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once set on death she was more ruthless than
the fierce Liburnians, her high disdain
refused to countenance the public
degradation of the triumph-train.

ANTONIA AND THE PIRATES

Plutarch prefaces his remarks on Pompey’s victory over the pirates in 67 with an account of the proliferation of piracy in the preceding decades. Plutarch observes that the pirates were initially based in Cilicia and restricted their operations to the eastern Mediterranean, but during the course of the Mithridatic Wars their fleets became so large and powerful that they ventured to attack Italy itself where:

ἥλω δὲ καὶ θυγάτηρ Ἀντωνίου, θριαμβικοῦ ἀνδρός, εἰς ἀγρὸν βαδίζουσα, καὶ πολλῶν χρυσῶν ἀπελυτρώθη (Pomp. 24.6: ‘They even captured the daughter of Antonius, a man who had celebrated a triumph, as she was visiting the country and exacted a large ransom for her’). Since M. Antonius (cos. 99) was the only Antonius to celebrate a triumph prior to Pompey’s victory there has understand-
ably been near universal agreement that the luckless Antonia was an otherwise unattested daughter of the consul of 99.¹ But the kidnapping of Antonia is also referred to by Cicero and Appian and the testimony of Cicero is crucial.² Cicero’s catalogue of the crowning indignities inflicted on the maiestas populi Romani by the pirates prior to Pompey’s victory includes the seizure from Misenum of the child of a man who had himself fought against the pirates (Leg. Man. 32: an uero ignoratis … ex Miseno autem eius ipsius liberos, qui cum praedonibus antea ibi bellum gesserat, a praedonibus esse sublatos?).³ At first sight Cicero’s words


² Cic. Leg. Man. 33; App. Mith. 93.

³ For the use of the masculine plural liberi of a single female child see: TLL 7.2.1301, 1303 and especially Gell. NA 2.13; Gai. Dig. 50.16.148; Donatus on Tet. Hec. 212; and Cic. Ferr. 2.1.65, 76, 106, 113.
appear to confirm the idea that Antonia was the daughter of M. Antonius (cos. 99) for Antonius fought against the pirates in Cilicia. Yet the consul’s son M. Antonius Creticus also campaigned against the pirates in the period 74–71 B.C. and J.H.D’Arms maintained that Cicero must be referring to M. Antonius Creticus and not his father because Cicero places the kidnapping of Antonia only a short time before his speech in favour of the *lex Manilia* early in 66.

Cicero’s chronology, though imprecise, tends to support the identification of D’Arms. As the depredations of the pirates were familiar to his audience, Cicero is content to locate the incidents he enumerates in ‘those years’ – apparently alluding to the period delimited in *Leg. Man.* 30–1 which extends from the first Civil War down to the Pirate War (88 to 67 B.C.). Unfortunately, few of the events referred to by Cicero are precisely dateable, but the exceptions confirm this picture. The assault on Samos dates to 85 or 84 B.C. The reference to the seizure of quaestors may include the quaestor of M. Antonius Creticus who was taken prisoner by the Cretans. The mention of the inviolability of Delos in former times was doubtless inspired by the raid on the island which occurred in 69 B.C. The praetors Sextilius and Bellienus, who were taken along with their lictors, are generally thought to have held office in or shortly before 67 B.C. The kidnapping and ransom of Roman legati conceivably includes the capture of P. Clodius Pulcher c. 67. And the attacks on Italy and Sicily were a feature of the 70s and early 60s when a putative daughter of M. Antonius (cos. 99) is unlikely to have been a child.

4 MRR 1.568, 572, 576, 3.19; and de Souza (n. 1), 102–8.
6 *Leg. Man.* 32: *per hosce annos … per hos annos*. See also *Leg. Man.* 54 where Cicero says the Romans had been unable to defend the harbours and coastline of Italy for ‘some years’ before the *lex Gabinia* (*aliquot annos continuos ante legem Gabiniam*).
7 *Leg. Man.* 33; see App. *Mith.* 63, and de Souza (n. 1), 164.
8 *Leg. Man.* 53; see Dio fr. 111.
12 See Sall. *Hist.* 2.47.7 Maurenbrecher = 2.44.7 McGushin; Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.85, 2.5.63–4, 80, 87–100, 122; App. *Mith.* 93; Vell. 2.42.2; Plut. *Crass.* 10.3; Oros. 6.3.5, 4.1. Appian indicates the raids on Italy occurred after the Cilician campaign of P. Servilius Vatia – i.e. after 74. The assault on Ostia (*Leg. Man.* 33) may be connected with the construction of the city’s walls in 63 (see F. Zevi, ‘Costruttori eccellenti per le mura di Ostia. Cicerone, Clodio e l’iscrizione della Porta Romana’, *Rivista di Archeologia* 19–20 [1996–7], 61–112 and in J.-P. Descoeudres, *Ostia: port et porte de la Rome antique* [Geneva, 2001], 15–18).
13 The likely date of birth of a daughter of M. Antonius (cos. 99) may be gauged from the age of his sons. The eldest, M. Antonius Creticus, was praetor in 74 and so was born by 114 and his younger brother C. Antonius Hybrida (cos. 63) was praetor in 66 and hence was born.
However, the evidence which proves the thesis of D’Arms beyond doubt is the unassuming adverb *ibi*. Cicero says that the man whose child was captured at Misenum had fought there (*ibi*) against the pirates which can only be a reference to Antonius Creticus, for the operations of M. Antonius (cos. 99) were confined to Cilicia whereas the mandate of Creticus covered the entire Mediterranean and Creticus began his campaign by attempting to secure the west coast of Italy, Sicily and Spain before proceeding eastward.14 Cicero therefore clearly indicates that Antonia was the daughter of Creticus and not an otherwise unattested daughter of M. Antonius (cos. 99) and Cicero’s testimony is unquestionably to be preferred to Plutarch’s for Cicero will have known Antonia and the incident at first hand. Antonia must then be identified with Creticus’ daughter by his second wife Iulia who was later to marry P. Vatinius (cos. 47) and her capture belongs sometime between her father’s death in 71 and the passage of the *lex Gabinia* early in 67.15 Antonia was probably captured while visiting the villa located at Misenum which had been acquired by M. Antonius (cos. 99) and which subsequently passed to Creticus and to Antony.16 As Creticus never celebrated a triumph, Plutarch, or his source, evidently confused the homonymous son with his more famous father.17 It is worth noting in this connection that the crippling debts which Antony amassed in his youth and which Cicero and Plutarch attributed to his extravagant lifestyle were probably at least partly comprised of the ransom that had to be paid to the pirates to redeem his younger sister.18 Plutarch does not quantify the ransom, except to say that it was large, but the pirates had exacted a 50-talent ransom from Caesar only a few years before.19 And as Antonia was taken at Misenum, Antony could not, like Caesar and Clodius, make the provincials bear the cost of the ransom.
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by 106. The latest possible date for the birth of a daughter of M. Antonius (cos. 99) would be late in 87 for Antonius was assassinated early that year (MRR 2.49, 52).


15 Antonia’s capture is securely dated after 71 n.c. as Cicero says the kidnapping post-dated her father’s campaign against the pirates (*antea bellum gesserat*).

16 See D’Arms (n. 5), loc.cit.

17 *Pace* D’Arms Creticus clearly did not celebrate a triumph (see A. Degrassi, *Inscriptiones Italae* 13.1.84–5, 564–5 and J. Linderski, ‘A missing Ponticus’, *AJAH* 12 (1987), 148–66 on the names of the triumphators to be restored in the lacuna in the *fasti triumphales Capitolini* between 80 and 63 n.c.). The two sources often linked to Plutarch in this context are Posidonius and Theophanes (see J. Malitz, *Die Historien des Poseidonios* (Munich, 1983), 168), but both men were contemporary with these events and seem unlikely to be responsible for the confusion.

18 Plutarch (*Ant. 2.4*) says that Antony had already racked up a debt of 250 talents in his youth.