic and created by the Orator vision, the tribune of 44 BC would fight in the Roman Forum (6, 5, 13). It even seems that the duel took place somewhere outside the civilized world. Cicero deliberately and consequently recalls the *Asiatic nature* of Lucius-myrmillo⁵³, although it is difficult to assume that Mylasa was a *terra incognita* for the Orator. If, even as the governor of Cilicia, he knew the Greek nature of this city, he should have, in accordance with logic

which Cicero links the word *parma* (gladiatorial shield of a *thraex*, cf. Mosci Sassi 1992, 149–150) with the destruction of the city of Parma by the youngest of the Antonii. The hypothesis would have been more convincing if it was Lucius fighting in Mylasa as a *thraex*.

⁵⁰ It is not only about the names of gladiators' categories, the rules of matching them in the fighting pairs (see n. 50), but also specialized terminology authenticating Cicero's enunciation, e.g. *lanista*, *depugnare* as terms specific for the Roman *gladiature*, Imholtz 1972, 228–229; Mosci Sassi 1992, 124–127; Ferriès 2014, 359; Manuwald 2007, 626.

⁵¹ Unless Cicero knew much more about it than we do. About the category of *myrmillones* see e.g. Schneider 1933, 664–667; Junkelmann 2008, 110–111, 119, 151–152; Mosci Sassi 1992, 144–145.

⁵² Cf. Teyssier 2009, *passim*.

⁵³ Perhaps the Orator wanted to emphasize that the role of a *myrmillo* was played by Lucius Antonius, the quaestor and proquaestor in office of the province of Asia. Cf. n. 28 and 29.

and his knowledge, referred to Lucius as a “Greek gladiator”⁵⁴. The appeal of the Orator made for those who used Latin (*qui plane et Latine loquuntur, Phil.*, 7, 6, 17) seems to be quite characteristic in this regard. They were the ones who verified who a gladiator was. Distinguishing those who were using Latin must have, in a natural way, assumed the existence of these “other” men. Was *myrmillo Asiaticus* an element of a recognizable reality for them, associated with the games, and with which they identified themselves more than with the Roman *gladiature*?⁵⁵

It seems that these matters deserve attention (they will be developed by the author in a separate article, which in terms of argumentation will move beyond the analysis of Cicero’s enunciation only and will be based exclusively on the information of *munera gladiatoria*) within the context of limited knowledge about quite characteristic period in the development of the games in the Greek world. For we know those organized in that area by the Roman generals in the 1st century BC, e.g. by Lucullus in 71/70 BC (I leave out the earlier ones given by the Hellenistic monarchs like Antioch IV Epiphanes) and those gladiatorial combats of the Greek East, quite well preserved by the epigraphy, which were organized as the part of the Emperor’s cult from the 1st century AD onwards. However, there is a considerable gap between them so that it is impossible to investigate the nature of gladiatorial games which directly preceded those associated already with the imperial cult. It is well known, on the other hand, what kind of similarities between the Greek *agones* (and the system of values inherently related to them) and the Roman gladiatorial combats played the role of a catalyst, a kind of transmission belt, which favored acceptance and dis-

⁵⁴ It is risky to state that it was disdain more than temperance, often present in Cicero’s works, towards Asia and Asiatics which could determine a subordinate status (other than those known at that time in Rome) of the games featuring an *Asiatic gladiator*. On the subject of Cicero’s xenophobia: Andrade 2013, 73–91; Facella 2005, 96–98. The presence of a Thracian gladiator (*De prov. cons.*, 9, 5) in the story about Lucius is for Grill 2015, 139, a proof of using by Cicero a motif of barbarization, often present in the Orator’s invectives (e.g. Achard 1981, 201–213; Craig 2004, 188–199; Corbeil 2002, 205–206), since savagery and rusticity of the Thracians were a commonly known problem also in his times. Even though this opinion (cf. footnote 33) does not seem to be entirely correct, it is probably worth to return to the opinions of those who treat gladiatorial invective as a tool *to denigrate one’s opponent as inherently un-Roman*. Cf. Mahy 2009, 317; Hammar 2015, 15; Steel 2001, 48.

⁵⁵ It is worth noting that Lucius’ fight with a thraex was devoid of any rules. It was neither a combat to the first blood nor an honorable fight, nor *sine missione*. Cf. e.g. Junkelmann 2008, 136–141; Ville 1981, 403–424. Most certainly this duel does not fit into the funerary games. Ville 1981, 255, referred to those in which Lucius participated as private games, which, however, does not reflect their proper nature for the funerary *munera* were, after all, a thoroughly family-oriented enterprise. Besides, Cicero seems to emphasize that Lucius’ fight was a different duel from those fought in the forum in honor of the deceased Servilius Sulpicius. Cf. *Phil.*, 6, 5, 13.

semination of *munera gladiatoria* in the Greek East⁵⁶. However, since the only unsurpassable boundary and primary difference between the Greek *agones* and the Roman *munera gladiatoria* was an invariably civic status of athletes and, generally, a slave status of gladiators, then why the uniqueness of the games in Mylasa (with an unquestionable participation of free men) cannot be treated as a kind of evidence of breaking down the barriers between the two forms of spectacles in the “canonical” scope as well?

Perhaps then the enquiry into the nature and content of Cicero’s attacks against Lucius will not turn out to be only a discourse on Cicero’s credibility. There is a slight chance that it will see a proper contextualization within the disputes over the development of *gladiature* in the areas of Hellenized Asia Minor.

Streszczenie

Lucjusz Antoniusz – *gladiator Asiaticus*. Gładiatorski epizod oczami Marka Tulliusza Cycerona widziany

W teoretycznej refleksji nad naturą rzymskiej inwektywy kwestią o pierwszorzędym znaczeniu dla historyków pozostaje jej wiarygodność. Choć uznaje się ją za gatunek przyjazny i właściwy studiom nad zagadnieniami szeroko pojmowanej obyczajowości, moralności rzymskiej, to ciągle rzadko odgrywa ona rolę dostarczycielki ważkich argumentów w dyskursie politycznym lub studiach natury biograficznej. Sceptycyzm historyków wobec inwektywy sprawia, że wyjątkowo traktuje się ją dosłownie, a niemal zawsze nieco przewrotnie, nieliteralnie i trochę na opak. Takie podejście do niej opiera się na apriorycznym założeniu przynajmniej nieprawdziwości obecnego w niej twierdzenia. Jak wiele generalizacji, podobnie i ta także bywa nie do końca słuszna, choć istotnie niewybredne ataki *ad personam*, które mieściły się w określonej i akceptowanej w Rzymie republikańskim konwencji, trudno oddzielać od niewygodnych, ale mimo wszystko kompromitujących adresata informacji (o faktach, realnych zdarzeniach, epizodach, postawach, itd.).

Wydaje się to jednak możliwe choćby w przypadku serii *gladiatorских inwektyw* Cycerona (*Phil.*, 3, 12, 31; 5, 7, 20; 5, 11, 30; 6, 4, 10; 6, 5, 13; 7, 6, 16–18; 12, 8, 20), kierowanych przeciw Lucjuszowi Antoniuszowi, najmłodszemu

⁵⁶ Carter 1999, 1–65; Carter 2009, 300–313; Mann 2009, 272–297; Müller 1995, 224–295. The results of the studies of these authors are further works on *new systems of meaning and of exchange* and on *provincial identity*. Cf. Frilingos 2004, *passim*; Concannon 2014, 193–214; Seesengood 2006; Reid 2006, 37–49.

z braci Marka. Choć to tylko kazus, na podstawie którego trudno wyciągać bardziej ogólne wnioski co do źródłowo-dowodowej mocy gatunku, to w tym przypadku wartość faktograficzna zarzutów Arpinaty może mieć dość istotne znaczenie dla wskazania właściwego charakteru igrzysk gladiatorских organizowanych poza Rzymem w epoce końca republiki.

Co prawda historycy zwracają uwagę, że walka Lucjusza w roli gladiatora mymillona w azjatyckim mieście Mylasa była prawdopodobna z racji pełnienia przez młodego nobila godności kwestora i prokwestora Azji w latach 50–49 p.n.e. i mogła przybrać formę popularnych wówczas swego rodzaju ćwiczeń w fechtunku, poniekąd opisu umiejętności czysto wojskowej natury. Wątpliwości co do historyczności tego epizodu jednak pozostają, choćby z tego powodu, że wszystkie informacje na ten temat pochodzą wyłącznie od Cyncerona, prezentowane są mocno *post factum* i dotyczą zadeklarowanego wroga mówcy (wobec swych nieprzyjaciół Arpinata zwykł z lubością używać *gladiatorского oreża*). Nawet w Filipikach wątki gladiatorские układają się w rodzaj dramy, w której Cynceron-lanista staje na czele „dobrych gladiatorów” (obrońców republiki), aby pokonać tych „złych”, Marka i Lucjusza Antoniuszów. Ta teatralizacja znakomicie wpisuje się w praktykowaną przez mówcę *rhetoric of crisis*, co nakazywać może wstrzeźliwość wobec ataków na Lucjusza, nawet wówczas, kiedy Cynceron *expressis verbis* deklaruje, że jego zarzuty nie są zwykłą inwektywą typu „gladiator” kierowaną często wcześniej pod adresem Marka Antoniusza.

Wydaje się jednak, że argumentów za historycznością gladiatorского epizodu Lucjusza można poszukiwać nie tylko w informacjach na temat kariery urzędniczej Lucjusza i wskazanych wyżej pewnych cechach rozwoju gladiatorry rzymskiej (wiedza na ich temat też pochodzi od Cyncerona). Poszukiwać ich można w samych Filipikach choćby w warstwie słownej. Epitety kierowane przeciw Markowi mają cechy metafory, odpowiadają na pytanie – jaki był Marek? W przypadku Lucjusza zaś – kim był? Atak na Lucjusza uwiarygodnia masa prezentowanych przez mówcę szczegółów, detali i faktów związanych z walką na arenie. Koronnym argumentem wydaje się przywołana przez Cyncerona, widoczna bodaj na twarzy Lucjusza blizna, spektakularna pamiątka jego pojedynku w Mylasa.

Trudne do wyjaśnienia pozostaje natomiast nadzwyczaj częste wykorzystanie przez mówcę przymiotnika *Asiaticus* (*gladiator, myrmillo*). Nie wydaje się ono „topograficzną” nazwą jakiejś subkategorii gladiatorów. Można sądzić, że Cynceron mógł tym przymiotnikiem określać charakter igrzysk organizowanych wówczas nie tylko w Mylasa. Cechą tych wydawanych poza

Rzymem – którymi Cyceron wyraźnie pogardzał – mógł być udział w nich ludzi wolnych. Problem wymaga dalszych badań, ale ich podstawą jest ustalenie historyczności igrzysk organizowanych w Mylasa, w jednym ze znaczących ośrodków miejskich zachodniej części Azji Mniejszej, w której rzymski, u genezy, obyczaj mógł upowszechnić się na bazie miejscowych, greckich, w naturze, zwyczajów.