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It is the year when M. Tullius Cicero and C. Antonius Hybrida are consuls. Will the republic survive to see another...

The Crisis of Catiline is set in Rome during 63 BC: a tumultuous year of urban and rural unrest, economic instability, sensational trials, and electoral misconduct. You are a Roman senator. Can you preserve the Republic?

At the center of the crisis stands Lucius Sergius Catilina, a charismatic (and scandal-ridden) nobleman who just the year before lost an election for the consulship, the highest office in Rome, to Marcus Tullius Cicero, a brilliant orator, canny politician, and “new man” (novus homo), the first member of his family to reach the pinnacle of Roman politics. Now that Catiline has again failed in his quest for the consulship, rumors swirl that he and his henchmen are planning assassinations and arson in Rome, while a rebellion is being raised to the north. Are the rumors true—is Catiline conspiring to lead a revolution? Or have Catiline’s enemies conspired to thwart desperately needed social and economic reforms by slandering Catiline and his followers?

Dissatisfaction with the current system has made Catiline popular among the urban and rural poor, as well as among many disaffected members of the nobility, who have seen their career thwarted by the wealthy and insular clique that dominates Roman politics. During the most recent campaign, Catiline proposed significant (some would say radical) reforms to address the hardships facing the poor Roman citizens, whose livelihoods had been undermined by the social and economic changes that accompanied Rome’s emergence as a commercial and military superpower.

Fear of Catiline led the entrenched elites to swing their support to an unlikely champion of the current political and economic system: Cicero, the son of a financially well-off businessman from the small town of Arpinium, over 60 miles southeast of Rome. Even if many of Rome’s conservative leaders acknowledge that incremental reform is necessary, most believe that Catiline’s reckless promises and rumored threats of violence pose a threat to public order. Posed in between these two factions are Roman leaders unsure about whether Catiline or Cicero can be trusted to set a more secure and prosperous course for Rome.

Although severe economic turmoil contributed to the unstable conditions that afflicted Rome in 63 BC, The Crisis of Catiline requires you to act to solve a political crisis. It poses essential questions about political action and the relationship between the individual and the state. What constrains those in power or those seeking power? What can undermine the legitimacy of a state or, conversely, permit the state or a person acting on its behalf to curtail or even eliminate the
traditional prerogatives and legal rights of a citizen or a group of citizens. Ultimately, the Crisis of Catiline asks whether the preservation of civil order justifies the use of force against threatening (but not yet violent) citizens, and who has the power to decide when that point of crisis has been reached.

The Crisis of Catiline begins on November 8th, 63 BC.

The Roman senators who assembled in the fortified Temple of Jupiter Stator have just heard Cicero denounce Catiline in his First Oration Against Catiline (included in this booklet). Catiline stands. He reminds the assembled senators of the achievements of his illustrious family, while Cicero, his tormentor, is a novus homo, the first man of his family to hold the consulship. Who, Catiline asks, could believe that he, a true Roman of Rome, posed a threat to the city while Cicero, an immigrant, barely even a citizen, could be its savior? Catiline defiantly calls for open debate on the treacherous accusations that Cicero has hurled against him and his supporters (refer ad senatum!).

Stunned silence is followed first by a murmur of assent, then a few scattered shouts of approval, growing ever more bold in showing their support for continued debate. Cicero resists at first (non referam!). As the meeting threatens to dissolve into chaos, all eyes turn to Quintus Lutatius Catulus, the elderly “first man of the senate,” the princeps senatus, who guards the traditions of the Roman Senate. Catulus is known to despise Catiline’s politics; but nevertheless, like so many senators, he has a personal affinity for the man. When Catulus signals his support for continued debate, Cicero grudgingly agrees to seek the Senate’s advice on how he should proceed when they reconvene in the morning. And thus begins the contest over the fates of Catiline, Cicero—and perhaps the Roman republic itself.

As a senator, your goal—whether you support Catiline, oppose him, or are undecided about which path to take (or even have your own agenda)—is to lead Rome out of this crisis by persuading the Senate to adopt a decree consistent with the goals of your character or faction. You will do this by persuading your fellow senators through a short speech that proposes a solution to the crisis that confronts Rome—or by supporting or condemning the proposal made by another senator. What course of action will Catiline and his supporters take; and what will other Romans do about (or to) Catiline and his supporters?

Crafting a persuasive speech will require you to reflect on how Rome came to this point of crisis. You will also have to consider the viewpoints of your friends and enemies, which you can discover by listening carefully to their speeches and speaking with them outside of the Senate. Some Romans will oppose your opinions to their dying breath—but others will be persuadable by the right argument, if it is well-presented. The fate of Rome (and quite possibly your own life) is in your hands. Take care, Roman, that you prosper!
A TENSE NIGHT IN ROME

Six days before the Ides of November, early evening

Gaius Sallustius Crispus shook his empty cup. A young slave rushed over, refilled the cup with wine from an ornate silver pitcher, and then retreated to the corner of the couch-lined dining room. Sallust had arrived late for dinner with scarcely an excuse. But you could overlook etiquette on a day like today.

“What do you think will happen, my dear Sallust?”

Sallust grimaced. He had been born in the Sabine countryside just over twenty years ago. But his few years of hard living in Rome made him seem older. You had hoped that Sallust, who showed such promise as a writer, would settle down to more serious pursuits, abandoning his current pastimes of dicing, drinking, and dancing girls. Sadly, he was not the first Roman to toss away a promising career and bring dishonor to his family. Not in times like these.

Sallust began, “History teaches us that the events of revolution are ‘many and terrible, such as have occurred and always will occur, as long as the nature of mankind remains the same.’ Slaughter is inevitable once a state has fallen into crisis. Crisis is, after all, ‘a rough master that brings men’s characters to a level with their fortunes.’”

Sallust, it seems, had been re-reading Thucydides’ History of the Peloponnesian War.

“... Murder and treachery and crime. The plots. The secret agreements. The threats. Manlius is said to be raising an army in the North, did you hear? Or at least that’s what Cicero claims. I don’t know if I believe him. Earlier today, while you were listening to his speech against Catiline, I was studying a letter by the tribune Tiberius Gracchus...”

Sallust was always “studying”—although one could never be sure whether his subject was a book, the bottom of a wine cup, or an actress...

“...but when the meeting broke up, I was in a tavern on the Aventine Hill—quite near the very place where the plebs first seceded from Rome, refusing to fight in wars until the wealthy acknowledged the rights of all citizens. Did you know....”

Sallust was always quick with a historical tidbit or three. He often claimed that he had a plan to continue Sisenna’s History down to the present day.
Sallust continued, "... and it was just down that same street that, exactly 350 years later, the consul Opimius caved in the skull of the tribune Gaius Gracchus. History moves in cycles, as they say. As I was finishing my Massic wine (a foul vintage; not like the sweet Rhaetic that you are serving this evening), a large group of men, many of them young, burst into the tavern. The equestrians, Publius Gabinius Capito and Lucius Statilius, both close friends of Catiline, were leading the group. While cheap wine was being poured to the men *gratis*, Gabinius Capito began to rage against Catiline's recent indictment under the *Plautine Law Concerning Violence*. Soon realizing that the speech might be of historical significance, I began to take notes:

...Is that all it takes to slander a Roman?
Suddenly a noble Roman like Catiline—a man from an ancient family, a consular family — is declared a criminal? *Declared* a criminal! The infamy! No charge. No trial. No appeal. But condemned. Are we, Catiline's friends, likewise to be condemned? Am I? Are you? Did I fall asleep and awake in the court of an eastern despot where the whim of a foul eunuch can trump the laws of the People? Or is this still Rome and are we not Roman citizens? Am I no longer a Roman citizen because two weeks ago Marcus Licinius Crassus claims he received a letter warning him to leave the city? Can my rights be violated without trial, whenever the Senate vomits forth their precious "Final Decree," the *Consultum Ultimum*?

They passed the decree 18 days ago, giving that hypocrite Cicero the power to "see to it that the state suffer no harm." I tell you, my fellow Romans, the only one who will harm the state is Cicero! Who hurls baseless accusations against good Romans? Cicero! Who slanders anyone who would support the legitimate grievances of the urban poor and the poor Italians and everyone who is disadvantaged by the rapacious property owners and moneylenders? Cicero! Who is so eager to lick the sandals of those marauding hypocrites, the *Boni*, the so-called "Good men," who occupy the fancy chairs of the Senate? Cicero! (the crowd roared the name) Who surrounds himself with private bodyguards, the surest sign of a would-be tyrant? Cicero! Who dared appear at a peaceful election wearing armor? Cicero! Who violates the ancient laws of the Roman People? Cicero! If there is a king among us, isn't it likely to be that very same man, who already behaves like a tyrant? Not me. Not you. Cicero!'

"Gabinius Capito then attacked the evidence that Cicero used to persuade the senators to issue the *Consultum Ultimum*:"

‘Crassus received letters warning of impending horrors? But when the supposed day of revolution came, I ask you what happened? There were no assassinations. There were no fires. There were no disturbances. Then, just as the People, whose interests we hold in
our hearts, were about to realize what a treacherous dog Cicero is—BANG, like a bolt from Jupiter!—he unearths a some pig-herder to claim that an army is being raised in Etruria. How convenient! Then Cicero finds another oaf, Quintus Arrius, to support this lie about a phantom army. Is it any wonder? The senators, at Cicero’s goading, approved bribes for information about Cicero’s opponents. Not for the truth, mind you; but about “conspiratorial acts.” Now anyone who supports the People is at risk of condemnation. Cicero is right about one thing. There is a coup underway and the state is being threatened—but not by us; not by just men who seek only to protect the privileges that are due us as Romans. Not by us, who seek to check those “Good men” from abusing the law. What use is the law, if a group of preening and paranoid plutocrats can declare that law suspended whenever it suits them? Can they simply declare the law null whenever someone resists them, by standing up and fighting—with words—on behalf of the People?

“He condemned the senators who repeatedly resorted to violence against their peaceful political opponents:”

When the election of Autronius Paetus and Cornelius Sulla was overturned two years ago, the “Good men” would not even allow Catiline to run for the consulship, despite the fact that Catiline had not been convicted of a single crime. We hear that Catiline was involved in the conspiracy to kill the consuls, Lucius Torquatus and Lucius Cotta. But just as in today’s so-called crisis, did anything happen? Was there ever any evidence that Catiline was involved, or any evidence of any conspiracy? Did not the consul Torquatus defend Catiline against charges of being involved in the conspiracy? The “Good men” must think Torquatus quite the fool if he would defend his own would-be assassin!

When the august tribunes of the People, Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus and his brother Gaius Sempronius Gracchus sought to give the people land—my apologies, I misspoke. When the tribunes sought to allow the people to use the public lands that were theirs by law, that had been appropriated illegally by the “Good men” without compensation, when they tried to restore to the poor what little they had, the “Good men” declared the law null and void and killed the tribunes and anyone who ever spoke well about them. When the tribune of the people Lucius Appuleius Saturninus and the praetor Gaius Servilius Glauca tried to provide land for Marius’ soldiers—Romans and Italians alike who had saved Rome from the barbarian hordes of the Teutons and the Cimbri—the sons of those same “Good men” killed Glauca in the street like a dog and stoned Saturninus and his supporters after they were already in custody awaiting trial. What could be the justification for such wickedness? What did they fear? Why did they break the law? It was all to prevent the reduction of their bloated, slave-run farms by a few acres. The People asked for scraps from the table of these grandees. Scraps that had been stolen from the mouths of the People. And did the People receive any generosity? The tribune
of the people Marcus Livius Drusus tried to clean up the mess that the “Good men” had caused. He tried to provide land to the veterans so that the heroes of the republic would not have to live in poverty, and also to increase the size of the Senate, so that it would truly represent the will of the Roman people, and also to recognize that our Italian brothers, who fight and bleed alongside Romans, deserved the same protections against the “Good men” as the citizens of Rome. What did the “Good men” do? They didn't even resort to the fig-leaf of their illegal Consultum Ultimum. But lo and behold, Livius Drusus was assassinated. All because he put the interests of all the Roman People above those of a few “Good men.”

“According to Capito, if anyone is to blame for the current unrest, it is the greedy and corrupt “Good men”:

And now they have another Consultum Ultimum and in Cicero, an ambitious coward to wield it. Why? Because Catiline has now twice been robbed of the consulship? Because he threatens to expose the true nature of that corrupt clique of treacherous traitors? Because he supports giving all Romans a second chance, liberated from unjust debt? Because he champions the common Roman? Because he hopes that they will be able to speak with a voice that matters in the assembly? And can do so on a full stomach? The debt crisis is untenable. Many of you were once landowners. But the “Good men” illegally occupied the public land that you needed for your livestock, firewood, or game. And they imported thousands of slaves to do the work that you once did. You now had to buy what once was yours by law—often you had to buy it from the “Good men” who had occupied the public land! To feed your family or plant your crop or pay your taxes you had to borrow money, often from the same “Good man” who took your land. Soon the “Good man” owned the land that was once yours. But he rented it back to you. What generosity! What greatness of soul!

Now, having to pay rent, you fell further and further into debt to the same “Good man.” As more and more farmers could not pay this immoral burden, interest rates soared. I heard one “Good man” would charge his tenant-farmers 48% interest! Who can possibly live when pirates own our farms and write our laws? The rest of you are hard working shop owners, tradesman, tavern operators, and traders. One piece of bad luck, one fire or theft or illness, and you too found yourself in hock to a “Good man.” For years the “good men” have played the urban poor against the rural poor, and poor Romans against poor Italians. But don’t you see that you all have one and the same problem? There is one source of wickedness for the men of Italy. “Good men”!

“But, said Capito, the people would see to it that those who violated the law received justice:”
Their *Consultum Ultimum* is nothing more than lawless destruction of the concept of citizenship. The Roman People have always been sovereign, even in the time of kings. After King Tarquinius Superbus was driven from Rome, we first replaced one king with 300—300 senators, more oppressive of the people than one king ever was. Eventually the People were able to regain their power. But we must always be vigilant against the treacheries of the so-called “Good men.” The People have a long memory, and even if they kill our leaders or illegally violate our rights, we will, in the end, always regain our rightful status as Roman citizens.

Just this year, we finally avenged the massacre of the tribune Saturninus, who was killed 37 years ago by a mob of “Good men.” Titus Labienus convicted one of the murderers, Gaius Rabirius, of treason. Then Rabirius, a murderer of a Tribune of the People, had the audacity to appeal to the people for mercy! But as a citizen, he had the right. The people would have upheld his conviction if the praetor had not lowered the flag on the Janiculum Hill, signaling the end of the assembly. The People, however, had made its point: anyone who kills a Roman citizen without trial would eventually face justice at the hands of the people—*Consultum Ultimum* or no.

“Capito then denounced Cicero, who risked overturning the state to indulge his hatred of Catiline and to satisfy this lust for power:”

‘But desperate times require swift and decisive action,’ they say. Even if we were to grant this to be true, how “swift” or “decisive” is an action that takes more than half a month to undertake? At least when the “Good men” killed Gaius Gracchus and Saturninus you could claim that they acted in the heat of the moment—not that panic is a good excuse for the enormity of their crimes, but at least it is an excuse. Now we are asked to believe that there is a threat to Rome so great, so imminent, that normal procedures cannot possibly be followed, that extraconstitutional action is the only remedy. Here it is eighteen days since the Senate gave Cicero leave to act. Yet he only slanders and gives speeches. Granted those are his strong suits, but if Catiline really were a threat, don't you think Cicero would have already moved against him? Or Catiline against Cicero? No, my friends, these eighteen days show that Catiline is no threat. Yet their *Consultum Ultimum* stands? What could be clearer proof that their “Final Decree” is not aimed at the safety of the state but the preservation of their pernicious power.

Many of you have no doubt read the pamphlet on electioneering written by Cicero’s brother Quintus. You can tell the rest how Quintus laid out Cicero’s plan for success in the election and beyond. First, secure the support of the “Good men” and the equestrians by posing as the champion of the Senate, the status quo, and public order. Well, how better to appear as Rome’s savior than by creating a crisis which only he can resolve—what a coincidence! Thus Cicero renders anyone who advocates commonsense
and necessary reform a revolutionary. But that is not enough, Quintus advised Cicero to be sure to slander his adversaries, impugn their motives, even if doing so required spreading titillating (and false) rumors about his opponents. How vile it is for a man to hold himself out as a champion of order and justice, while whispering falsehoods about better men. But it was not enough to whisper. Only days before the election he delivered a speech in which he slandered Catiline and Hybrida. How many times did he mention Catiline’s recent acquittal of bribery charges? Apparently being found innocent of a crime is a crime in Cicero’s Rome! Such poison worked on too many of the “Good men,” whose judgment was bought at the price of a lie.

Who has suffered more than Catiline has on your behalf? The “Good men” cannot abide a true noble who loves the People and whom the People love. That is why they tainted Catiline’s good name when he tried to run for the consulship three years ago. Why? Because of the baseless accusations that he abused his position as governor. An accusation that was not even levied by citizens. Do you see the pattern? There is a threat to Cicero’s ambition or vanity. An aggrieved provincial appears, like Jupiter from the mist, with some fool story about how Cicero’s opponents are lying, corrupt, and treacherous. It happened with Verres, when he prosecuted him for corruption. It happened when Catiline ran for the consulship. It is happening again on this very night! As it became clear that Catiline had the support of the People and would be elected consul, they manufactured another crisis. Cato threatened to indict him for bribery, raising the possibility of another contested election, more chaos. I was at his house when Catiline sought to rally his supporters by reminding them of how much he had suffered at the hands of the “Good men”:

‘it is impossible for any faithful defender of the miserable citizens to be found, except a man who was himself miserable. Men in an embarrassed and desperate condition ought not to trust the promises of men of a flourishing and fortunate estate. And therefore that those who were desirous to replace what they had spent, and to recover what they had lost, had better consider what I owe, what I possess, and what I will dare to do. Any man ought to be very fearless and thoroughly overwhelmed by misfortune, who is the leader and standard-bearer of unfortunate men.’

Cicero, that sniveling coward, misunderstood Catiline’s wisdom as a threat and tried to postpone the election. The next day in the Senate, he called on Catiline to explain his words. Catiline, you’ll remember, replied:

---

* Adapted from The Speech of M. T. Cicero For Murena §51. Translated by C. D. Yonge (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1856).
'there are two bodies of the republic—the one weak with a weak head, [that is the Senate] the other powerful without a head [that is the People]. As the latter had deserves my support, it will never want a head as long as I live.'

Tomorrow is an important day, my friends. Tomorrow you have a chance to expose the lie that is the ‘Good men.’ You can convince the Senate that the ‘Good men’ are not. You, the best men, can convince the Senate to be Better Men and to not allow rumor and innuendo to run riot over the Roman People! Or you can let the ‘Good men’ trample on Roman citizens. You can let them continue to extort and steal from the Roman People. We must be ready to do battle—with words, friends, with words (for now)—for Catiline and for Rome!’

“The crowd exploded in applause and shouts of approval. A few of them noticed me scribbling, and I took my leave before the wine encouraged their enthusiasm and suspicion further. As I had promised that I would stop at the house of my good friend Cornelius Nepos before our dinner, I made my way down the Aventine on the Via Triumphalis. There I spotted Quintus Caecilius Metellus...”

“My dear Sallust, do you mean Metellus Nepos?” “No.” “Metellus Celer?” “Not him.” “Metellus Nepos Iunior?” “No... the Quintus Caecilius Metellus who wishes to celebrate a triumph for killing those pirates in Crete. Ha! There are so many of the Caecilii Metelli it is hard to keep them straight. Lucina, the goddess of fertility, blesses the Caecilii Metelli, as the saying goes. It was this Caecilius Metellus who was rushing down from the Palatine...”

“Rushing?! Like a frantic slave in a comedy? Ha! How improbably amusing!”

“Well not ‘rushing’—he was walking in a dignified manner towards the Forum with a few attendants when he saw me. He keeps requesting that I write a history of his campaign in Crete. He thinks it would help him secure his triumph. Caecilius paused to greet me. His handshake was firm. But he looked anxious:”

“Walk with me, Gaius Sallustius Crispus. Even brave men like us ought not to grant the more nefarious element an easy target, yes? Yes. I just left Tullius Cicero, who is consulting even now with other senators at his home about how best to approach the debate tomorrow. A momentous day. I confess I wish the ship of state were in the hands of a more experienced pilot from a more experienced family. But we cannot choose our fate, yes? Yes.
Yet we can certainly exercise foresight and prudence. I knew that we would find ourselves in just such danger the moment that Marcus Licinius Crassus and Gnaeus Pompeius Strabo restored the powers that Sulla Felix, in his wisdom, stripped from the tribunes of the people. Gnaeus Pompeius! I’ll not call him ‘Magnus’. The “great!” Sulla meant the nickname as a joke. A quip at the expense of a shrub that thought itself an oak. Just like a provincial dimwit to think an insult is a complement.

Pompey... that bloated fraud, always traipsing in at the last minute to claim the victory from the diligent men who did the hard work. He snatched glory from Licinius Crassus when he slaughtered the remnants of Spartacus’ band of brigands. And like a thief he stole my victory on Crete. Did you know that I oversaw the capture and execution of over a thousand pirates and had nearly pacified the whole island of Crete—a feat never before even attempted, let alone accomplished? Then Pompey with his irregular command over the whole Mediterranean floats past, bribes a few locals, and steals my glory. When Pompey arrived in Asia, he executed the same maneuver against Lucius Licinius Lucullus in the war against Mithridates. And Pompey was not content to steal only Licinius Lucullus’ command. He had his creature Gaius Memmius block Licinius Lucullus’ triumph for three years! Thankfully Tullius Cicero and Porcius Cato were finally able to overcome popular opposition and grant Licinius Lucullus his well-deserved triumph—the entire Circus Maximus covered in the weapons of Rome’s defeated foes! Now that shows what a noble Roman can accomplish on behalf of Rome and the people of Rome. No doubt Pompey will return at the precise moment that we have settled the current crisis—just in time to play the hero again!

But I loose the thread of my thoughts. Sergius Catiline, yes? Yes. Enmeshed in vice and swimming in perversion, but dangerously clever. The man is a paradox. A slave to every urge, every unclean impulse, yet capable of tolerating great physical discomfort they say. A hard man with a soft spirit. Debauched a Vestal Virgin—the infamy!—scarcely ten years ago. Since then we have all heard the rumors of his adulteries and even—for give me, Gaius Sallustius, for uttering the word—incest. And that he killed his wife to marry his daughter by a previous affair! Nefarious! But not an inconsequential man. No, not inconsequential. Too many of my colleagues underestimate him, thinking him just another rabble rouser. No one should doubt his charisma. And now he has the attention of the mob with his calls for land reform, free grain, and the forgiveness of debt. Land reform? A fancy word for theft. Free grain? Not free to those who will have to buy it for the ungrateful people! Forgiveness of debt? Novae tabulae! “Clean slates,” they shout—just an oratorical flourish to disguise another species of theft!

I had thought we were rid of Sergius Catiline three years ago, when he was banned from running for office for bribery and corruption. But no, the following year, there was Sergius Catiline again, and there again was Sergius Catiline abusing his authority. Plots
against the leading senators! What treachery! And yet many of the very senators that Catiline was conspiring to kill helped defend him against this round of charges (some of my colleagues may be more easily seduced by Catiline’s gold). That is the greatness of soul, the magnanimity, that good Romans display towards even the least deserving among them. But having been given this second change to be a lawful citizen, what did Sergius Catiline do? He plots to assassinate the consuls! Have you ever heard of such an abomination? Thanks to the gods that some in the conspiracy let slip his plans. With their conspiracy revealed, the snakes slithered back into the muck of the Subura.’

“Caecilius Metellus then detailed Catiline’s public crimes and his legislative program:’

‘You would think that a man almost convicted of malfeasance so many times would either limit his ambition or begin to pursue a more ethical course. But then you have not met Sergius Catiline! Sergius Catiline, joined by the rogue Antonius Hybrida, ran for the consulship again. A disaster for the state if they came to power. When Cato prudently noted his intention to indictment Catiline for bribery, how did Catiline respond but with threats and a claim that he would extinguish the fire “not with water but with destruction.” He said even worse the day before the election. Their defeat was a great affirmation of the wisdom of the Roman people—even if the cost of Catiline’s defeat was the election of a novus homo, a “new man,” Tullius Cicero, first of his family to serve as consul.

Now twice on the verge of being condemned and twice defeated, you would think that Sergius Catiline would understand the limits of his support. But no! He ran again. Do you remember what he promised in the last election? Free food; cancellation of all debt; redistribution of land! Imagine. No one approves of hunger. But is free food the answer? How would we afford it? What becomes of a man who does not need to work for his daily bread? I think Sergius Catiline’s brood of wastrel decadents shows us that leisure corrupts the character, takes the inborn excellence of a Roman and converts it to sloth and indolence and avarice. Could Rome survive or tolerate an entire city of such men?

Cancel debts? As though those who took on debts did not do so willingly. Some used their loans for good purpose. Others wasted their money on wine and women and bribes in losing elections. Now are the moneylenders, who already financed their debauchery once (unknowingly, of course), to pay again when the debt is “forgiven”? Only this once? Why not again in the future? Who will ever loan another man money, if even this simple contract cannot be enforced whenever a majority of debtors can just declare themselves absolved? Your crop failed? Novae Tabulae! Ship sank? Novae Tabulae! Bad bet on dice? Novae Tabulae! Your girlfriend needs a present? Novae Tabulae!
And land reform? Do they ever have any other ideas? I know that you are somewhat sympathetic to this cause, Sallustius Crispus. But please do tell, what is an urban pleb going to do with a piece of my farm? They do not know how to tend the livestock, cultivate the orchards, or nurture the crops. They are as ignorant of these matters as I would be about which brothel offers the best rate or which *thermopolium* has the best mulled wine. Cornelius Sulla gave his soldiers land. Most soon fell into debt. No surprise since they were not farmers! Should my ancestral home—where my family has lived for centuries, since before the republic, and since there was a Rome—should my land—burned by Hannibal and restored by the sweat of the Caecilii Metelli—would be parceled out to some recently arrived Gaul or Greek who happens to have the favor of Sergius Catiline? No wonder every shiftless aristocrat and slothful pleb hustled to support him. A shame on them—and on us if we do not stop them.

When earlier this year the good people of Rome again rejected Catiline—for a third time, mind you!—he refuses to accept defeat, but begins to raise an army against the Senate and People of Rome. And again conspires to assassinate a consul! Treachery. Vile, villainous treason! Tell me, Sallustius Crispus, what course of action should be barred to Cicero now, now that he must grapple with this hydra of villainy. Catiline is still in the Senate. His creatures prowl the streets, no doubt hoping to find a good man like myself and catch him unawares. Or, as Cicero says, do they plan to burn the city and undertake their vengeance against the Senate and People with one thrust? What could be more apt for that viper than burning down the city that he hopes to lead, destroying the property that he imagines he can claim, immolating a people that he claims to champion, yes? Yes! He would rather be king of ash and bone than the ex-praetor of Rome.

Concerning the legitimacy of the *Consultum Ultimum*, Caecilius Metellus was uncompromising in his support:"

‘We have already authorized Cicero to preserve the safety of the state against any and all threats. You seem skeptical, Sallustius Crispus. Is it because of that sordid Rabirius affair earlier this year? What a farce, for Titus Labienus and Gaius Julius Caesar to drag that decrepit old man from his home and try to deny an honorable death in old age to a man who bears wounds on his chest, won in service of the republic. All to stand trial for *perduellio*, “treason,” a law so obsolete that we had to consult the law tablets to recall who would oversee the trial. Lo, Gaius Julius Caesar! The luck! One man is prosecutor and judge! A mockery start to finish clearly aimed at undermining the authority of the Senate. Thankfully men like Rabirius were bold enough to take decisive action against an imminent threat to the state. Cicero said it best during his defense of Rabirius:

‘There is no king remaining, no nation, no people, whom you can fear. There is no foreign or external evil which can insinuate itself into this republic. If you
wish this state to be immortal, if you wish your empire to be eternal, if you wish your glory to continue everlasting, then it is our own passions, it is the turbulence and desire of revolution engendered among our own citizens, it is intestine evil, it is domestic treason that must be guarded against.

And your ancestors have left you a great protection against these evils in these words of the consul, “Whoever wishes the republic to be safe.” Protect the legitimate use of these words, O Romans. Do not by your decision take the republic out of my hands; and do not take from the republic its hope of liberty, its hope of safety, its hope of dignity.

What should I do, if Titus Labienus were to make a slaughter of the citizens, like Lucius Saturninus? If he were to break open the prison? If he had occupied the Capitol with armed men? I should do what Gaius Marius did. I should refer the matter to the Senate; I should exhort you to defend the republic. I myself in arms should, with your aid, resist the armed enemy."

“Despite the vehemence of his speech, Caecilius Metellus’ voice betrayed a hint of doubt that the other senators would agree that Cicero was acting in the best interests of the state:”

‘It will all be settled tomorrow. You, Sallustius Crispus, are too young to attend the Senate. But know well that tomorrow either the good men will confirm the Consultum Ultimum against Catiline or the city will lie exposed to destruction, as surely as when Tarpeia opened the gates to Titus Tatius or when the Gauls were scaling the Capitoline. When Hannibal was at the gates, our ancestors showed what greatness true Romans possess. Threatened with torture Scaevola willingly thrust his hand in the fire—courageous testament to our relentless hostility to tyranny. May the gods nod on our undertakings tomorrow. Or else I fear that the republic will not see another sunrise. Forgive me Sallustius Crispus, I must go see my nephew Caecilius Metellus Celer before sunset. I fear he is letting his personal animosity towards Cicero cloud his judgment about what course of action to take.

Surely all good men must recognize that dangerous times require us to think first of Rome. I do not begrudge the slanders that Tullius Cicero told about me at the trial of Verres. It was not Verres’ money that secured by election and I will not “throw duty and dignity to the winds,” as Cicero claimed I would. Having principles is a fine and noble thing; letting the world burn in their service is the prerogative of the philosopher and not the politician. Senators cannot imagine that they live in Plato’s republic and not the cesspool of Romulus. Duty demands that we look first to the safety of the republic. Take

care that you be well, Sallustius Crispus. And I do hope that, when this storm has
passed, we can talk more about Crete. It is riveting I assure you, yes? Yes. May you be
well.'

“And, with that, Metellus and his entourage headed towards his cousin’s house on the Esquiline
Hill.” Sallust shook his wine cup to attract the attention of the serving boy.

“But my dear Sallust, you said it was not quite dark when Metellus took his leave. Yet you
arrived here so late. What detained you?”

“I had hoped to see Marcus Antonius—I see your disapproval; I know he can be a rogue but,
when he’s sober, he is terribly sharp and, although he’s younger than I am he knows everyone.
Any man who can be friends with populares like Crassus and Caesar, Catilinarians like Lentulus
Sura, and the Boni too is worth cultivating. Cicero, you know, greatly esteemed his grandfather,
the famous orator. In fact, did you know that when the grandfather of Marcus Antonius was
about to be murdered by a partisan of Marius during the Terror...

“Please, my dear Sallust, if you tell me everything, what will you have left for your history?”

“Of course. Marcus Antonius, I was sure, would know the mood of the people and intentions of
the popular faction. It took some searching, but I found him at the house of Gaius Scribonius
Curio—yes, the orator—in his house, just a little distance away from the Roman Forum. It won’t
surprise you to learn that I found them drinking.

After the usual greetings and introductions,

Marcus Antonius voiced his concerns about the
behavior of Cicero and Catiline:”

Our friends find themselves in a most uncomfortable situation. The “Good men” are
sure they are on the side of Catiline. Ever since Crassus turned those letters over to
Cicero, the friends of Catiline believe we value the few above the welfare of the people.
Personally, and I am not ashamed to say it, I think that Catiline makes a great deal of
sense. The “Good men,” with their villas and their retinues of slaves, might not realize it
but Rome has changed. This is not a city of shepherds' huts and she-wolf lairs! It is the
head of the world. And Italy and the world have come here. But the city is dangerous for
the poor. Food is scarce; their apartments are ramshackle. Gaius, you said recently that a
poor person is more likely to die in a collapsing or burning building than of old age.
Champions of the People have long recognized that Rome can only be strong when her
people are strong.

Yet earlier this year, when the tribune Publius Servilius Rullus proposed first the
abolition of debts and then real land reform, Cicero stood in the way. Debt relief I know
is controversial. But how could anyone object to the land bill? Land would have been purchased at a fair price using funds from Pompey’s conquests. And public lands in Campania, all now unoccupied, would have been distributed to the urban and rural poor. But Cicero spoke vigorously against it, citing its costs and claiming that land would be no benefit to the poor. No benefit to the poor!? No wonder there is such desperation among the poor here and throughout Italy, when a consul can speak such folly. Emotions were raw. My friends thought, ‘surely we can allow the sons of men proscribed under Sulla to be fully Roman and let them run for office again.’ But no! Even this act of decency was blocked by Cicero. No wonder so many such men now support Catiline.

As if this insult to the People were not enough, Cicero then defended Gaius Rabirius, a man who killed a fellow Roman without trial, all to prevent any challenge to the authority of their precious Consultum Ultimum. Look, Cicero claims that the Consultum Ultimum is needed to prevent the chaos of mob rule. Rabirius and the other murders climbed on the roof of the Senate House, tore off the tiles, and stoned to death Saturninus and his followers, who had surrendered to the consul and were awaiting lawful trial. Where was the imminent threat to public order? Even if you grant the authority of the decree, as soon as the threat was neutralized, surely the decree has run its course. Or once given does it allow anyone to resort to violence with impunity whenever the mood strikes? That is mob rule! Rabirius’ conviction reveals that the People believe strongly that their tribunes should be protected and that the rights of Roman citizens are inviolate. Cicero risks all by resting his ability to act illegally on the discredited authority of Consultum Ultimum. A mob in fine togas is still a mob.

“Marcus Antonius nevertheless felt that rumors of Catiline raising an army were plausible and that resorting to force would only result in the empowerment of the man with the largest army, Pompey:”

But this business of Catiline raising an army? If it is true, then Catiline is less clever than I suspected. What folly! First, the threat of insurrection gives the elites a pretext to move against those who seek reform. They have been itching for just such an excuse since Pompey and Crassus restored the powers of the tribunes. We must preserve and strengthen the powers of the tribunate. It is our best check on the abuse of the People by the powerful. But just as Cicero ought not be able to act outside the law, neither should Catiline, no matter how compelling his reforms. Don’t misunderstand, I see the attraction. Many of my friends are on the Aventine tonight, listening to Catiline and his associates rallying the people. But we know all too well what might happened when one man’s ambition grows too high. Marius’ supporters taught my grandfather, a good and just man, that lesson all too well. Second, while we bicker about who will serve the meal, the bull is standing outside of the door. Pompey, I mean. Who will be in Catiline’s supposed army? Old men and farmers? Pompey has 8 legions! Over 30,000 battle-
hardened veterans, each more loyal to Pompey than to the Senate. Cicero supported Pompey’s command in the East, remember. Even if Catiline achieved everything he hoped for, what happens when Pompey comes home? Remember Sulla’s return, and Marius’, and Cinna’s? That was less then twenty years ago. Whoever has the best army controls Rome. That is the reality of this new world. And now, Pompey has that army.

Or what if Catiline and Pompey divide the world between them, what would become of us? Where will Crassus buy an army? What use will Caesar’s pontifical robes be against the two? Need I mention Catiline’s “service” to Sulla during his reign of terror. How many equestrians met their fate because of Catiline. He even arranged for his own brother-in-law to be added to list of the proscribed, and tortured to death Marius’ nephew on the tomb of his friend Lutatius Catulus. Catiline says he is a friend of the People, and maybe now he is. But when he had the chance to stand against tyranny, he preferred to put citizens’ necks in the noose. I cannot shake the feeling that he cares more for the consulship of Catiline than the welfare of the People.

But if Cicero wins outright and the Consultum Ultimum is confirmed, then what is to stop the “Good men” from silencing whomever they deem a threat. No liberty can survive in that circumstance, especially with Pompey’s 30,000 swords guaranteeing their new authority. At the same time, if Cicero falls, we face an uncertain future. The status quo might be best. But no matter what happens we must attempt to overturn the Consultum Ultimum. Unless, of course, advantage seems to lie with strange bedfellows.”

“You would know about those, Marcus Antonius!” someone shouted. Anthony smiled, “There was this time in Baiae...”

“Well then, modesty prevents me from repeating the rest of Marcus Antonius’ story. As the whole group dissolved in uproars of laughter after his indecent anecdote, Marcus Antonius crossed over to me.”

“Gaius Sallustius, I promised I would visit my good friend Cornelius Nepos. He is dining tonight, as he does most nights, at the house of Titus Pomponius Atticus, the philosopher. Will you join me? You and Cornelius are both such... historians! (he laughed) I am sure Cornelius would appreciate seeing you.”

“Marcus Antonius and I climbed the Esquiline Hill to the house of Pomponius Atticus. Conversation had turned to Cornelius Nepos’ designs to write a history of the world. Posidonius, the Greek historian, and Nepos were debating some obscure point concerning the geography of Gaul. Licinius Macer Calvus and Valerius Catullus were there too, the poets. You surely
know Catullus, “let us live and let us love....” Not my style, this modern poetry, I confess. Pomponius Atticus welcomed us into the dining room:

“Marcus Antonius, welcome! And Sallustius Crispus! A surprise to see you—but of course not an unpleasant one. I am sorry to say that you just missed our friend Helvius Cinna. He wanted to rest before the important debate in the Senate tomorrow. Imagine! Cinna taking an interest in faction, law, and politics. Not that such things much concern young poets and old philosophers like us, of course. I regret to say that before he left Cinna made it clear that he is no sure vote for my dear friend Cicero. Cicero you remember had some pointed criticism for Cinna’ Zymrna, a learned and challenging poem. And Cinna, like all poets, can hold a grudge.

There are several senators who would just as soon rid themselves of Catiline and Cicero as see any one of them victorious. One of the many reasons why politics, as you know, holds no interest for me. But even a philosopher does not wish to see blood run in the streets. I travelled to Athens the year after Sulla’s siege, you know. There I heard in no uncertain terms that even if one ignores politics, sometimes politics does not return the favor. It would be better if a solution could be found without the need for bloodshed. Well. These are not the topics for which my meals are famous, now are they? Let us turn to happier pursuits. Catullus, I believe you have a new poem about my dear friend Marcus Tullius, do you not?”

“Indeed I do, my dear Titus, one that bears directly on Tullius’ judgment:

\[
O \text{ most learned of the descendants of Romulus,} \\
As \text{ many as there are and were, Marcus Tullius,} \\
And \text{ will be in later years.} \\
\text{Catullus gives great thanks to you,} \\
\text{Catullus the worst poet of all,} \\
As \text{ he is the worst poet of all,} \\
\text{Just so you are the best patron of all.”}
\]

“Marvelous, Sallust, marvelous! I know that you are not fond of the new style of poetry. But how was Catullus’ poem received?”

“Pomponius Atticus cheered in the Greek style—‘sophos, sophos, three times sophos!’—thinking, of course, that a humble Catullus had praised Cicero’s support of his friends and the arts. But I noticed that Cornelius Nepos seemed confused about whether the poem was sincere. Marcus Antonius was about to burst out laughing at what he perceived as a riotous insult of Cicero when he realized that his interpretation differed from that of his host...”
“Well, dear Sallust, Catullus has hit the mark, hasn't he. What kind of man is Cicero? Does he have the interests of Rome foremost in this heart, as he claims, or is it ambition that drives him, and us, towards the rocks of civil strife. I think that tomorrow we will learn what is best and worst for us all. Now, dear Gaius, if you will indulge me, did Catullus recite any other poems...”
YOUR SPEECH

The game begins *ante diem quartum Idus Novembres*, also known as November 9th, the day after Cicero delivered his “First Oration Against Catiline” (included in this book). Your instructor may suggest or require other readings, but Cicero's speech serves as the primary source for the game. Cicero's speech, however, is not a sterile recitation of facts. It is passionate, clever, and biased testimony composed by a passionate partisan of one side of this debate. You should read Cicero’s speech (and any other primary documents) from the perspective of your character. Depending on who you are, his speech may appear to be a powerful indictment of a malignant threat to the Senate and People of Rome, or it may seem a tissue of lies spun by a slanderous megalomaniacal blowhard—or a little of both.

During the debate that follows Cicero’s speech you are required by the traditions of the senate to state your opinion about the matter introduced by Cicero. You may make a counter-proposal for how to address the crisis that confronts Rome or comment on the wisdom or folly of a proposal that has already been made.

Legally, a senator may speak as long as they wish, but debate will be limited to a duration determined by your instructor (likely between 4 and 8 minutes, or the equivalent of 2-to-4-pages of typed text). The order of speakers will follow standard senatorial practice (see ORDER OF DEBATE in the “RULES & TRADITIONS OF THE ROMAN SENATE” below). With this in mind, you will be well served to discuss your ideas, concerns, fears, and/or plots with Romans who are likely to support (or oppose) your designs, especially if they will be speaking before you. Seek out allies, anticipate the arguments of enemies, and court those senators who can be persuaded.

**The Necessity of Action** If the Senate is unable to approve a new proposal at the conclusion of this debate, then the *Senatus Consultum Ultimum* or “Final Decree of the Senate” that instructed Cicero to undertake any and all actions to safeguard the state remains in effect. Yet, failing to pass a resolution will further exacerbate the confusion of the current political crisis. In the absence of a new decree, Cicero may act on the existing decree at any moment. This state of affairs that is untenable to the Catilinarians and to many of the undecided senators. Since failing to confirm the “Final Decree” could (further) delegitimize it in the eyes of many Romans and call into question the legality of any action taken under its auspices, Cicero and his supporters have every incentive to pass a decree that confirms their authority. In short, (almost) all senators have a vested interest that the Senate take *some* action.
Since your goal is to persuade your fellow senators by means of a persuasive speech in the Roman Senate, you will need to conform to the expectations of a Roman audience. With this in mind, your speech must:

1. **Be believable and consistent with the historical moment**: you must avoid anachronism and may not allude to events or works that have yet to happen (no mention of any events after November 9th, 63 BC). Avoiding anachronism includes shunning contemporary slang or allusion to pop or literary culture. During the game, you are a Roman; “To be or not to be” is just another antithesis (and a facile one at that); “I have a dream” has no historical-cultural significance for you.

2. **Situate your support or opposition to a proposal in the context of the “Roman Virtues”** (see Appendix). Romans rarely argued exclusively from fact. Rather they approached important decisions from the perspective of ethics and character. Much more important than *who* did *what when* is the question of *what kind of character* would do *what sort of thing* in *what kind of circumstance*. That is, it matters less if Catiline really *did* sleep with his sister or if Cicero would bribe a witness, than if they were the kind of people who would engage in such actives. Refer early and often to the “Roman Virtues,” observing how your opponents lack them and the actions of you and your friends display them.

3. **Quote at least one phrase or passage from Cicero’s *First Speech Against Catiline*.” Feel free to quote other *sententiae* by ancient Romans as well.

   Note: This is the one place where anachronism may be allowable—i.e. you might ‘quote’ a Roman text written after 63 BC, as long as you do not acknowledge the author. For example you might pretend like you are first person to claim that you are speaking “without anger or prejudice” (*sine ira et studio*, Tacitus, *Annales* 1.1). Your instructor will inform you if such anachronism is permissible.

4. **Use at least one *exemplum*.” That is refer to the actions of i) a notable ancestor or, if you do not have an ancestor whose actions are relevant to the debate, the actions of ii) a notable figure from Roman history: e.g. Regulus, Coriolanus, Mucius Scaevola, Fabius Maximus, Brutus (the avenger of Lucretia, not the killed of Caesar, which has yet to happen), etc.

5. **Make the speech sound Roman by making frequent use of the rhetorical devices common in Latin oratory.” Examples can be found in the “Guide to Rhetorical Figures” in the *Appendix;* further advice is offered in the selections by ancient rhetoricians (see *Appendix*). More information about ancient rhetoric, rhetorical theory, and rhetorical devices is available at BYU’s outstanding *Silvae Rhetoricae* (rhetoric.byu.edu).
6. **Be consistent with the practice of Roman oratory.** Fundamentally, Roman oratory is performance. You persuade through entertainment (supported by facts and reality, if possible). A dry rehearsal of law or facts will not persuade anyone. Be flamboyant, be funny, be over the top; but...

7. **Be consistent with your persona.** Some of you are regal; some shady; some experienced; some young and excitable; some, frankly, a little crazy.

Since Roman rhetorical training emphasized memory and improvisation, a Roman would never dream of reading his speech. Since, however, you have not have the 20 years of rhetorical training and likely 20 or more years of practice at delivering speeches, **you may use notes during your speech.** Please, however, do not read your speech verbatim. If you anticipate this being a problem, please approach your instructor to discuss the situation.

After delivering your speech, you will submit it to your instructor. Your instructor will provide additional details about the expectations for your written speech.
Some Questions You May Wish to Consider

✦ What should be done about Catiline?
✦ What kind of man is he? Is he a flawed agent of necessary change? Or is he a vile monster obsessed with power?
✦ Are there limits to the powers of the consuls and the Senate? If not, what is the value of citizenship?
✦ Do threats to the state ever justify the curtailing of fundamental rights? If so, when? Who decides?
✦ When does a threat to the state justify action that in “normal” times would be illegal?
✦ What proof is needed to act against the treasonous?
✦ What is the real crisis facing Rome? the desperation of the people? the promises (or threats) of Catiline? The reaction of Cicero?

More broadly, you might consider whether the challenges facing Rome justified decisive reform.

✦ Is the primary function of the law to empower the weak from the strong or to safeguard all equally?
✦ What duties do the wealthy owe to the poor? The poor to the rich?

Remember that your speech should not aim to answer these questions directly. Rather, they may influence how you craft your proposal, or support or criticize the proposal put forward another senator.

A Note About Fortuna et Nefas (Fortune & Wicked Behavior)

At any point in the debate, events may overtake the deliberation of the Senate. That is, you should be prepared for the unexpected (a riot caused by a particularly offensive speech, a sign from the gods, word that a prominent Roman has returned to Italy, etc.).

Roman history shows that politics was not always settled by debate. In the event that you wish to undertake action outside of the normal parameters of acceptable behavior (as one might say), you should approach your Instructor who will determine if your proposed action is permissible and how you should proceed.
Cultivating Your Persona

Once you are assigned a particular role, you should work to understand who you are and how your identity contributes to your understanding of the current crisis and what must course of action must be taken. General information about your biography and goals is provided in your “Character Sheet.” But you must take these facts and craft them into a persona, the character in whose voice you will be addressing the Senate.

Begin with some research about your life (only up to 63 BC! you are not a prophet), including the events of the conspiracy (the essay on “Historical Context” in this booklet and the two timelines in the Appendix good places to start). Then answer these questions about yourself and how you view on the current crisis:

I. How old are you? What events of import have you experienced? An 80-year old, who was a child when Tiberius Gracchus was killed, has experienced a very different Rome than someone who is only 30 years old, and only dimly remembers to Social War or Sulla’s Reign of Terror. Compare how you conceive of and speak about the United States, its strengths and challenges, and how your parents and/or grandparents talk about the country, its history, and direction.

II. What is your family like? Current family members may influence your politics, of course; but famous (or infamous) ancestors can also be influential as well. Note that such judgments are likely to be partisan: a noble hero for one family might be a bloody-minded monster to another. Do familial ties lead you to support or oppose other characters? Are you the client of another character?

III. What experiences have you had? For some of you, the historical record is be quite extensive and might provide a rich trove of information about your experiences and personality; for others, it will be up to you to hone your character in accordance to what limited information you have.

Note: whoever you are, you are not a prophet and do not know about what happens to you or Rome after 63 BC. You cannot refer to Crassus’ invasion of Parthia or Caesar’s assassination any more than you could the French Revolution or the Moon landing. Nevertheless, you may gain insight into your character by seeing what the future has in store. Your instructor will inform you about whether it is advisable or allowed to research “the future” in the context of The Crisis of Catiline.
IV. **What do you think of Cicero and Catiline, and their political agendas?** Have you had past dealings with either? Are you inclined to be receptive to a *novus homo*, or to give a noble the benefit of the doubt? Do you think that senatorial prerogatives need to be maintained? Or do the people have legitimate grievances? Your “Character Sketch” will give you the general sense of where you stand (or perhaps more specific direction), but even so you should be sure that you understand *why* you have the positions that you have, as then you will be able to convey them to your fellow senators.

**VICTORY**

At the start of the game, no party has the advantage. The course of the debate will be determined by what proposals are made and how you support or assail them.

In a sense, everyone who participates in the transformative educational experience that is *The Crisis of Catiline* is a winner—but in another, more accurate sense, some of you will be winners and others will be disgraced, exiled, or dead. Your instructor may assign a victory bonus for those of you who successfully navigate your way through this crisis.

*Nota bene:* you may pretend to support one position to mask a secret goal that you work for behind the scenes. If this is the case, be sure to confess your treacherous (but perhaps crafty) designs to your instructor; otherwise the position you support publicly will be assumed to be your actual position.
Reacting to the Past (RTTP) is a game playing pedagogy that was developed to provide a more interesting and dynamic way to present complex historical and scientific ideas. The heart of the game is persuasion. You must persuade other Romans that “your” opinion makes more sense than that of your opponents.

Liminality

Reacting to the Past places you and your classmates within a re-imagined moment of crisis, one in which decisive action is required and history could unfold in any number of ways. In antiquity, orators practiced a kind of speech in which they impersonated a famous figure from the past was impersonated. In Reacting you will be following in their footsteps, taking on the persona of a Roman senator. This figure has a distinctive personality and set of ideas and convictions formed from a lifetime of experience. Your biggest challenge—and what will determine more than anything else if you are successful in the game—is arguing and listening from the perspective of this Roman persona. Whenever you are in class during the game (that is “in” the Senate), it is vital that you strive to the best of your abilities to act and think and speak like a Roman. At no point should you introduce a modern quotation or concept into the debate.

Decorum

Many, if not most, discussions in academic settings are decidedly polite. An instructor may correct or refine the statement by a student but (one hopes) does so without malice or bias. Students may (and should) disagree with the opinions voiced by their classmates (and more rarely by the instructor), yet rarely do these conversations become as intense or personal as we may experience outside of the classroom. Indeed, politeness and deference towards the opinions of others is often a winning rhetorical strategy. As the saying goes, “you can catch more flies with honey than with vinegar.” But when it came to politics, Romans were rarely polite to their opponents. If your speech is effective, it will be booed by some senators (and cheered by others). In The Crisis of Catiline you will disagree, often vehemently, with your opponents. You must integrate your knowledge of Roman society and conjure every rhetorical trick in your arsenal to refute their misguided, mendacious, and muddle-headed proposals.

Please remember that what your fellow students say and do during The Crisis of Catiline is said and done in service of their roles. Their actions are not an expression of their personal opinions of the topic being debated or of the students who are opposing them the debate. Indeed, some individual roles may require that they are unpleasant to a character (e.g. Cinna or Celer towards Cicero; Cato towards... almost everyone). In the same way, it is your responsibility to avoid
bringing your personal feelings or experiences with a classmate into the world of the game. The *liminality* of the game is only possible when each participant strives to their utmost to win the argument, while remembering that actions undertaken in the context of the game are just that, part of the game.

Similarly, although you are encouraged to continue your discussions, plotting, and machinations outside of class, remember that outside of the Senate, *you are you and your classmates are your classmates*. Leave the wrongs, slights, and insults felt by your persona on the floor of the Senate.

*Reacting* provides a uniquely valuable environment for learning about the past (and the present). You should always remember that, no matter how aggressive disagreement may during the game, that everyone is aiming towards the same goal: a better understanding of the past, and through a better understanding of the past, a richer and more nuanced understanding of the present.
ROLES & FACTIONS

At the beginning of the game, Roman senators are distributed among three roughly equal groups:

I) devoted Catilinarians, who support Catiline’s bid for power and his reform agenda;

II) Optimates, who oppose the Catilinarians and support Cicero (with greater or lesser degrees of enthusiasm); and,

III) a group of Indeterminates, who are uncertain about which faction to support, perhaps because they detest Catiline or cannot support Cicero (or both), or because they fear either faction dominating Roman politics.

I. CATILINARIANS

Catiline and his followers. Marginalized by the optimates, they sought power by radical appeals to the disgruntled and disaffected Romans and Italians, especially the impoverished urban Plebs, indebted aristocrats and farmers, and veterans who had failed as farmers and fondly remembered the excitement (and profit) that accompanied military victory. To ameliorate the financial pressures on the many, Catilinarians advocated a radial program of debt forgiveness, land reform (redistribution of property), the curtailing of the prerogatives of the Senate, the empowerment of popular assemblies, the opening of magistracies and priesthoods to all regardless of wealth or status.

II. OPTIMATES

Optimates or the Boni (“Good Men”) are united by a unanimous hostility towards Catiline, his supporters, and his political agenda. They are devoted to preserving the political prerogatives of the Senate and the power and privileges of the traditional nobility of Rome. They sought to limit the power of the popular assemblies and the Tribunes of the Plebs. In general, they favored the nobles (noble families) and opposed the ascension of novi homines (“new men”, usually provincials) into Roman politics. But some “new men,” like Cicero, might support and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lucius Sergius Catilina</th>
<th>Gaius Antonius Hybrida</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. Cornelius Lentulus Sura</td>
<td>Servius Cornelius Sulla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucius Cassius Longinus</td>
<td>Lucius Calpurnius Bestia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaius Cornelius Cethegus</td>
<td>Marcus Porcius Laeca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus Tullius Cicero</td>
<td>Decimus Junius Silanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucius Licinius Murena</td>
<td>Marcus Porcius Cato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucius Julius Caesar</td>
<td>Quintus Caecilius Metellus Pius Scipio Nasica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servius Sulpicius Rufus</td>
<td>Publius Servilius Vatia Isauricus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucius Caeilius Rufus</td>
<td>Marcus Caelius Rufus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
seek the support of the optimates. They oppose the furor (‘destructive madness’) that the believe the “men of the people” or populares threaten to unleash by stoking the ambitions and resentments of the people. In times of crisis, stability must be maintained, even at the cost of individual liberties.

III. INDETERMINATES

Some senators are uncertain about whether they should support Catiline or Cicero. They are persuadable by the proper argument.

Some indeterminate senators are anti-Ciceronian Optimates. They detest Catiline, but they believe that Cicero is exploiting the current crisis for his personal benefit or aggrandizement. They may have a personal grudge against Cicero, resent the fact that he is the “first man” of his family to win election to the consulship, or remember Cicero’s past support of Pompey, whom they view as a far greater threat to the stability of the republic than Catiline.

The other indeterminate senators align with the populares, a group that opposes the optimates and supports measures favorable to the Roman urban and rural poor. Populares (or “those who favor the people”) are noble senators who relied on the people’s assemblies and the office of the tribune to acquire political power. Populares seek to gain the support of the urban plebs by supporting legislation that would benefit this group. In generally they support the subsidized distribution of grain (the dole) restrictions on the power of the Senate, and reducing the economic importance of slavery, which reduced the opportunities for the urban and rural poor to earn a living by means of low- and unskilled labor. They also seek to broaden the electorate (and their political support) through expanding citizenship to members of communities outside Rome and Italy. They support many aspects of Catiline’s program of social reform, but resist his methods. They may believe that Catiline has gone too far, but believe that his arrest (or worse) would set a dangerous precedent that could empower the entrenched Optimates to oppress their opponents and stifle reform. They are unanimous in their opposition to the authority of the Senatus Consultum Ultimum, which they believe is a dangerous violation of the traditional protections afforded to Roman citizens.
A Note about Factions

It is important to recognize although the senators are divided into different factions, they are all drawn from the wealthiest strata of Roman society. *Optimates* and *populares*, therefore, are not differentiated by economic class or coherent political platforms or modern conceptions of *liberal* and *conservative*. There are wealthy *populares* (like Crassus) and more modestly-heeled *optimates* (like Cicero and Cato). Cicero began his career allied with *populares* politicians and interests, but saw his allegiances shift as he rose through the ranks of the *cursus honorum*.

Rather, these factions differ most in the segment of Roman society where they seek political support. An *optimate* might be persuaded to support legislation what would benefit the material well-being of the people; the *populares* were themselves members of the Roman elite, and sought to reform, not replace, the current system.

One question that all Romans in the game must ask and answer is whether the *Catilinarians* are likewise seeking to address legitimate grievances through political means, or have they launched an extraconstitutional grab for power that aims to upend the state: are they reformers or revolutionaries?
**Rules & Traditions of the Roman Senate**

**Convening the Senate**

Any magistrate with the “the right to consult the Senate” (*ius agendi cum senatu*) could convene the Senate. Only one magistrate could convene the Senate at any given time and for our purposes this will be Cicero.

The presiding magistrate would offer a sacrifice and take the auspices (look to the sky for ill- or favorably-omened birds) before he entered the Senate house. If the Senate was convening in a Temple, the senators might offer a small, bloodless sacrifice to the god (e.g. valuable spices).

The regular meeting place of the Senate in 63 BC was the *Curia Cornelia*. But the location of a Senate meeting is up to the convening magistrate. Cicero summoned the Senate to the Temple of Jupiter Stator, which was more defensible than the *Curia*, should violence break out.

**Attendance**

Any senator (i.e. anyone whose name was on the list of *senatōrēs* which had been compiled by the *censōrēs*) was entitled to attend any meeting of the Senate.

The presiding magistrate could also grant special permission to anyone not normally entitled to attend particular meeting of the Senate. This permission was most commonly given to special guests such as foreign ambassadors.

**Quorum**

Although a minimum number of votes was required to vote on an ordinary matter for discussion (*relātiō*) and to pass an ordinary senatorial decree (*senatus consultum*), the exact number is uncertain. We do hear that a senator could challenge whether the quorum had been met by stating “count the Senate!” (*numera Senatum!*). The presiding magistrate had the discretion to judge whether the meeting was sufficiently full for meaningful business to be done. This decision was not open to challenge.

**Entry and Departure of Magistrates**

When a magistrate entered or left the meeting, all in attendance would stand up. They might also stand up on the arrival or departure of any individual to whom they wished to show particular respect.

---

* The procedures below are based on references to Senate meetings in the speeches and letters of Cicero and on the handbook of Senate procedure written by Marcus Terentius Varro in 70 BC at the request of Pompey the Great, which was quoted by the antiquarian scholar Aulus Gellius (14.7). These instructions have been adapted from those found on the *Nova Roma* website (novaroma.org/nr/Senate_procedures)
**CONDUCT OF THE MEETING**

The presiding magistrate conducted the meeting and had control of its agenda: he sought the advice of the Senate on whatever matters he brought before it, and the purpose of the meeting was to advise him what to do.

**Introducing the Matter for Discussion (Relātiō)**

The presiding magistrate brought the matter for discussion (relātiō) before the Senate. He did not propose a specific course action, but merely outlined the issue for discussion. The relātiō itself was always quite brief and followed this pattern:

*Quod bonum faustum felix fortunatumque sit populō Rōmānō Quiritium, referimus ad vōs, patrēs conscriptī...*  
“That which is good and favorable to the Roman people we refer to you, conscript fathers...

He would then state succinctly the matter for discussion and conclude with these words:

*Dē eā rē quid fieri placet?*  
“That about this matter, what action is pleasing?”

**DEBATE**

Having introduced his relātiō, the presiding magistrate would ordinarily open the matter for debate. This was customarily done by calling each member of the Senate to state his opinion on the matter.

**ORDER OF DEBATE**

Senators speak in the order they appear in the *Album Senatorum*, a list of senators maintained by the censors. The most prestigious and experienced senators spoke first; newly minted senators would speak at the end of debate, after they had heard the opinions of their elders.

There are three important exceptions to this sequence of debate:

1. **Current magistrates** (i.e. *praetors* and *consuls* and *censors*) have no set place in the order of debate. They can speak without being called upon to do so, at any time, subject only to the normal rules of *intercessio* (see below).

2. The presiding magistrate could call on senators to speak earlier in the debate if the matter directly concerned them or as a mark of special esteem, but this was unusual, since it could be perceived as a slight to those senators who had been displaced.

3. The presiding magistrate may call on senior members of the Senate to respond briefly to speeches made after they had already spoken. In particular, a speaker who had himself put forward a proposal might wish to reply to a later proposal, whether by briefly...
restating his adherence to his original view or else by saying that he was changed his view and now supported the new proposal.

*Album Senatorum*

1. Marcus Tullius Cicero, *consul and presiding magistrate* [Speech is *First Oration Against Catiline*]

Quintus Lutatius Catulus, *princeps senatus* (Instructor)

2. Decimus Junius Silanus, *consul designatus*
3. Lucius Licinius Murena, *consul designatus*
4. Lucius Aurelius Cotta, *censor*
5. Marcus Licinius Crassus, *censor*
6. Gaius Antonius Hybrida, *consul*
7. P. Servilius Vatia Isauricus
8. P. Cornelius Lentulus Sura, *praetor* (ex-consul)
9. Lucius Julius Caesar
10. Gaius Julius Caesar, *pontifex maximus; praetor designatus*
11. Lucius Sergius Catilina
12. Lucius Cassius Longinus
13. Quintus Caecilius Metellus Celer, *praetor*
14. Servius Cornelius Sulla
15. Servius Sulpicius Rufus
16. Lucius Calpurnius Bestia, *tribune designatus*
17. Quintus Caecilius Metellus Nepos, *tribune designatus*
18. Marcus Porcius Cato, *tribune designatus*
19. T. Atius Labienus, *tribune*
20. L. Caecilius Rufus, *tribune*
21. Gaius Helvius Cinna
22. Quintus Caecilius Metellus Pius Scipio Nasica
23. Publius Vatinius
24. Gaius Cornelius Cethegus
25. Marcus Porcius Laeca
26. Publius Claudius Pulcher

Magistrates who may speak at any time:

- Lucius Aurelius Cotta, *censor*
- Marcus Licinius Crassus, *censor*
- Gaius Antonius Hybrida, *consul*
- P. Cornelius Lentulus Sura, *praetor*
- Quintus Caecilius Metellus Celer, *praetor*
DELIVERING AN OPINION (SENTENTIA)

dîc, M. Tullî, (quid censēs) “Speak, Marcus Tullius, (what you recommend)”

When the presiding magistrate called upon a senator by name, that senator was obliged to
give some indication of his opinion, even if was simply agreeing with another's position.

Cnaeo Pompiō adsentior “I agree with Gnaeus Pompeius”

If he planned to deliver a speech of any length, he would stand. Once he was on his feet, a
member of the Senate was entitled to speak for as long as he wished without being stopped
(although the presiding magistrate or another magistrate might make a brief interruption to
ask a question or challenge a point). The only requirement was that he must, usually at the
end of his speech, either make a specific proposal of what should be done about the relātiō
or express his agreement with the proposal of a previous speaker.

RESPONDING TO A SENTENTIA

A speech might be greeted by cheers, heckles or grumbles. Senators would react in some way
to any notable speech.

Signaling agreement with your feet: If in agreement with a previous speaker, a member of the
Senate might go to sit near that speaker. He might do so not only when called on to give his
own opinion but after hearing another speaker make a proposal with which he agreed. He
might also move away from a speaker to indicate his disapproval of that speaker's view. Thus
the conclusion of a speech might be followed by a quite extensive movement of people from
one place to another.

ENDING DEBATE

Once the presiding magistrate had opened debate he was obliged to continue calling for
opinions until he had called on every member present at the meeting, and if there was not
enough time for this in a single day then he was obliged to call a new meeting on a
subsequent day to continue the debate. This interpretation is supported by references in Livy
and Cicero to meetings which went on past sunset and had to be resumed on a subsequent
day, but none of these references state explicitly that the meetings overran because the
presiding magistrate was obliged to continue to the bitter end; it might equally be that when
sunset came there were still members whose advice the presiding magistrate wished to hear,
and that he therefore voluntarily chose not to call for a vote on that day.¹

¹ There is some debate about the power of the presiding magistrate to limit debate. It has been argued that
the presiding magistrate could call a vote (thus ending the debate) at any time except while a member of
the senate was speaking. The procedures of the senate, however, appear to have been constructed around a
senator's right to speak, rather than around logic and efficiency, so this argument is not conclusive.
**Voting (Discessio)**

If there was debate on the *relatio*, one or more alternative proposals might be put forward by members of the Senate.

The magistrate had complete freedom in deciding what to do about these proposals. He could put a proposal to a vote exactly as it had originally been suggested, or he could make changes to it, or he could refuse to put it to a vote at all. He could even create entirely new proposals which had not been discussed during the debate. That said, the deference afforded senators meant that the presiding magistrate would exercise this discretion with care. Even senators who did not support a proposal might take offense if that proposal was not brought to a vote.

The magistrate also had freedom to decide in which order he would put proposals to a vote, and the result of one vote might influence his decision about which, if any, proposal to put forward next. If the presiding magistrate attempted to push through an unpopular proposal by including it in a single vote with a number of more popular items, members might protest by shouting “divide!” (“split it up”). The presiding magistrate was not obliged to do so, but it seems that he would often bow to pressure.

Voting was always by separation (*discessio*). The presiding magistrate would read the proposal and then say:

*Quī hoc cēnsētis, illuc trānsite; quī alia omnia, in hanc partem.*

“Whoever agrees with this, move over there, those who think anything else, move over here.”

At the same time he would indicate where the first group should go, and where the second. Those supporting the proposal would normally be told to go over to the person who had originally made the proposal. The options were either to support the proposal or not to support it. Abstentions were thus counted as votes against the proposal.

**Voters**

All members of the Senate participate in the vote, with the exception of the presiding magistrate. You likely control the vote of a certain bloc of *pediarii*, clients who are loyal to you and your family, and who will take their cue from your vote. This models the influence of the patron-client system in ancient Rome, which exerted a profound influence over to the arena of politics—also it is unlike that you playing *The Crisis of Catiline* in a class of hundreds!

The instructor will inform you of how many *pediarii* you control before the game begins. Although Cicero, as the presiding magistrate, cannot vote, he does control a bloc of *pediarii*. 
But your *auctoritas* can be fleeting. Based on the strength (or weakness) of your speech, you may gain (or lose) supporters—if you deliver passionate, well-styled speech while someone else speaks mutters incoherent nonsense, you are bound to convince some additional *pedarii* to support you.

**TALLYING THE VOTES**

Once the voting members had taken up their positions in the two parts of the meeting-place, the magistrate either counted or simply assessed the relative sizes of the two groups, and then declared:

*Haec pars maior videtur.*  
“This group seems bigger.”

A simple majority decided the issue. There is no evidence that his tally could be challenged in any way. Every now and then, when a result was very close, this may have allowed the presiding magistrate to choose the result he preferred, but social and political pressure must in most cases have been enough to keep presiding magistrates honest in their counting.

**VETO (**intercessio**)**

For most of the Roman republic, a tribune could use a veto (**intercessio**) could to block the outcome of the vote by standing up either during or immediately after the vote and declare:

*Intercēdō!*  
“I veto this!”

A veto would have the effect of preventing a proposal from becoming a recommendation of the Senate (**senatus consultum**) even if the Senate had voted to approve it. It would instead become an informal resolution (**senatus auctoritas**). It was unclear whether a tribute could veto a **senatus consultum ultimum**. But note, vetoing was done only in *exceptional* circumstances and the trivial use of the veto could have dire consequences.
Historical Context

*The Crisis of Catiline* plays out against the backdrop of two transformative changes in Roman society. The first is the development of Rome—founded as a small settlement on the famous seven hills at a bend in the Tiber River in Italy—into the most powerful state in the ancient world, with subjects on three continents and spanning nearly the entire Mediterranean. By the time of the *Crisis of Catiline* no state posed a serious threat to Rome's continued survival or dominance. Local potentates or Germanic tribes might raid across Rome's borders, kill Roman citizens, or even defeat a Roman army, but the manpower and resources available to Rome all but guaranteed its eventual victory against such foes.

Instead, the threats to Roman society were internal: corruption, economic disruption, mob violence, popular uprising, and civil war. The foundation of Rome’s military manpower had been the small family farm, which provided the resources for non-elite Romans to purchase arms and serve in the army. But by the late second century, deteriorating economic conditions in the countryside forced many farmers to immigrate to Rome, where they joined the swelling ranks of the urban poor. The economic distress led even those who remained on their land to fall into debt. Attempts to resolve these and other crises in the generations before the *Crisis of Catiline* led to a series of increasingly violent political conflicts within the Roman nobility and between the Roman nobility and the poor.

Competition among the Roman elites had always been ferocious. But beginning in 133 BC, the wealth and power of Rome’s expanding empire distorted a political system that had developed to balance the ambitions of local aristocrats in central Italy. By 63 BC the system of Roman governance, which had evolved and endured for over 400 years, was breaking—if it was not already broken. Romans had become the greatest threat to Rome.

The Growth of Rome and its Empire

According to myth, Rome was founded on April 21, 753 BC Romulus and Remus, twin sons of Mars, the Roman god of war, and Rhea Silvia, a descendant of the Trojan hero Aeneas. Remus, however, was soon killed in a quarrel over the name of the new settlement. Naming the site “Rome,” Romulus became its first king and opened his city as an asylum to foreign outcasts. After abducting woman from the neighboring tribe of the Sabines, Romans and Sabines united and Rome began to prosper. Early Rome was ruled by kings. Although the king’s power was great, a council of wealthy elders, called the Senate, eventually acquired the authority to offer advice to the king. All male citizens capable of military service met in the *Popular Assembly* to ratify the decisions of the
king. The Assembly, which represented the Roman people or the *populus Romanus*, theoretically possessed ultimate political authority. In time, the Roman people would demand that their theoretical power gain the force of law.

Exactly when and how Rome transitioned from a monarchy to a republic is among the most disputed questions in Roman history. At the time of the transition, Rome was controlled by the Etruscans, a sophisticated culture based to the north of Rome. The popular story held that in 509 BC an Etruscan prince raped a noblewoman by name of Lucretia. When Lucretia committed suicide rather than endure the abuses of tyranny, she emboldened the Roman nobles to overthrow the monarchy and establish the republic. Forever after, the word *rex* or king was cursed in Rome, and there could be no greater charge against a Roman than the accusation that he was aiming to establish himself as king. Although Roman came to see the establishment of the republic as a singular event, the overthrow of the Etruscan monarchy was in fact part of a trend throughout the region as towns reasserted their independence against an Etruscan state weakened by recurrent famine. The collapse of Etruscan hegemony in central Italy led to a prolonged struggle for supremacy among the various cities and tribes of the region. After nearly a century of conflict with its neighboring towns, Rome established its dominance in central Italy, setting the stage for its explosive expansion throughout Italy and the Mediterranean in the following centuries.

It was during this period of conflict with its neighbors that Rome transitioned from a monarchy to a republic, evolving the distinctive political system that, with a few changes, was still largely in place during the Crisis of Catiline.

- The **Senate** benefited most from the abolition of the monarchy. Originally composed of 100 noblemen, the Senate grew in size, eventually reaching 600 men. Admittance became limited to those who had been elected to the post of *quaestor* (see below). The Senate's ability to initiate legislation, control expenditures, oversee foreign policy, and supervise most aspects of public administration granted it practical control of the government. The Senate was the only public body in which public debate was permitted.

- All male Roman citizens participated in one or more of the **Assemblies**. The **Centuriate Assembly** (*comitia centuriata*) elected consuls, praetors, and censors; declared war; and served as a court of appeal for citizens sentenced to death. It was organized by wealth, and as a result nobles controlled an effective majority of the voting groups. The **Tribal Assembly** (*comitia tributa*), which was originally organized by geography, elected all other magistrates and ratified laws. A subgroup of this assembly, the **Plebeian Assembly** elected those magistrates open only to plebeians (tribunes and plebeian aediles). Eventually its decrees were given the full force of law.

- The **consul** developed into the most prestigious and powerful political office in Rome. Drawn from a slate of candidates proposed by the Senate, consuls were elected to one-year terms by the people of the *comitia centuriata*, an assembly of Roman citizens of military age. When consuls were in Rome, they were responsible for the legal, political,
and diplomatic apparatus of the Roman state; outside of Rome they served as supreme commanders of the Roman army. There were always two consuls, each with the power to block decisions of the other, an effective check on the ability of a consul to leverage his considerable power into a tyranny. Consuls were accompanied by a bodyguard of 12 lictors, who carried the fasces, a double-headed axe in a bundle of rods that symbolized the consul’s imperium, or their “power to command” the obedience of Roman citizens in military operations and to punish malefactors. Throughout the history of the republic, election to the consulship was dominated by a small group of noble families, although occasionally a talented “new man,” or novus homo, from non-consular family was able gain election to the office.

- Most of the king’s religious functions were transferred to the Pontifex Maximus (‘Chief Pontiff’), who oversaw public sacrifices, regulated the calendar, and supervised the priests who conducted public religious activities. It is important to note that the Romans, like the Greeks, did not have a hereditary class of religious officials. The offices of the priests were instead filled by lay citizens.

- In times of severe crisis, the consuls could empower a single leader to take control of the entire apparatus of the Roman state. The dictator possessed superior imperium over all magistrates, but was limited to a single six-month term. Although quite common in the fourth and third centuries, the office of the dictator eventually fell into disuse.

Other magistracies developed to administer Rome’s increasingly large and complex society.

- In 443 BC censors began to compile the official lists of senator and equestrians (the next highest property class), to maintain the roll of citizens, to assess the tax liability of property, and to contract for major public projects. Unique among magistrates, censors were elected to five-year terms.

- Praetors oversaw the foreign and citizen law courts and assumed the administrative duties of consuls when consuls were absent from Rome.

- Aediles supervised public places, public games, and the grain supply in the city of Rome.

- Quaestors assisted the consuls and kept public records.

Over time a standard sequence of political offices developed. Known as the cursus honorum (right), it began with election to the quaestorship around age thirty and progressed through the aedileship and praetorship to the distinguished consulship.
In general, after serving in a magistracy, a Roman was required to wait at least two to three years before becoming eligible for higher office. Re-election was exceedingly rare, occurring only in time of great crisis. For this reason, political power was spread among a larger segment of the Roman political elite, who were thus encouraged to maintain the stability of the system. This constant turnover, however, assured that most magistrates had little to no direct experience in their offices at the time of their elections. As a result, the advisory role of the Senate took on added significance. Because most magistrates were elected to single, annual terms, there was a tendency for magistrates to focus more on their own short-term advantage than the longer-term concerns of the Roman people.

Unlike the federal and state governments in the United States of America, Rome did not have a written constitution that provided the core political and legal framework for the state. Rather, Rome's political system developed over centuries through a combination of custom and legislation. As a result, precedent was an essential factor in determining whether political actions were acceptable. By the time of the Crisis of Catiline, however, generations of bad precedents had revealed that there were few limitations for a politician who was cunning, daring, and/or shameless enough to seize the advantage.

Before the end of the monarchy, Roman society had become stratified into two distinct classes: the noble Patricians and the common Plebeians, also called the Plebs. Patricians belonged to a few ancient families that dominated the political and religious life of the city. The more numerous plebeians tended to be poor. But even in the early period there is evidence that some plebeian families were wealthy. While both groups enjoyed basic civic rights, in the early years of the republic, patricians came to possess almost exclusive claim to the Senate and religious offices. Eventually, the distinction was formalized and plebeians were prevented from holding many political offices and they were often subjected to harsh treatment by patrician magistrates. The unequal rights afforded to plebeian citizens led to the Struggle of the Orders, a centuries-long struggle by the plebeians for the restoration of their political and legal rights.

The main weapon of the plebeians in pressing for more equitable treatment was secession, a kind of civic strike in which the plebs withdrew from Roman institutions until their demands were met. Because Rome was constantly at war during this period, secession posed a serious threat to the interests of the landowning Roman political elite. In 494, the plebeians seceded to the “Sacred Mountain,” refusing to fight even while Rome was under attack by several neighboring tribes. As part of that settlement, the plebs won the right to elect ten Tribunes of the Plebs. Tribunes were empowered to protect the life and property of all plebeians against arbitrary abuses by patrician magistrates. The bodies of tribunes were declared sacrosanct, making it a religious offense to harm a tribune when they exercised their power of intercessio, or intercession.
on behalf of a pleb. Plebeians took an oath to consider cursed anyone who violated the sacrosanctity of a tribune.

Because laws during this period were passed down orally and controlled by the patrician Pontifex Maximus, plebs were often subjected to arbitrary justice, including enslavement for debt. In 451 BC, another secession, this time to the Aventine Hill within Rome, forced the Senate to establish a commission of ten men to codify existing laws. In 449, they published the Law of the Twelve Tables, but only after a scandal led to the overthrow of the commission. When one of the commissioners, the cruel Appius Claudius, lusted after Verginia, he father killed her rather than see her abused by the power-crazed Appius. The Roman people, repulsed by Appius' behavior, overthrew the commissioners after first compelling them to promulgate laws more favorable to the plebeians. The expansion of plebeian rights continued in 445 when they gained the ability to marry into patrician families. In 367 plebeians were permitted to seek election as consul. By 338 the Senate could no longer override votes by the Plebeian Council and plebeians could run for election to all magistracies. In 287 another plebeian succession gave the votes of the Assembly, or plebiscites, the full force of law. The peaceful resolution of the struggle for plebeian rights was recognized as the Concord of the Orders. The classes of patricians and plebeians continued to exist and remained socially, if no longer legally, important.

The internal dispute between patricians and plebeians played out against a period of Roman expansion in Italy. In 466 BC, Rome conquered the nearby city of Veii after a protracted struggle. By the early third century BC, Rome dominated central Italy. Following the second of three Punic Wars against Carthage (264–202 BC), Roman power was unrivaled throughout the western Mediterranean. By 146, Carthage lay in ruins and Rome had conquered Greece. Rome was master of the Mediterranean, although independent kingdoms in Asian Minor and Egypt would only finally be conquered in the first century BC. Its rapid expansion throughout the Mediterranean and contact with the ancient cultures of the East revolutionized the political, social, and economic lives of the Romans. Rome's success had sown the seeds of the republic's destruction and Rome's eventual transformation into a dictatorship similar to the Hellenistic (or Greek) monarchies it had conquered.

The infusion of wealth from Rome's victories transformed it into one of the most important commercial hubs of the Mediterranean. For those Romans who had earned their livelihood through small-scale farming and crafts, however, the “globalizing” economy and the almost constant military service caused great hardship. Participation in the Roman army was limited to those citizens who owned property. The vast majority of these farmers worked small plots of land ranging from 7 to 20 acres (an acre is about $\frac{3}{4}$ the area of a football field). To supplement their meager harvests, many worked as day laborers on larger farms, gathered firewood, and grazed livestock on public land (the ager publicus, the public land that had been seized during Rome's
numerous wars of expansion). The almost continual warfare in Italy during the late third and early second centuries BC took an enormous toll on these farmers, causing the number of Roman citizens to plummet from 285,000 before the First Punic War (264–241 BC) to only 144,000 by 193 BC. The numerous and lengthy foreign wars fought in the second century required these farmers to be abroad for years at a time, during which time their farms suffered from the lack of their labor and often fell into disrepair and debt. The decline in the number of landowners reduced the number of citizens eligible for military service. The burden of military service thus fell more heavily on the remaining citizen farmers, who in turn were compelled to spend more time away from their farms on campaign, leading more to fall in debt and lose their land. The military and strategic success of Rome, which garnered enormous wealth for the Roman elite, paradoxically undermined Rome's traditional economy and the source of Roman military power.

Absentee landlords, often using the wealth generated by Rome's wars of conquest, purchased the indebted farms and combined them into large farms known as latifundia. Latifundia often specialized in a single export crop and were worked by slaves. Small farmers were unable to compete with the efficient, export-oriented latifundia. As the size of these farms grew, many of the landowners began to rent additional plots of public land. Many of these large farms were soon renting more public land than was permissible under the law, further constraining what had been an important resource for the remaining small farmers. Moreover, the presence of slave labor further depressed the economic prospects of free citizens, who could no longer work as laborers on neighboring farms. Meanwhile, the concentration of brutalized slaves in massive farms resulted in a series of large-scale uprisings, known as the Servile Wars. The first two Servile Wars occurred in Sicily (135–132 and 104–100 BC). The last, led by the gladiator Spartacus, would threaten the Roman heartland of Italy. As the agrarian crisis accelerated, many of the rural poor flocked to Rome in search of employment. High rents from the swelling urban population forced the poor into overcrowded, poorly constructed apartment buildings (insulae) where they lived at continual risk of building collapse, disease, and fire.

The Crises of the Republic

Rome's explosive conquest of the Mediterranean exposed a critical weakness in the Roman political system. As we have seen, the republican system was organized so as to avoid the concentration of power by any one person or family. Magistrates were thus always limited to short terms in office, after which they could be held accountable for their actions while in office. The powers of a magistracy were also usually apportioned among several co-equal colleagues (e.g. the 2 consuls and 2 censors). When Roman population and territory was small and its wars were waged against relatively poor towns of tribes of Italy, no reform could create enough clients
nor could a single military command provide enough wealth to overwhelm the ability of the
Roman nobility to check the accumulation of power and prestige by a group of reformers or a
victorious general. But as the population of Rome grew and Rome’s wars took on a larger scale,
the prestige and power attained by magistrates in successful wars of expansion and by politicians
through passing popular reforms threatened the balance of power within the senatorial
aristocracy. A single campaign against a wealthy power in the east could bring the victorious
general massive wealth. A popular reform could generate thousands or even tens of thousands of
clients, loyal to the reformers and ready to support them in subsequent elections.

Senators who were fearful (or jealous) of the growing authority of a politician, or family, or
group worked to prevent the concentration of power or any reforms that would diminish the
traditional prerogatives and authority of the senatorial aristocracy. Such conservative senators are often referred to as Optimates or “the best men.” Because of their opposition, popular generals
often returned from successful and lucrative campaigns only to find themselves political pariahs
at their moment of triumph; likewise, reformers saw sensible and necessary legislation defeated
by senators who feared destabilizing the balance of power. Finding their ambitions thwarted by
the Optimates, another group of Roman politicians began to seek alternative sources of power
among the Roman people and also the Italian allies. Because they looked to the people as the
source of their power, these Roman politicians are often called Populares or “men of the people.”

It is important to note that Populares and Optimates were not permanent political parties in the
modern sense. Nor were its members drawn from a different social classes. Rather they are terms
that represent different approaches to the exercise of political power within the Roman elite.
Populares wielded the power of the tribuneship to press for social, economic, and political
reforms, because these were the reforms that were most likely to garner the support of the poor.
Optimates sought to limit the power of the tribunes, to preserve the dominance of the aristocracy
in the political assemblies, and to maintain the balance of power within the political aristocracy.
Although certain families became associated with each approach, lineage was not a sure
guarantee of how a Roman would seek to wield political power. Cicero began his career by
allying himself with popularis politicians, attacking the corruption of the well-connected senator
Verres and supporting Pompey’s extraordinary commands in the East, before moving decisively
towards the optimates during the Crisis of Catiline. Pompey himself began his career as an outsider
who used appeals to the people to further his political agenda, only to find himself, decades later
in the 50s and 40s BC, the champion of the senate against Caesar. Clodius was from one of the
oldest and most decorated families in Rome, yet renounced his patrician status in order to run
for the tribunate. Most populares and optimates believed they were working in the best interests
republic; both kinds of politicians engaged in unscrupulous behavior, the manipulation of the
system, and political violence. Although neither actively sought its destruction, their exploitation
of a failing political system hastened its collapse.
In 137 BC a young Roman noble by the name of Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus travelled through northern Italy, where he observed firsthand the consequences of the agrarian crisis. His attempts to solve the impending crisis of manpower by reestablishing the small family farm in Italy would provoke a violent crisis. Although this crisis occurred seventy years before the Crisis of Catiline, it will be worthwhile to describe the reform attempts of Tiberius and his brother Gaius in some detail, as they demonstrated the political power available to a politician who could muster the support of the urban and rural poor, they grappled with many of the same social and economic problems that remained central to the crisis in the time of Catiline and Cicero, and in the reaction of the entrenched political elite to reform, they set a pattern for many of the subsequent political crises that would eventual wreck Rome's republican order.

When Tiberius Gracchus was elected tribune in 133 BC, he proposed a solution to the agrarian crisis: public land that had been illegally occupied by large landowners would be confiscated by a special commission that would redistribute it to the poor and also found additional colonies of Roman citizens in recently conquered provinces outside of Italy. There was broad agreement among the Roman elite that land reform was needed. And indeed at first Tiberius could count on the support of many noble Romans. Tiberius himself was from a very noble family—his father had twice been consul and his mother was the daughter of Scipio Africanus, who had defeated Hannibal in the Second Punic War. The consul for 133 assisted in drafting the bill, and it had the support of the pontifex maximus and also the princeps senatus, who happened to be Tiberius' father-in-law. Nevertheless, the needed reform was hampered by economic and political factors. The same senators who had to approve the agrarian reforms were in many cases the landowners whose land would be confiscated. To gain the support of these senatorial landowners, Tiberius proposed a comprise. Landowners who had illegally occupied public land would gain legal title, rent-free, to a substantial portion of the occupied land (plus an additional allotment for each child up to a total of four children). But the rest of the occupied land would have to be restored to the state for distribution to landless citizens, regardless of how long the landowner had used it or what improvements he had made. This reasonable and generous proposal might have had a chance at success. But any substantial reform also posed a political challenge to the nobility. It was recognized that the commissioners who enacted this program would gain they loyalty of many thousands of clients among the settlers. They would also have the unchecked power to survey the land and determine which land was public and which private, a power open to abuse. When Tiberius’ proposal met with vehement opposition in the Senate, Tiberius bypassed the Senate and took his bill directly to the Plebeian Council. Tiberius summarized the moral case for reform in an address to the Roman poor:

"The wild beasts that roam over Italy," he would say, "have every one of them a cave or lair to lurk in; 5 but the men who fight and die for Italy enjoy the common air and light, indeed, but nothing else; houseless and homeless they wander about with their wives and children. And it is with lying lips that their imperators exhort the soldiers in their battles
to defend sepulchres and shrines from the enemy; for not a man of them has an hereditary altar, not one of all these many Romans an ancestral tomb, but they fight and die to support others in wealth and luxury, and though they are styled masters of the world, they have not a single clod of earth that is their own.”—Plutarch, *Life of Tiberius Gracchus* 9, B. Perrin (translator)

Tiberius’ maneuver in taking his bill directly to the people was not illegal, but it did violate the long-standing precedent that granted the Senate the right to advise on legislation. Provoked by this affront to the traditional prerogatives of the Senate, senatorial opposition to Tiberius’ bill hardened. Encouraged by the senatorial opposition, the tribune Octavius vetoed the law. When Octavius again exercised his veto, Tiberius took the unprecedented step of deposing Octavius, reasoning that Octavius was not acting in the interest of the plebs but at the behest of the nobles whose power Octavius was duty-bound to check. Once Octavius was removed, the law was passed, establishing the Commission to distribute the public land. Tiberius did nothing to lower the fears of the opposition when he had himself, his brother Gaius, and his father-in-law Appius Claudius appointed as commissioners.

The senatorial opposition, led by the new pontifex maximus, Scipio Nasica, refused to fund the Agrarian Commission, which was manned by members of Tiberius’ family. At his moment of impasse, news arrived that King Attalus III of Pergamon, a wealthy Hellenistic kingdom in Asia Minor, had died, bequeathing his land and wealth to the Roman people. Tiberius proposed that the Plebeian Council would oversee the distribution of the inheritance, part of which would be used to fund the Commission. This proposal provoked intense opposition by the Senate, which had traditionally directed Rome’s foreign policy and managed its finances. In the face of senatorial hostility, Tiberius decided to take an unprecedented step and stand for re-election, which would prevent his enemies from prosecuting him for the removal of Octavius. Tiberius’ actions can be viewed from two opposing perspectives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From the Perspective of Tiberius &amp; His Supporters</th>
<th>From the Perspective of the Senatorial Opposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius was attempting to strengthen Rome by addressing a pressing economic and social problem. It would have been legal and ethical to restore the public land, which was illegally occupied by the large landowners, could have been restored to the people without any compensation. Tiberius' proposal was generous to these illegal occupiers of public land. Concerning the tribune Octavius, since the tribune was bound by oath to defend the Roman people, any tribune that failed to do so had forfeited his standing as a tribune. Thus the deposition of Octavius was justified. Since his opponents among the optimates did not really care about the prerogatives of the plebeian tribunes, and at any rate they could not trump the judgment of the Plebeian Assembly. Since these nobles were planning legal action against Tiberius, who had only sought to defend the integrity of the tribunate, he reasonably sought to remain in office. Reelection as tribune would also permit Tiberius to staff the Agrarian Commission and ensure the fair redistribution of land. If unusual steps had been taken, it was only because the crisis was so dire and the opposition so recalcitrant.</td>
<td>Tiberius was attempting to consolidate power for himself and his family. Tiberius' failure to secure the approval of the Senate for his legislation revealed that he would overturn precedent to achieve his personal political goals, even if it risked undoing the Concord of the Orders. His removal of Octavius was a dangerous attack on the rights of the tribunes that threatened the system of checks and balances that defined Rome's republican constitution. If elections were no longer binding, then politics would devolve to the whim of the unchecked mob. Mob rule was antithetical to Rome's constitutional order, and would inevitably result in the rise of a tyrant, when a charismatic figure realized he could take advantage of the unchecked power of the majority. Tiberius' intention to run for consecutive re-election, which was traditionally granted only to essential leaders during times of crisis in war, was another attempt to avoid responsibility for his reckless behavior. Tiberius, therefore, had all the hallmarks of an aspiring tyrant: a noble who sought the support of the people to establish his power outside of the limitations imposed by tradition and law. Rome could not tolerate a king nor a tyrant. The balance of political power had to be restored.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the election, disagreement over the propriety of Tiberius' candidacy turned violent. The Senate, fearful of revolution, condemned Tiberius as a tyrant and authorized the consul Publius Mucius Scaevola to safeguard the republic. When Scaevola refused to resort to violence against Tiberius and his supporters, Scipio Nasica, although only a private citizen, proclaimed “let any who wish to save the republic follow me,” the formal phrase spoken by consuls spoke they mobilized the people against an imminent threat to Rome. A group of senators led by Nasica marched to the Capitoline hill, where the Plebeian Council was meeting. There, the senators clubbed to death Tiberius and hundreds of his supporters. That night their bodies were thrown into the Tiber. For the first time in centuries, violence had settled a political dispute among Romans. Nasica was quickly dispatched on a diplomatic mission to Asia, lest the vengeful
people attempt to avenge Tiberius. The following year a special commission headed by the consul Popillius Laenas condemned to exile or death many Romans who were thought to have supported with Tiberius.

Although the Senate had mobilized to prevent Tiberius from gaining authority and prestige through the Agrarian Commission, once the political value of the Commission was neutralized, the Senate allowed it to proceed with the needed land reform. The Commission, however, encountered resistance from Italian landowners, who were required to return large tracts of public land, but who, as non-citizens, were ineligible for compensatory land grants. Partially in response to the growing resentment among the Italian allies, Fulvius Flaccus proposed a law in 125 that would grant citizenship to the allies. In the same year, the Latin town of Fregellae revolted. Although the revolt was quickly suppressed, this revolt by a long-term ally of Rome revealed the growing animosity of the Italians, who were shouldering an ever larger share of the burdens of military service, while reaping little of the rewards of empire. Unable to overcome resistance by both the Senate and the local elites throughout Italy, the Agrarian Commission failed to resolve the land crisis.

In 123, Tiberius’ younger brother, Gaius, was elected tribune. Assembling a broad coalition of the discontented middle class, urban poor and small farmers, he sought to revive and expand Tiberius’ program of reform. Among his first acts, Gaius passed the lex Sempronia, which banned extraordinary tribunals like the one that condemned the followers of Tiberius. In theory, a Roman citizen could no longer be declared an enemy of the state (hostis) and deprived of his legal rights without being first being convicted in a trial. To ease the plight of the urban poor, he proposed the establishment of numerous colonies, including the first outside of Italy. The urban poor also benefited from the first grain law, which provided for the sale of wheat at fixes low prices to Roman citizens. He also ordered the construction of large grain warehouses in the city to prevent shortages and price fluctuations. The minimum age for military service was set at 17 years old, and the basic equipment for Roman legionaries was to be provided by the state at no cost to the soldier.

Gaius was re-elected tribune with the plan of tackling land reform. In the face of stiffening opposition, Gaius proposed to two significant reforms in an attempt to gain new sources of political support. First he cultivated the support of the equites, the Roman commercial class, who were wealthy but had little involvement in the political system. For some time provincial subjects had been entitled to sue a governor who extorted money during his term under the quaestio de pecuniis repetundis (‘an inquiry for recovering money’). But these extortion trials were judged by senators, who had close familial and political associations with the senatorial governors. Many senators no doubt also hoped to profit by serving as a governor of a wealthy province themselves

“This was the beginning of civil bloodshed and of the free rein of swords in the city of Rome. From then on justice was overthrown by force and the strongest was preeminent.”
—Velleius Paterculus 2.3.3-4, Harriet I. Flower
someday. As a result, although the law had been in effective for the nearly thirty years, not a single conviction had been won. Since _equites_, many of whom were involved with trade with the provinces, would be more concerned about the long-term financial stability of the provinces, it was reasoned that they would be more diligent in prosecuting corruption by magistrates. Although the Senate viewed this change as a threat to its traditional prerogatives, it provided a more effective check on provincial corruption: nearly half of the extortion cases brought under the revised law resulted in a conviction. An indictment under this law would nearly derail the political career of Catiline.

Gaius also sought support outside of Rome by attempting to extend full citizenship to the Latin allies and granting additional rights to all of the peoples of Italy. The Latins were Rome's oldest and closest allies and shared a language and many cultural institutions with the Romans. The Italians, meanwhile, were providing an ever-increasing share of Rome's military power. Granting these allies some benefit from Rome's lucrative overseas conquests would help solidify Rome's military advantage while also binding the still diverse peoples of Italy to Rome. But this farsighted proposal proved too much for many Romans, in particular the poor Romans who feared that their hard-won rights would be diluted by the mob of new Italian citizens. Even when it became clear that Gaius lacked the support to pass this law, he persisted in attempting to force the law's passage. Gaius' support began to ebb and many supporters denounced his plan.

Even before Gaius' citizenship law foundered, his position among the people was being actively undermined by the tribune Livius Drusus, who would present more generous versions of Gaius' proposals. For example when Gaius proposed two small colonies in which settlers would pay a small rent, Drusus proposed 12 large colonies in which settlers could hold land for free. Drusus' proposals were so generous that it seems likely that they were never intended to be put into effect, but only to undermine support for Gaius among the more gullible of the urban and rural poor. Drusus also assailed the character of Gaius' ally, Fulvius Flaccus, even suggesting that Flaccus was inciting the Italian allies to revolt. Suspicion inevitably transferred from Flaccus to Gaius. Gaius' plan to found a colony at the site of Carthage in Africa provided further fodder for his foes. When the ceremonies that accompanied the founding of the new colony were marked by bad omens (unnatural winds, failed sacrifices, boundary stones pulled out by wolves), Gaius' opponents claimed that the gods opposed his plan to settle Romans on the land once occupied by Rome's greatest enemy.

In 121, as Gaius' popularity continued to deteriorate, his opponents moved against him. An assembly was called to repeal the bill that established the colony at Carthage. During the tense meeting, Quintus Antyllius, a client of the consul Lucius Opimius, pushed his way through a crowd of Gaius' supporters. When he impugned their honesty and made an obscene gesture, Gaius' supporters stabbed him to death with their pens. The next day Opimius paraded Antyllius' corpse through the city, further stirring animosity against Gaius and his supporters. The Senate, fearful of mass demonstrations and riots, took the unprecedented step of issuing a
“final decree of the Senate.” The Senatus Consultum Ultimum of SCU authorized the magistrates to “take any measure necessary for the safety of the state.” Normally no Roman citizen could be put to death without trial and could appeal conviction to the people. The lex Sempronia had forbidden the Senate from voiding the rights of citizens without trial. Magistrates in turn were also limited in the powers they could exercise within the boundaries of Rome. The SCU was, in effect, a declaration of a state of emergency in which normal civil rights were suspended. Supporters of the SCU would argue that desperate times called for desperate measures; opponents would claim that no political body could suspend the law or grant essentially unlimited powers to any magistrate. Gaius and his followers retreated to the Aventine hill. Attempts to negotiate a resolution failed. Opimius led the senators, equites, and a force of Cretan archers to the Aventine and slaughtered Gaius and his followers after a short battle. Thousands more were arrested and executed without trial in the aftermath. A few months later Opimius was indicted under the lex Sempronia for killing Roman citizens without trial. Opimius defended himself by claiming that his actions were authorized by the Senate and that no action could be illegal if it was undertaken to preserve the state. The acquittal of Opimius seemed to legitimize the SCU as a legal response to an imminent crisis. But the SCU would remain a highly contentious action whenever it was deployed.

Meanwhile a dynastic dispute in North Africa drew Rome into an unpopular war against Jugurtha, the king of Numidia. After corrupt and incompetent generals failed to defeat and capture Jugurtha, Quintus Marcellus at last put Jugurtha on the defensive in 109 but failed to capture him. Gaius Marius, a novus homo and Marcellus’ client, exploited Marcellus’ failure to win popular support for his election to the consulship.

Reforms of Marius

The consul Marius solved the manpower crisis by abolishing the property requirement for serving in the army. On the one hand, this was a commonsense solution that recognized the reality of Roman military service. The property requirement for service had been progressively lowered to the point that even citizens with only the smallest amount of land could serve in the army. Moreover, during times of emergency, Rome often waived even this meager requirement. Nevertheless, the elimination of property qualifications had profound consequences for Roman politics and society. Soldiers became dependent on their general for their support in the army and their livelihood once they were discharged. The potential of thousands of loyal clients increased the value of military commands dramatically. To provide for their new soldier-clients, generals had an incentive to seek new (and lucrative) conflicts. They were compelled to find land...
for their veteran-clients when the legions were demobilized. Although few at the time recognized how significant this small change would be, Marius had irrevocably changed the relationship between the Roman state, its generals, and its army.

Fresh from victory over Jugurtha in 104, Marius found Rome gripped with fear of invasion by the Teutons and Cimbri, Germanic tribes which had won a series of victories against Rome culminating the Battle of Arausio in which over 80,000 legionaries were killed. To deal with the “Cimbric Terror,” Marius was reelected to an unprecedented five consecutive consulships. Hailed as “another Camillus,” after the illustrious general who had defeated an earlier invasion of Gauls, Marius routed the tribes and preserved Rome from invasion. But his unrivaled prestige and status as a *novus homo* generated resentment among the aristocracy. With the military threat passed, Marius sought land for his triumphant veteran, many of whom were Latins and Italians. The Roman urban poor resented the prospect of non-Romans receiving land. When Marius' ally, the tribune Saturninus, brought the measure to a veto, a group of poor Romans claimed that they heard thunder, a bad omen that required the vote to be postponed. Saturninus, however, was known for heavy-handed tactics and pressed ahead, leading the poor to attempt to dissolve the Assembly by force. Marius' veterans, who were watching nearby, overpowered the mob and forced the passage of the bill, which included a provision that required all senators to swear allegiance to the bill within five days of its passage. The pledge was another affront to the Senate’s prestige and powers. Elected consul for the sixth time in 100 BC, Marius now faced opposition by the Senate and the people. When Gaius Memmius, one of the candidates for the consulship, was beaten to death by Saturninus' mob, the Senate issued an *SCU*. Marius attempted to protect his supporters by locking them in the Senate house under his custody until they could face charges. A mob, which included many senators, scaled the Senate house, tore through the roof of, and stoned Saturninus and his supporters roofing tiles. A ruined Marius went into voluntary exile in the East. His land bill was never fully implemented, stoking further resentment among Rome’s Latin and Italian allies.

Animosity between the Romans and her allies continued to grow. In 95, Italians were expelled from Rome. In 91, Livius Drusus, the son of Gaius Gracchus’ opponent, sought to resolve the growing rift between Rome and Italy by incorporating the *equites* into the Senate and enfranchising the Italian Allies. His aim was to make Italians “co-rulers rather than subjects” (Appian 1.35). The bill faced stiff opposition by the conservative senators and the urban poor. When Drusus was assassinated, revolts broke out throughout Italy, leading to the Italian or Social War (90–88 BC), after the Latin word for “ally”: *socius*. The war exacted a terrible human and economic toll, and Rome was forced to enfranchise all free persons south of the Po River. Although isolated pockets of resistance continued for several years, most revolts quickly subsided and 500,000 Italians gained Roman citizenship. At terrible cost, Rome and Italy had been unified. In the crisis, Marius again displayed his talent for military operations, as did one of his former lieutenants, an noble named Lucius Cornelius Sulla.
Meanwhile, Rome’s position in the eastern Mediterranean was deteriorating. Roman preoccupation with the Cimbric and Social Wars, and discontent with corrupt Roman governors, allowed Mithridates VI of Pontus to occupy most of Asia Minor and Southern Greece. The command against Mithridates promised immense wealth and prestige to the victorious general. Violence erupted when Publius Sulpicius Rufus, tribune in 88, sought to grant the lucrative command to Marius instead of Sulla, who as proconsul was entitled to lead the campaign. Rufus’ bill was resisted by the Senate, who saw it as another attempt to usurp the Senate’s traditional authority over foreign policy. To block the passage of the bill, the consuls declared a *iustitium*, a suspension of official business. Rufus surrounded himself with a bodyguard and attempted to force the consuls to call a vote on the bill. When they refused, mob violence erupted throughout the city. In the ensuing chaos, Sulla sought refuge in the nearest house, which happened to the that of his former mentor and now bitter foe, Marius. Marius agreed to allow Sulla to leave the city into exile, provided that Rufus’ bill be passed. Sulla assented. He then fled to Campania, where six legions that had served him during the Social War were besieging the city of Capua. The soldiers enthusiastically endorsed Sulla’s right to campaign against Mithridates (a campaign that promised rich plunder for his soldiers). Sulla marched into the Rome and for the first time a Roman army led by a Roman general slaughtered Roman citizens in Rome. Facing fierce resistance from the Roman people, Sulla burned rebellious neighborhoods of Rome. He defeated a hastily organized militia led by Marius and Sulpicius, who were declared *hostes* by the Senate. Marius fled to Africa, but Sulla massacred Sulpicius and his supporters, repealed his laws, and strengthened the authority of the Senate. Sulla then marched to the East to confront Mithridates.

In Sulla’s absence, Lucius Cornelius Cinna, consul of 87, attempted to repeal Sulla’s laws. The other consul, Gaius Octavius, drove Cinna from the city and declared him a *hostis*. Cinna rallied support of newly-minted Italian citizens, recalled Marius, and quickly starved Rome into submission. In Rome, Marius and his army ranged through the city slaughtering their noble adversaries and confiscating their property. In 86, Marius attained a seventh consulship but died soon after taking office. Cinna took control, appointed the consuls without elections in 85 and 84, and sought cooperation with opponents.

Meanwhile, Sulla, having learned of the situation in Rome, negotiated a generous peace with Mithridates and hastened back to Rome. Cinna’s poorly trained armies stood little chance against Sulla’s veteran force. In 82 Sulla decisively defeated one army; another defected to Sulla. Marcus Crassus and Gnaeus Pompey raised a private army in the north and marched towards Rome in support of Sulla. The combined army engaged and defeated a large force of recently-enfranchised Samnites outside of Rome’s Colline Gate. Sulla used the captured rebels to make a grim point about the new order in the city. While Sulla calmly presided over a meeting of the
Senate on the day after the battle, 6,000 Samnites were tortured to death in the Circus Maximus—“only some criminals being punished,” he calmly remarked to the shocked and horrified senators. To finance the settlement of his veterans, Sulla posted lists of persons who were declared to be outlaws. These “proscribed” individuals could be hunted down and killed with impunity. Their killers received a share of their property, while the rest went to the state treasury. During the Sullan reign of terror, 90 senators and 2,600 *equites* lost their lives and property. Some cities received small fines while others were leveled. Farmers were driven from their land throughout Italy to make room for Sulla's veterans. Etruria, the region to the north of Rome, was especially hard hit by the confiscations.

As dictator, Sulla broke the power of the *populares* by forbidding tribunes from holding higher offices and restricting the veto to personal protection of plebeian citizens. To forestall the concentration of power among the nobility, he increased the number of magistrates and limited the term of provincial governors to one year. He expanded the size of the Senate to 600, filling its ranks with grateful *equites*. The prestige of the Senate was restored and juries were to be composed entirely of senators. He discouraged the concentration of the poor in Rome by eliminating the subsidy for wheat. He also forbade generals from leaving their province without the explicit permission of the Senate. In short, Sulla undid every popular reform of the past few generations, while also trying to prevent another general from exploiting the weaknesses of the system as he had done. Sulla retired to his country estate in 79, believing that he had restored the Roman state to balance. His death the following year saved him from witnessing the quick demise of his reforms. Having failed to address the discontents of the populace that fueled the power of the *populares* or the military system that tempted generals with unlimited power, Sulla's reforms and cruelty only laid the foundation for further civil trauma.

The power vacuum caused by the civil wars and the discontent fueled by Sulla’s vicious reprisals led to two rebellions: one in Spain by Quintus Sertorius and one in Italy by Marcus Aemilius. Sertorius, an opponent of Sulla, had been assigned by Cinna to protect Spain. For nearly a decade he would lead a coalition of Roman and native forces that resisted the armies sent by the Senate. Lepidus was a member of the Roman aristocracy who as consul in 78 sought to undo a number of Sulla’s reforms, including the resumption of subsidized grain for the urban poor, the distribution of land for the dispossessed in Etruria, and the restoration of the powers of the tribunes. When a group of Italian farmers sought to force Sulla’s veterans off their land, the consuls were sent to quell the violence. Lepidus instead enlisted the discontented farmers in his private army and marched on Rome. The Senate passed a *SCU* authorizing the other consul, Quintus Lutatius Catulus, to preserve the republic. Gnaeus Pompey, who was in his late twenties...
at the time, raised a private army to support Catulus, and defeated Lepidus at the Mulvian Bridge outside of Rome. After Lepidus died in Sardinia, his lieutenant, Perperna, took the remaining 20,000 men in Lepidus’ army and joined forces with Sertorius. Pompey, fresh from his defeat of Lepidus, then demanded the command against Sertorius. The Senate, however, feared the young, popular, and wealthy general, and rejected his request. But Pompey simply refused to disband his legions and reiterated his demand that he be allowed to campaign against Sertorius. With the bloody examples of Marius, Cinna, and Sulla fresh in their minds, the Senate acquiesced and dispatched Pompey to Spain. There, he and Quintus Caecilius Metellus Pius wore down the army of Sertorius. After Perperna assassinated Sertorius in 72 BC, Pompey quickly dispatched the overmatched Perperna and returned to Rome. In Rome, Sulla's reforms continued to unravel, as distribution of subsidized grain had resumed in the same year.

The year before, a small band of gladiators under the leadership of Spartacus escaped from their barracks in Capua. They defeated a small force of Romans and withdrew to Mount Vesuvius, where they raided the local countryside. After defeating several thousand Roman troops, the numbers of the rebels swelled to over 70,000 men, women, and children. The next year the slaves rebounded from early losses to annihilate a large army. Rome, in panic, turned to to Marcus Licinius Crassus, who penned Spartacus’ depleted forces in the toe of the Italian “boot.” Eventually Crassus first trapped and then destroyed Spartacus’ army, while Pompey, returning from Spain, captured and executed the few slaves who had escaped, allowing him to claim a share of the honor and Crassus' enmity. As a sign of his victory and a warning to other slaves, Crassus crucified 6,000 slaves along the Via Appia. The crosses stretched all the way from Rome to Capua, where the rebellion had begun. Pompey, although only 35 years old, was granted a triumph for his victory in Spain and, against all precedent, was elected consul with Crassus for 70 BC.

The consulship of Pompey and Crassus was relatively uneventful. With no one able to rival their prestige, popularity among the people, or their support among the army, they moved to restore the powers of the tribune. The failure of Sulla’s attempt to restore the power of the Senate was now complete. Meanwhile throughout the Mediterranean, a crisis was coming to a head. In 67 BC piracy had become an endemic problem, one threatening to cripple Roman trade. Previous attempts to curtail piracy had proven ineffective. If a competent governor managed to drive the pirates from his province, they simply relocated and continued to capture ships and plunder the coast. As the crisis grew acute, the Tribune Aulus Gabinius proposed the *Lex Gabinia*, which granted Pompey authority over all territory within 50 miles of the sea, as well a massive force of 500 warships, 120,000 infantry and around 5,000 cavalry. In effect, Pompey was given extraordinary command over the entirety of Rome's empire. The law passed over vehement opposition from conservative senators, who feared the concentration of
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**Pompey’s Suppression of the Pirates and Departure to the East**
such power in the hands of a single magistrate. Although Pompey was allotted three years to
resolve the problem, he resolve the crisis in months by resettling most of the pirates, and likely
bribing others. In recognition of his success, Pompey was nominated to succeed Lucius Licinius
Lucullus as commander against Mithridates. Pompey’s command was supported by Caesar and
defended by Cicero, although it was opposed by the conservative faction of the senate. In 65 BC
he decisively defeated Mithridates in Pontus, which he converted into a Roman province. The
following year, just as the political situation in Rome was descending into crisis, he marched into
Syria, deposed its king, Antiochus XIII Asiaticus, and reconstituted this, too, as a Roman
province. In 63 BC, he moved south, and established Roman supremacy in Phoenicia and Coele-
Syria, and then into Judea, where he supported the Pharisee faction against the Sadducees.
Pompey had conquered the East, in the process gaining unprecedented power and prestige.
Meanwhile, the Roman state was teetering on the brink of chaos, as the Crisis of Catiline came to
a head.

A NOTE ON THE CRISIS OF 64-63 BC

In retrospect, it it tempting to see the events of the late second and early first centuries BC as a
single, continuous sequence of political unrest that eventually undid the republican order of the
Roman state. While the escalating stresses on the political system and the inadequacy of the
reforms seem self-evident in hindsight, it is important to remember that Romans in 63 BC did not
realize that in less than a generation the republic would be irrevocably lost. Despite the recent
turmoil, it is doubtful that few Romans, even in the midst of the Crisis of Catiline really doubted
the long-term stability and durability of Rome’s government, which after all had survived in
roughly the same form for over 400 years, and which to the Romans appeared to be the longest-
lasting and most successful government the world had ever seen.

We might think that the evolution towards tyranny was the inevitable result of Rome’s territorial
growth and the bureaucratic and military apparatus necessary to maintain that geo-strategic
order. But “radicals” like Catiline were seeking to gain power within the existing system, even if
they were seeking to do so through extra-constitutional means. Catiline sought to be consul, not
king or a leader of a radical democracy. Indeed, faith in the system is one of the factors that
eventually led to its fracturing, as the political elite failed to enact necessary reforms and
manipulated the traditions that made possible the consensual model of Roman politics.
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In the First Catilinarian, Cicero addresses Catiline, accusing him of aiming at the destruction of the whole republic and being hated by the whole city, and demanding that he and the other traitors separate themselves from good citizens.

[1.1] When, O Catiline, do you mean to cease abusing our patience? How long is that madness of yours still to mock us? When is there to be an end of that unbridled audacity of yours, swaggering about as it does now? Do not the nightly guards placed on the Palatine Hill—do not the watches posted throughout the city—does not the alarm of the people, and the union of all good men—does not the precaution taken of assembling the senate in this most defensible place—do not the looks and countenances of this venerable body here present, have any effect upon you? Do you not feel that your plans are detected? Do you not see that your conspiracy is already arrested and rendered powerless by the knowledge which every one here possesses of it? What is there that you did last night, what the night before—where is it that you were—who was there that you summoned to meet you—what design was there which was adopted by you, with which you think that any one of us is unacquainted?

[1.2] Shame on the age and on its principles! The senate is aware of these things; the consul sees them; and yet this man lives. Lives! aye, he comes even into the senate. He takes a part in the public deliberations; he is watching and marking down and checking off for slaughter every individual among us. And we, gallant men that we are, think that we are doing our duty to the republic if we keep out of the way of his frenzied attacks.

You ought, O Catiline, long ago to have been led to execution by command of the consul. That destruction which you have been long plotting against us ought to have already fallen on your own head.

[1.3] What? Did not that most illustrious man, Publius Scipio, the Pontifex Maximus, in his capacity of a private citizen, put to death Tiberius Gracchus, though but slightly undermining the constitution? And shall we, who are the consuls, tolerate Catiline, openly desirous to destroy the whole world with fire and slaughter? For I pass over older instances, such as how Caius Servilius Ahala with his own hand slew Spurius Maelius when plotting a revolution in the state. There was—there was once such virtue in this republic, that brave men would repress mischievous citizens with severer chastisement than the most bitter enemy. For we have a resolution of the senate, a formidable and authoritative decree against you, O Catiline; the wisdom of the republic is not at fault, nor the dignity of this senatorial body. We, we alone,—I say it
openly, —we, the consuls, are waiting in our duty.

[1.4] The senate once passed a decree that Lucius Opimius, the consul, should take care that the republic suffered no injury. Not one night elapsed. There was put to death, on some mere suspicion of disaffection, Caius Gracchus, a man whose family had borne the most unblemished reputation for many generations. There was slain Marcus Fulvius, a man of consular rank, and all his children. By a like decree of the senate the safety of the republic was entrusted to Caius Marius and Lucius Valerius, the consuls. Did not the vengeance of the republic, did not execution overtake Lucius Saturninus, a tribune of the people, and Caius Servilius, the praetor, without the delay of one single day? But we, for these twenty days have been allowing the edge of the senate's authority to grow blunt, as it were. For we are in possession of a similar decree of the senate, but we keep it locked up in its parchment—buried, I may say, in the sheath; and according to this decree you ought, O Catiline, to be put to death this instant. You live,—and you live, not to lay aside, but to persist in your audacity.

I wish, O conscript fathers, to be merciful; I wish not to appear negligent amid such danger to the state; but I do now accuse myself of remissness and culpable inactivity.

[1.5] A camp is pitched in Italy, at the entrance of Etruria, in hostility to the republic; the number of the enemy increases every day; and yet the general of that camp, the leader of those enemies, we see within the walls—yes, and even in the senate,—planning every day some internal injury to the republic. If, O Catiline, I should now order you to be arrested, to be put to death, I should, I suppose, have to fear lest all good men should say that I had acted tardily, rather than that any one should affirm that I acted cruelly. But yet this, which ought to have been done long since, I have good reason for not doing as yet; I will put you to death, then, when there shall be not one person possible to be found so wicked, so abandoned, so like yourself, as not to allow that it has been rightly done.

[1.6] As long as one person exists who can dare to defend you, yet shall live; but you shall live as you do now, surrounded by my many and trusty guards, so that you shall not be able to stir one finger against the republic: many eyes and ears shall still observe and watch you, as they have hitherto done, though you shall not perceive them.

For what is there, O Catiline, that you can still expect, if night is not able to veil your nefarious meetings in darkness, and if private houses cannot conceal the voice of your conspiracy within their walls;—if everything is seen and displayed? Change your mind: trust me: forget the slaughter and conflagration you are meditating. You are hemmed in on all sides; all your plans are clearer than the day to us; let me remind you of them.

[1.7] Do you recollect that on the 21st of October I said in the senate, that on a certain day, which was to be the 27th of October, C. Manlius, the satellite and servant of your audacity, would be in arms? Was I mistaken,
Catiline, not only in so important, so atrocious, so incredible a fact, but, what is much more remarkable, hi the very day? I said also in the senate that you had fixed the massacre of the nobles for the 28th of October, when many chief men of the senate had left Rome, not so much for the sake of saving themselves as of checking your designs. Can you deny that on that very day you were so hemmed in by my guards and my vigilance, that you were unable to stir one finger against the republic; when you said that you would be content with the flight of the rest, and the slaughter of us who remained?

[1.8] What? when you made sure that you would be able to seize Praeneste on the first of November by a nocturnal attack, did you not find that that colony was fortified by my order, by my garrison, by my watchfulness and care? You do nothing, you plan nothing, you think of nothing which I not only do not hear, but which I do not see and know every particular of.

Listen while I speak of the night before. You shall now see that I watch far more actively for the safety than you do for the destruction of the republic. I say that you came the night before (I will say nothing obscurely) into the Scythe-dealers' street, to the house of Marcus Lecca; that many of your accomplices in the same insanity and wickedness came here too. Do you dare to deny it? Why are silent? I will prove it if you do deny it; for I see here in the senate some men who were there with you.

[1.9] O ye immortal gods, where on earth are we? in what city are we living? what constitution is ours? There are here,—here in our body, O conscript fathers, in this the most holy and dignified assembly of the whole world, men who meditate my death, and the death of all of us, and the destruction of this city, and of the whole world. I, the consul see them; I ask them their opinion about the republic, and I do not yet attack, even by words, those who ought to be put to death by the sword. You were, then, O Catiline, at Lecca's that night; you divided Italy into sections; you settled where every one was to go; you fixed whom you were to leave at Rome, whom you were to take with you; you portioned out the divisions of the city for conflagration; you undertook that you yourself would at once leave the city, and said that there was then only this to delay you, that I was still alive. Two Roman knights were found to deliver you from this anxiety, and to promise that very night, before daybreak, to slay me in my bed.

[1.10] All this I knew almost before your meeting had broken up. I strengthened and fortified my house with a stronger guard; I refused admittance, when they came, to those whom you sent in the morning to salute me, and of whom I had foretold to many eminent men that they would come to me at that time.

As, then, this is the case, O Catiline, continue as you have begun. Leave the city at last the gates are open; depart. That Manlian camp of yours has been waiting too long for you as its general. And lead forth with you all your friends, or at least as many as you can; purge the city of your presence; you will deliver me from a great fear, when there is a wall between me and you. Among us you can
dwell no longer—I will not bear it, I will not permit it, I will not tolerate it...

[1.11] Great thanks are due to the immortal gods, and to this very Jupiter Stator, in whose temple we are, the most ancient protector of this city, that we have already so often escaped so foul, so horrible, and so deadly an enemy to the republic. But the safety of the commonwealth must not be too often allowed to be risked on one man. As long as you, O Catiline, plotted against me while I was the consul elect, I defended myself not with a public guard, but by my own private diligence. When, in the next consular comitia, you wished to slay me when I was actually consul, and your competitors also, in the Campus Martius, I checked your nefarious attempt by the assistance and resources of my own friends, without exciting any disturbance publicly. In short, as often as you attacked me, I by myself opposed you, and that, too, though I saw that my ruin was connected with great disaster to the republic.

[1.12] But now you are openly attacking the entire republic.

You are summoning to destruction and devastation the temples of the immortal gods, the houses of the city, the lives of all the citizens; in short, all Italy. Wherefore, since I do not yet venture to do that which is the best thing, and which belongs to my office and to the discipline of our ancestors, I will do that which is more merciful if we regard its rigour, and more expedient for the state. For if I order you to be put to death, the rest of the conspirators will still remain in the republic; if as I have long been exhorting you, you depart, your companions, those worthless dregs of the republic, will be drawn off from the city too.

[1.13] What is the matter, Catiline? Do you hesitate to do that which I order you which you were already doing of your own accord? The consul orders an enemy to depart from the city. Do you ask me, Are you to go into banishment? I do not order it; but, if you consult me, I advise it.

For what is there, O Catiline, that can now afford you any pleasure in this city? for there is no one in it, except that band of profligate conspirators of yours, who does not fear you, —no one who does not hate you. What brand of domestic baseness is not stamped upon your life? What disgraceful circumstance is wanting to your infamy in your private affairs? From what licentiousness have your eyes, from what atrocity have your hands, from what iniquity has your whole body ever abstained? Is there one youth, when you have once entangled him in the temptations of your corruption, to whom you have not held out a sword for audacious crime, or a torch for licentious wickedness?

[1.14] What? when lately by the death of your former wife you had made your house empty and ready for a new bridal, did you not even add another incredible wickedness to this wickedness? But I pass that over, and willingly allow it to be buried in silence, that so horrible a crime may not be seen to have existed in this city, and not to have been chastised. I pass over the ruin of your fortune, which you know is hanging over you against the ides of the very next month; I
come to those things which relate not to the infamy of your private vices, not to your domestic difficulties and baseness, but to the welfare of the republic and to the lives and safety of us all.

[1.15] Can the limit of this life, O Catiline, can the breath of this atmosphere be pleasant to you, when you know that there is not one man of those here present who is ignorant that you, on the last day of the year, when Lepidus and Tullus were consuls, stood in the assembly armed; that you had prepared your hand for the slaughter of the consuls and chief men of the state, and that no reason or fear of yours hindered your crime and madness, but the fortune of the republic? And I say no more of these things, for they are not unknown to every one. How often have you endeavoured to slay me, both as consul elect and as actual consul? how many shots of yours, so aimed that they seemed impossible to be escaped, have I avoided by some slight stooping aside, and some dodging, as it were, of my body? You attempt nothing, you execute nothing, you devise nothing that call be kept hid from me at the proper time; and yet you do not cease to attempt and to contrive.

[1.16] How often already has that dagger of yours been wrested from your hands? how often has it slipped through them by some chance, and dropped down? and yet you cannot any longer do without it; and to what sacred mysteries it is consecrated and devoted by you I know not, that you think it necessary to plunge it in the body of the consul. But now, what is that life of yours that you are leading? For I will speak to you not so as to seem influenced by the hatred I ought to feel, but by pity, nothing of which is due to you. You came a little while ago into the senate in so numerous an assembly, who of so many friends and connections of yours saluted you? If this in the memory of man never happened to any one else, are you waiting for insults by word of mouth, when you are overwhelmed by the most irresistible condemnation of silence? Is it nothing that at your arrival all those seats were vacated? that all the men of consular rank, who had often been marked out by you for slaughter, the very moment you sat down, left that part of the benches bare and vacant? With what feelings do you think you ought to bear this?

[1.17] On my honour, if my slaves feared me as all your fellow-citizens fear you, I should think I must leave my house. Do not you think you should leave the city? If I saw that I was even undeservedly so suspected and bated by my fellow-citizens, I would rather flee from their sight than be gazed at by the hostile eyes of every one. And do you, who, from the consciousness of your wickedness, know that the hatred of all men is just and has been long due to you, hesitate to avoid the sight and presence of those men whose minds and senses you offend? If your parents feared and hated you, and if you could by no means pacify them, you would, I think, depart somewhere out of their sight. Now, your country, which is the common parent of all of us, hates and fears you, and has no other opinion of you, than that you are meditating parricide in her case; and will you neither feel awe of her authority, nor
deference for her judgment, nor fear of her power?

[1.18] And she, O Catiline, thus pleads with you, and after a manner silently speaks to you:—There has now for many years been no crime committed but by you; no atrocity has taken place without you; you alone unpunished and unquestioned have murdered the citizens, have harassed and plundered the allies; you alone have had power not only to neglect all laws and investigations, but to overthrow and break through them. Your former actions, though they ought not to have been borne, yet I did bear as well as I could; but now that I should be wholly occupied with fear of you alone, that at every sound I should dread Catiline, that no design should seem possible to be entertained against me which does not proceed from your wickedness, this is no longer endurable. Depart, then, and deliver me from this fear; that, if it be a just one, I may not be destroyed; if an imaginary one, that at least I may at last cease to fear.

[1.19] If, as I have said, your country were thus to address you, ought she not to obtain her request, even if she were not able to enforce it? What shall I say of your having given yourself into custody? what of your having said, for the sake of avoiding suspicion, that you were willing to dwell in the house of Marcus Lepidus? And when you were not received by him, you dared even to come to me, and begged me to keep you in my house; and when you had received answer from me that I could not possibly be safe in the same house with you, when I considered myself in great danger as long as we were in the same city, you came to Quintus Metellus, the praetor, and being rejected by him, you passed on to your associate, that most excellent man, Marcus Marcellus, who would be, I suppose you thought, most diligent in guarding you, most sagacious in suspecting you, and most bold in punishing you; but how far can we think that man ought to be from bonds and imprisonment who has already judged himself deserving of being given into custody?

[1.20] Since, then, this is the case, do you hesitate, O Catiline, if you cannot remain here with tranquillity, to depart to some distant laud, and to trust your life, saved from just and deserved punishment, to flight and solitude? Make a motion, say you, to the senate, (for that is what you demand) and if thus body votes that you ought to go into banishment, you say that you will obey. I will not make such a motion, it is contrary to my principles, and yet I will let you see what these men think of you. Be gone from the city, O Catiline, deliver the republic from fear; depart into banishment, if that is the word you are waiting for. What now, O Catiline? Do you not perceive, do you not see the silence of these men; they permit it, they say nothing; why wait you for the authority of their words when you see their wishes in their silence?

[1.21] But had I said the same to this excellent young man, Publius Sextius, or to that brave man, Marcus Marcellus, before this time the senate would deservedly have laid violent hands on me, consul though I be, in this very temple. But to you, Catiline, while they are quiet they approve, while they permit me to speak they vote, while they are
silent they are loud and eloquent. And not
they alone, whose authority forsooth is dear
to you, though their lives are unimportant,
but the Roman knights too, those most
honourable and excellent men, and the
other virtuous citizens who are now
surrounding the senate, whose numbers you
could see, whose desires you could know,
and whose voices you a few minutes ago
could hear,—yes, whose very hands and
weapons I have for some time been scarcely
able to keep off from you; but those, too, I
will easily bring to attend you to the gates if
you leave these places you have been long
desiring to lay waste.

[1.22] And yet, why am I speaking? that
anything may change your purpose? that
you may ever amend your life? that you may
meditate flight or think of voluntary
banishment? I wish the gods may give you
such a mind; though I see, if alarmed at my
words you bring your mind to go into
banishment, what a storm of unpopularity
hangs over me, if not at present, while the
memory of your wickedness is fresh, at all
events hereafter. But it is worthwhile to
incur that, as long as that is but a private
misfortune of my own, and is unconnected
with the dangers of the republic. But we
cannot expect that you should be concerned
at your own vices, that you should fear the
penalties of the laws, or that you should
yield to the necessities of the republic, for
you are not, O Catiline, one whom either
shame can recall from infamy, or fear from
danger, or reason from madness.

[1.23] Wherefore, as I have said before, go
forth, and if you to make me, your enemy
as you call me, unpopular, go straight into
banishment. I shall scarcely be able to endue
all that will be said if you do so; I shall
scarcely be able to support my load of
unpopularity if you do go into banishment at
the command of the consul; but if you wish
serve my credit and reputation, go forth with
your ill-omened band of profligates; betake
yourself to Manilius, rouse up the abandoned
citizens, separate yourself from the good
ones, wage war against your country, exult in
your impious banditti, so that you may not
seem to have been driven out by me and gone
to strangers, but to have gone invited to your
own friends.

[1.24] Though why should I invite you, by
whom I know men have been already sent on
to wait in arms for you at the forum
Aurelium; who I know has fixed and agreed
with Manlius upon a settled day; by whom I
know that that silver eagle, which I trust will
be ruinous and fatal to you and to all your
friends, and to which there was set up in your
house a shrine as it were of your crimes, has
been already sent forward. Need I fear that
you can long do without that which you used
to worship when going out to do murder, and
from whose altars you have often transferred
your impious hand to the slaughter of
citizens?

[1.25] You will go at last where your
unbridled and mad desire has been long
hurrying you. And this causes you no grief;
but an incredible pleasure. Nature has formed
you, desire has trained you, fortune has
preserved you for this insanity. Not only did
you never desire quiet, but you never even
desired any war but a criminal one; you have
collected a baud of profligates and worthless
men, abandoned not only by all fortune but even by hope.

[1.26] Then what happiness will you enjoy with what delight will you exult in what pleasure will you revel! when in so numerous a body of friends, you neither hear nor see one good man. All the toils you have gone through have always pointed to this sort of life; your lying on the ground not merely to lie in wait to gratify your unclean desires, but even to accomplish crimes; your vigilance, not only when plotting against the sleep of husbands, but also against the goods of your murdered victims, have all been preparations for this. Now you have an opportunity of displaying your splendid endurance of hunger, of cold, of want of everything; by which in a short time you will find yourself worn out.

[1.27] All this I effected when I procured your rejection from the consulship, that you should be reduced to make attempts on your country as an exile, instead of being able to distress it as consul, and that that which had been wickedly undertaken by you should be called piracy rather than war.

Know that I may remove and avert, O conscript fathers, any in the least reasonable complaint from myself; listen, I beseech you, carefully to what I say, and lay it up in your inmost hearts and minds. In truth, if my country, which is far dearer to me than my life,—if all Italy,—if the whole republic were to address me, “Marcus Tullius, what are you doing? will you permit that man to depart whom you have ascertained to be an enemy? whom you see ready to become the general of the war? whom you know to be expected in the camp of the enemy as their chief; the author of all this wickedness, the head of the conspiracy, the instigator of the slaves and abandoned citizens, so that he shall seem not driven out of the city by you, but let loose by you against the city? Will you not order him to be thrown into prison, to be hurried off to execution, to be put to death with the most prompt severity? What hinders you? is it the customs of our ancestors?

[1.28] But even private men have often in this republic slain mischievous citizens.—Is it the laws which have been passed about the punishment of Roman citizens? But in this city those who have rebelled against the republic have never had the rights of citizens. —Do you fear odium with posterity? You are showing fine gratitude to the Roman people which has raised you, a man known only by your own actions, of no ancestral renown, through all the degrees of honour at so early an age to the very highest office, if from fear of unpopularity or of any danger you neglect the safety of your fellow-citizens.

[1.29] But if you have a fear of unpopularity, is that arising from the imputation of vigour and boldness, or that arising from that of inactivity and indecision most to be feared? When Italy is laid waste by war, when cities are attacked and houses in flames, do you not think that you will be then consumed by a perfect conflagration of hatred?”

To this holy address of the republic, and to the feelings of those men who entertain the same opinion, I will make this short answer: —If, O conscript fathers, I thought it best that Catiline should be punished with death, I would not have given the space of one hour
to this gladiator to live in. If, forsooth, those excellent men and most illustrious cities not only did not pollute themselves, but even glorified themselves by the blood of Saturninus, and the Gracchi, and Flaccus, and many others of old time, surely I had no cause to fear lest for slaying this parricidal murderer of the citizens any unpopularity should accrue to me with posterity. And if it did threaten me to ever so great a degree, yet I have always been of the disposition to think unpopularity earned by virtue and glory, not unpopularity.

[1.30] Though there are some men in this body who either do not see what threatens, or dissemble what they do see; who have fed the hope of Catiline by mild sentiments, and have strengthened the rising conspiracy by not believing it; influenced by whose authority many, and they not wicked, but only ignorant, if I punished him would say that I had acted cruelly and tyrannically. But I know that if he arrives at the camp of Manlius to which he is going, there will be no one so stupid as not to see that there has been a conspiracy; no one so hardened as not to confess it. But if this man alone were put to death, I know that this disease of the republic would be only checked for awhile, not eradicated for ever. But if he banishes himself; and takes with him all his friends, and collects at one point all the ruined men from every quarter, then not only will this full-grown plague of the republic be extinguished and eradicated, but also the root and seed of all future evils

[1.31] We have now for a long time, O conscript fathers, lived among these dangers and machinations of conspiracy; but somehow or other, the ripeness of all wickedness, and of this long-standing madness and audacity, has come to a head at the time of my consulship. But if this man alone is removed from this piratical crew, we may appear, perhaps, for a short time relieved from fear and anxiety, but the danger will settle down and lie hid in the veins and bowels of the republic. As it often happens that men afflicted with a severe disease, when they are tortured with heat and fever, if they drink cold water, seem at first to be relieved, but afterwards stiffer more and more severely; so this disease which is in the republic, if relieved by the punishment of this man, will only get worse and worse, as the rest will be still alive.

[1.32] Wherefore, O conscript fathers, let the worthless be gone,—let them separate themselves from the good,—let them collect in one place,—let them, as I have often said before, be separated from us by a wall; let them cease to plot against the consul in his own house,—to surround the tribunal of the city praetor,—to besiege the senate-house with swords,—to prepare brands and torches to burn the city; let it, in short, be written on the brow of every citizen, what are his sentiments about the republic. I promise you this, O conscript fathers, that there shall be so much diligence in us the consuls, much authority in you, so much virtue in the Roman knights, so much unanimity in all good men, that you shall see everything made plain and manifest by the departure of Catiline,—everything checked and punished.

[1.33] With these omens, O Catiline, be gone to your impious and nefarious war, to the great safety of the republic, to your own
misfortune and injury, and to the destruction of those who have joined themselves to you in every wickedness and atrocity. Then do you, O Jupiter, who were consecrated by Romulus with the same auspices as this city, whom we rightly call the stay of this city and empire, repel this man and his companions from your altars and from the other temples,—from the houses and walls of the city,—from the lives and fortunes of all the citizens; and overwhelm all the enemies of good men, the foes of the republic, the robbers of Italy, men bound together by a treaty and infamous alliance of crimes, dead and alive, with eternal punishments.
It behooves all men who wish to excel the other animals to strive with might and main not to pass through life unheralded, like the beasts, which Nature has fashioned grovelling and slaves to the belly. All our power, on the contrary, lies in both mind and body; we employ the mind to rule, the body rather to serve; the one we have in common with the Gods, the other with the brutes. Therefore I find it becoming, in seeking renown, that we should employ the resources of the intellect rather than those of brute strength, to the end that, since the span of life which we enjoy is short, we may make the memory of our lives as long as possible. For the renown which riches or beauty confer is fleeting and frail; mental excellence is a splendid and lasting possession. Yet for a long time mortal men have discussed the question whether success in arms depends more on strength of body or excellence of mind; for before you begin, deliberation is necessary, when you have deliberated, prompt action. Thus each of these, being incomplete in itself, requires the other's aid.

Accordingly in the beginning kings (for that was the first title of sovereignty among men), took different courses, some training their minds and others their bodies. Even at that time men's lives were still free from covetousness; each was quite content with his own possessions. But when Cyrus in Asia and in Greece the Athenians and Lacedaemonians began to subdue cities and nations, to make the lust for dominion a pretext for war, to consider the greatest empire the greatest glory, then at last men learned from perilous enterprises that qualities of mind availed most in war.

Now if the mental excellence with which kings and rulers are endowed were as potent in peace as in war, human affairs would run an evener and steadier course, and you would not see power passing from hand to hand and everything in turmoil and confusion; for empire is easily retained by the qualities by which it was first won. But when sloth has usurped the place of industry, and lawlessness and insolence have superseded self-restraint and justice, the fortune of princes changes with their character. Thus the sway is always passing to the best man from the hands of his inferior.

Success in agriculture, navigation, and architecture depends invariably upon mental excellence. Yet many men, being slaves to appetite and sleep, have passed through life untaught and untrained, like mere wayfarers in these men we see, contrary to Nature's intent, the body a source of pleasure, the soul a burden. For my own part, I consider the lives and deaths of such men as about alike, since no record is made of either. In very truth that man alone lives and makes the

---


most of life, as it seems to me, who devotes himself to some occupation, courting the fame of a glorious deed or a noble career. But amid the wealth of opportunities Nature points out one path to one and another to another.

[3] It is glorious to serve one's country by deeds; even to serve her by words is a thing not to be despised; one may become famous in peace as well as in war. Not only those who have acted, but those also who have recorded the acts of others oftentimes receive our approbation. 2 And for myself, although I am well aware that by no means equal repute attends the narrator and the doer of deeds, yet I regard the writing of history as one of the most difficult of tasks: first, because the style and diction must be equal to the deeds recorded; and in the second place, because such criticism as you make of others' shortcomings are thought by most men to be due to malice and envy. Furthermore, when you commemorate the distinguished merit and fame of good men, while every one is quite ready to believe you when you tell of things which he thinks he could easily do himself, everything beyond that he regards as fictitious, if not false.

When I myself was a young man, my inclinations at first led me, like many another, into public life, and there I encountered many obstacles; for instead of modesty, incorruptibility and honesty, shamelessness, bribery and rapacity held sway. And although my soul, a stranger to evil ways, recoiled from such faults, yet amid so many vices my youthful weakness was led astray and held captive my ambition; for while I of took no part in the evil practices of the others, yet the desire for preferment made me the victim of the same ill-repute and jealousy as they.

[4] Accordingly, when my mind found peace after many troubles and perils and I had determined that I must pass what was left of my life aloof from public affairs, it was not my intention to waste my precious leisure in indolence and sloth, nor yet by turning to farming or the chase, to lead a life devoted to slavish employments. On the contrary, I resolved to return to a cherished purpose from which ill-starred ambition had diverted me, and write a history of the Roman people, selecting such portions as seemed to me worthy of record; and I was confirmed in this resolution by the fact that my mind was free from hope, and fear, and partisanship. I shall therefore write briefly and as truthfully as possible of the conspiracy of Catiline; for I regard that event as worthy of special notice because of the extraordinary nature of the crime and of the danger arising from it. But before beginning my narrative I must say a few words about the man's character.

[5] Lucius Catiline, scion of a noble family, had great vigour both of mind and body, but an evil and depraved nature. From youth up he revelled in civil wars, murder, pillage, and political dissension, and amid these he spent his early manhood. His body could endure hunger, cold and want of sleep to an incredible degree; his mind was reckless, cunning, treacherous, capable of any form of pretence or concealment. Covetous of others' possessions, he was prodigal of his own; he was violent in his passions. He possessed a certain amount of eloquence, but little discretion. His disordered mind ever craved
the monstrous, incredible, gigantic.

After the domination of Lucius Sulla the man had been seized with a mighty desire of getting control of the government, recking little by what manner he should achieve it, provided he made himself supreme. His haughty spirit was goaded more and more every day by poverty and a sense of guilt, both of which he had augmented by the practices of which I have already spoken. He was spurred on, also, by the corruption of the public morals, which were being ruined by two great evils of an opposite character, extravagance and avarice.

Since the occasion has arisen to speak of the morals of our country, the nature of my theme seems to suggest that I go farther back and give a brief account of the institutions of our forefathers in peace and in war, how they governed the commonwealth, how great it was when they bequeathed it to us, and how by gradual changes it has ceased to be the noblest and best, and has become the worst and most vicious.

[6] The city of Rome, according to my understanding was at the outset founded and inhabited by Trojans, who were wandering about in exile under the leadership of Aeneas and had no fixed abode; they were joined by the Aborigines, a rustic folk, without laws or government, free and unrestrained. After these two peoples, different in race, unlike in speech and mode of life, were united within the same walls, they were merged into one with incredible facility, so quickly did harmony change a heterogeneous and roving band into a commonwealth. But when this new community had grown in numbers, civilization, and territory, and was beginning to seem amply rich and amply strong, then, as is usual with mortal affairs, prosperity gave birth to envy. As a result, neighbouring kings and peoples made war upon them, and but few of their friends lent them aid; for the rest were smitten with fear and stood aloof from the danger. But the Romans, putting forth their whole energy at home and in the field, made all haste, got ready, encouraged one another, went to meet the foe, and defended their liberty, their country, and their parents by arms. Afterwards, when their prowess had averted the danger, they lent aid to their allies and friends, and established friendly relations rather by conferring than by accepting favours.

They had a constitution founded upon law, which was in name a monarchy; a chosen few, whose bodies were enfeebled by age but whose minds were fortified with wisdom, took counsel for the welfare of the state. These were called Fathers, by reason either of their age or of the similarity of their duties. Later, when the rule of the kings, which at first had tended to preserve freedom and advance the state, had degenerated into a lawless tyranny, they altered their form of government and appointed two rulers with annual power, thinking that this device would prevent men's minds from growing arrogant through unlimited authority.

[7] Now at that time every man began to lift his head higher and to have his talents more in readiness. For kings hold the good in greater suspicion than the wicked, and to them the merit of others is always fraught
with danger; still the free state, once liberty was won, waxed incredibly strong and great in a remarkably short time, such was the thirst for glory that had filled men's minds. To begin with, as soon as the young men could endure the hardships of war, they were taught a soldier's duties in camp under a vigorous discipline, and they took more pleasure in handsome arms and war horses than in harlots and revelry. To such men consequently no labour was unfamiliar, no region too rough or too steep, no armed foeman was terrible; valour was all in all. Nay, their hardest struggle for glory was with one another; each man strove to be the first to strike down the foe, to scale a wall, to be seen of all while doing such a deed. This they considered riches, this fair fame and high nobility. It was praise they coveted, but they were lavish of money; their aim was unbounded renown, but only such riches as could be gained honourably. I might name the battlefields on which the Romans with a mere handful of men routed great armies of their adversaries, and the cities fortified by nature which they took by assault, were it not that such a theme could carry me too far from my subject.

[8] But beyond question Fortune holds sway everywhere. It is she that makes all events famous or obscure according to her caprice rather than in accordance with the truth. The acts of the Athenians, in my judgment, were indeed great and glorious enough, but nevertheless somewhat less important than fame represents them. But because Athens produced writers of exceptional talent, the exploits of the men of Athens are heralded throughout the world as unsurpassed. Thus the merit of those who did the deeds is rated as high as brilliant minds have been able to exalt the deeds themselves by words of praise. But the Roman people never had that advantage, since their ablest men were always most engaged with affairs; their minds were never employed apart from their bodies; the best citizen preferred action to words, and thought that his own brave deeds should be lauded by others rather than that theirs should be recounted by him.

[9] Accordingly, good morals were cultivated at home and in the field; there was the greatest harmony and little or no avarice; justice and probity prevailed among them, thanks not so much to laws as to nature. Quarrels, discord, and strife were reserved for their enemies; citizen vied with citizen only for the prize of merit. They were lavish in their offerings to the gods, frugal in the home, loyal to their friends. By practising these two qualities, boldness in warfare and justice when peace came, they watched over themselves and their country. In proof of these statements I present this convincing evidence: firstly, in time of war punishment was more often inflicted for attacking the enemy contrary to orders, or for withdrawing too tardily when recalled from the field, than for venturing to abandon the standards or to give ground under stress; and secondly, in time of peace they ruled by kindness rather than fear, and when wronged preferred forgiveness to vengeance.

[10] But when our country had grown great through toil and the practice of justice, when great kings had been vanquished in war, savage tribes and mighty peoples subdued by force of arms, when Carthage, the rival of
Rome's sway, had perished root and branch, and all seas and lands were open, then Fortune began to grow cruel and to bring confusion into all our affairs. Those who had found it easy to bear hardship and dangers, anxiety and adversity, found leisure and wealth, desirable under other circumstances, a burden and a curse. Hence the lust for money first, then for power, grew upon them; these were, I may say, the root of all evils. For avarice destroyed honour, integrity, and all other noble qualities; taught in their place insolence, cruelty, to neglect the gods, to set a price on everything. Ambition drove many men to become false; to have one thought locked in the breast, another ready on the tongue; to value friendships and enmities not on their merits but by the standard of self-interest, and to show a good front rather than a good heart. At first these vices grew slowly, from time to time they were punished; finally, when the disease had spread like a deadly plague, the state was changed and a government second to none in equity and excellence became cruel and intolerable.

But at first men's souls were actuated less by avarice than by ambition — a fault, it is true, but not so far removed from virtue; for the noble and the base alike long for glory, honour, and power, but the former mount by the true path, whereas the latter, being destitute of noble qualities, rely upon craft and deception. Avarice implies a desire for money, which no wise man covets; steeped as it were with noxious poisons, it renders the most manly body and soul effeminate; it is ever unbounded and insatiable, nor can either plenty or want make it less. But after Lucius Sulla, having gained control of the state by arms, brought everything to a bad end from a good beginning, all men began to rob and pillage. One coveted a house, another lands; the victors showed neither moderation nor restraint, but shamefully and cruelly wronged their fellow citizens. Besides all this, Lucius Sulla, in order to secure the loyalty of the army which he led into Asia, had allowed it a luxury and license foreign to the manners of our forefathers; and in the intervals of leisure those charming and voluptuous lands had easily demoralized the warlike spirit of his soldiers. There it was that an army of the Roman people first learned to indulge in women and drink; to admire statues, paintings, and chased vases, to steal them from private houses and public places, to pillage shrines, and to desecrate everything, both sacred and profane. These soldiers, therefore, after they had won the victory, left nothing to the vanquished. In truth, prosperity tries the souls of even the wise; how then should men of depraved character like these make a moderate use of victory?

As soon as riches came to be held in honour, when glory, dominion, and power followed in their train, virtue began to lose its lustre, poverty to be considered a disgrace, blamelessness to be termed malevolence. Therefore as the result of riches, luxury and greed, united with insolence, took possession of our young manhood. They pillaged, squandered; set little value on their own, coveted the goods of others; they disregarded modesty, chastity, everything human and divine; in short, they were utterly thoughtless and reckless.

It is worth your while, when you look upon
houses and villas reared to the size of cities, to pay a visit to the temples of the gods built by our forefathers, most reverent of men. But they adorned the shrines of the gods with piety, their own homes with glory, while from the vanquished they took naught save the power of doing harm. The men of to-day, on the contrary, basest of creatures, with supreme wickedness are robbing our allies of all that those heroes in the hour of victory had left them; they act as though the one and only way to rule were to be wrong.

[13] Why, pray, should I speak of things which are incredible except to those who have seen them, that a host of private men have levelled mountains and built upon the seas? To such men their riches seem to me to have been but a plaything; for while they might have enjoyed them honourably, they made haste to squander them shamefully. Nay more, the passion which arose for lewdness, gluttony, and the other attendants of luxury was equally strong; men played the woman, women offered their chastity for sale; to gratify their palates they scoured land and sea; they slept before they needed sleep; they did not await the coming of hunger or thirst, of cold or of weariness, but all these things their self-indulgence anticipated. Such were the vices that incited the young men to crime, as soon as they had run through their property. Their minds, habituated to evil practices, could not easily refrain from self-indulgence, and so they abandoned themselves the more recklessly to every means of gain as well as of extravagance.

[14] In a city so great and so corrupt Catiline found it a very easy matter to surround himself, as by a bodyguard, with troops of criminals and reprobates of every kind. For whatever wanton, glutton, or gamester had wasted his patrimony in play, feasting, or debauchery; anyone who had contracted an immense debt that he might buy immunity from disgrace or crime; all, furthermore, from every side who had been convicted of murder or sacrilege, or feared prosecution for their crimes; those, too, whom hand and tongue supported by perjury or the blood of their fellow citizens; finally, all who were hounded by disgrace, poverty, or an evil conscience — all these were nearest and dearest to Catiline. And if any guiltless man did chance to become his friend, daily intercourse and the allurements of vice soon made him as bad or almost as bad as the rest. But most of all Catiline sought the intimacy of the young; their minds, still pliable as they were and easily moulded, were without difficulty ensnared by his wiles. For carefully noting the passion which burned in each, according to his time of life, he found harlots for some or bought dogs and horses for others; in fine, he spared neither expense nor his own decency, provided he could make them submissive and loyal to himself. I am aware that some have believed that the young men who frequented Catiline's house set but little store by their chastity; but that report became current rather for other reasons than because anyone had evidence of its truth.

[15] Even in youth Catiline had many shameful intrigues — with a maiden of noble rank, with a priestess of Vesta — and other affairs equally unlawful and impious. At last he was seized with a passion for Aurelia Orestilla, in whom no good man ever commended anything save her beauty; and
when she hesitated to marry him because she was afraid of his stepson, then a grown man, it is generally believed that he murdered the young man in order to make an empty house for this criminal marriage. In fact, I think that this was his special motive for hastening his plot; for his guilt-stained soul, at odds with gods and men, could find rest neither waking nor sleeping, so cruelly did conscience ravage his overwrought mind. Hence his pallid complexion, his bloodshot eyes, his gait now fast, now slow; in short, his face and his every glance showed the madman.

[16] To the young men whom he had ensnared, as I have described, he taught many forms of wickedness. From their number he supplied false witnesses and forgers; he bade them make light of honour, fortune, and dangers; then, when he had sapped their good repute and modesty, he called for still greater crimes. If there was no immediate motive for wrong doing, he nevertheless waylaid and murdered innocent as well as guilty; indeed, he preferred to be needlessly vicious and cruel rather than to allow their hands and spirits to grow weak through lack of practice.

Relying upon such friends and accomplices as these, Catiline formed the plan of overthrowing the government, both because his own debt was enormous in all parts of the world and because the greater number of Sulla's veterans, who had squandered their property and now thought with longing of their former pillage and victories, were eager for civil war. There was no army in Italy; Gnaeus Pompeius was waging war in distant parts of the world; Catiline himself had high hopes as a candidate for the consulship; the senate was anything but alert; all was peaceful and quiet; this was his golden opportunity.

[17] Accordingly, towards the first of June in the consulate of Lucius Caesar and Gaius Figulus, he addressed his followers at first one by one, encouraging some and sounding others. He pointed out his own resources, the unprepared condition of the state, the great prizes of conspiracy. When he had such information as he desired, he assembled all those who were most desperate and most reckless. There were present from the senatorial order Publius Lentulus Sura, Publius Autronius, Lucius Cassius Longinus, Gaius Cethegus, Publius and Servius Sulla, sons of Servius, Lucius Vargunteius, Quintus Annius, Marcus Porcius Laeca, Lucius Bestia, Quintus Curius; also of the equestrian order, Marcus Fulvius Nobilior, Lucius Statilius, Publius Gabinius Capito, Gaius Cornelius; besides these there were many men from the colonies and free towns who were of noble rank at home. There were, moreover, several nobles who had a somewhat more secret connection with the plot, men who were prompted rather by the hope of power than by want or any other exigency. The greater part of the young men also, in particular those of high position, were favourable to Catiline's project; for although in quiet times they had the means of living elegantly or luxuriously, they preferred uncertainty to certainty, war to peace. There were also at that time some who believed that Marcus Licinius Crassus was not wholly ignorant of the plot; that because his enemy Gaius Pompeius was in command of a large army, he was willing to see anyone's influence
grow in opposition to the power of his rival, fully believing meanwhile that if the conspirators should be successful, he would easily be the leading man among them.

[18] Now, even before that time a few men had conspired against the government, and among them was Catiline; of that affair I shall give as true an account as I am able. In the consulship of Lucius Tullus and Manius Lepidus, the consuls elect, Publius Autronius and Publius Sulla, were arraigned under the law against bribery and paid the penalties. A little later Catiline was charged with extortion and prevented from standing for the consulship, because he had been unable to announce his candidacy within the prescribed number of days. There was at that same time a young noble called Gnaeus Piso, a man of the utmost recklessness, poor, and given to intrigue, who was being goaded on by need of funds and an evil character to overthrow the government. He revealed his plans to Catiline and Autronius; they in concert with him began, about the fifth of December, to make preparations to murder the consuls Lucius Cotta and Lucius Torquatus in the Capitol on the first of January; they then proposed that they themselves should seize the fasces and dispatch Piso with an army to take possession of the two Spanish provinces. Upon the discovery of their plot they postponed their murderous design until the fifth of February. At that time they plotted the destruction not merely of the consuls but of many of the senators, and had Catiline not been over-hasty in giving the signal to his accomplices in front of the senate-house, on that day the most dreadful crime since the founding of the city of Rome would have been perpetrated. But because the armed conspirators had not yet assembled in sufficient numbers, the affair came to naught.

[19] Piso was afterwards, through the efforts of Crassus, who knew him to be a deadly enemy of Gnaeus Pompeius, sent to Hither Spain with praetorian powers, although he was only a quaestor. The senate, however, had been quite willing to give him the province, wishing to remove the shameless fellow to a distance from the seat of government; moreover, many of the aristocracy thought they had in him a safeguard against Pompey, whose power was even then becoming formidable. Now this Piso was slain, while marching through his province, by the Spanish cavalry under his command. Some say that the barbarians could not endure his rule, unjust, insolent, and cruel; others, that the horsemen, who were old and devoted retainers of Pompey, attacked Piso at his instigation. The latter point out that the Spaniards had never before committed such a crime, but had tolerated many cruel rulers in former days. We shall not attempt to decide this question, and enough has been said about the first conspiracy.

[20] When Catiline saw before him the men whom I mentioned a short time ago, although he had often had long conferences with them individually, he thought that it would be well to address and encourage the entire body. Accordingly, withdrawing to a private room of the house and excluding all witnesses, he made the following speech:

“If I had not already tested your courage and loyalty, in vain would a great opportunity have presented itself; high hopes and power
would have been placed in my hands to no purpose, nor would I with the aid of cowards or inconstant hearts grasp at uncertainty in place of certainty. But because I have learned in many and great emergencies that you are brave and faithful to me, my mind has had the courage to set on foot a mighty and glorious enterprise, and also because I perceive that you and I hold the same view of what is good and evil; for agreement in likes and dislikes — this, and this only, is what constitutes true friendship. As to the designs which I have formed, they have already been explained to you all individually. But my resolution is fired more and more every day, when I consider under what conditions we shall live if we do not take steps to emancipate ourselves. For ever since the state fell under the jurisdiction and sway of a few powerful men, it is always to them that kings and potentates are tributary and peoples and nations pay taxes. All the rest of us, energetic, able, nobles and commons, have made up the mob, without influence, without weight, and subservient to those to whom in a free state we should be an object of fear. Because of this, all influence, power, rank, and wealth are in their hands, or wherever they wish them to be; to us they have left danger, defeat, prosecutions, and poverty. How long, pray, will you endure this, brave hearts? Is it not better to die valiantly, than ignominiously to lose our wretched and dishonoured lives after being the sport of others' insolence? Assuredly (I swear it by the faith of gods and men!) victory is within our grasp. We are in the prime of life, we are stout of heart; to them, on the contrary, years and riches have brought utter dotage. We need only to strike; the rest will take care of itself. Pray, what man with the spirit of a man can endure that our tyrants should abound in riches, to squander in building upon the sea and in leveling mountains, while we lack the means to buy the bare necessities of life? That they should join their palaces by twos or even more, while we have nowhere a hearthstone? They amass paintings, statuary and chased vases, tear down new structures and erect others, in short misuse and torment their wealth in every way; yet, with the utmost extravagance, they cannot get the upper hand of their riches. But we have destitution at home, debt without, present misery and a still more hopeless future; in short, what have we left, save only the wretched breath of life? Awake then! Lo, here before your eyes, is the freedom for which you have often longed, and with it riches, honour, and glory; Fortune offers all these things as prizes to the victors. The undertaking itself, the opportunity, the dangers, your need, the splendid spoils of war, speak louder than any words of mine. Use me either as your leader or as a soldier in the ranks; my soul and my body shall be at your service. These very schemes I hope to help you carry out as your consul, unless haply I delude myself and you are content to be slaves rather than to rule.”

[21] When these words fell upon the ears of men who had misfortune of every kind in excess, but neither means nor any honourable hope, although disorder alone seemed to them an ample reward, yet many of them called upon him to explain the conditions under which war would be waged, what the prizes of victory would be, and what resources or prospects they would have and in
what quarter. Thereupon Catiline promised abolition of debts, the proscription of the rich, offices, priesthoods, plunder, and all the other spoils that war and the license of victors can offer. He added that Piso was in Hither Spain, Publius Sittius of Nuceria in Mauretania with an army, both of whom were partners in his plot; that Gaius Antonius was a candidate for the consulship, and, he hoped, would be his colleague, a man who was an intimate friend of his and was beset by every sort of necessity; consul with him, he would launch his undertaking. Thereupon he heaped maledictions upon all good citizens, lauded each of his own followers by name; he reminded one of his poverty, another of his ambition, several of their danger or disgrace, many of the victory of Sulla, which they had found a source of booty. When he saw that their spirits were all aflame, he dismissed the meeting, urging them to have his candidacy at heart.

[22] It was said at the time that when Catiline, after finishing his address, compelled the participants in his crime to take an oath, he passed around bowls of human blood mixed with wine; that when after an imprecation upon traitors all had tasted it, as is usual in solemn rites, he disclosed his project; and his end in so doing was, they say, that they might be more faithful to one another because they shared the guilty knowledge of so dreadful a deed. Others thought that these and many other details were invented by men who believed that the hostility which afterwards arose against Cicero would be moderated by exaggerating the guilt of the conspirators whom he had put to death. For my own part I have too little evidence for pronouncing upon a matter of such weight.

[23] Now one of the members of the conspiracy was Quintus Curius, a man of no mean birth but guilty of many shameful crimes, whom the censors had expelled from the senate because of his immorality. This man was as untrustworthy as he was reckless; he could neither keep secret what he had heard nor conceal even his own misdeeds; he was utterly regardless of what he did or said. He had an intrigue of long standing with Fulvia, a woman of quality, and when he began to lose her favour because poverty compelled him to be less lavish, he suddenly fell to boasting, began to promise her seas and mountains, and sometimes to threaten his mistress with the steel if she did not bow to his will; in brief, to show much greater assurance than before. But Fulvia, when she learned the cause of her lover's overbearing conduct, had no thought of concealing such a peril to her country, but without mentioning the name of her informant she told a number of people what she had heard of Catiline's conspiracy from various sources.

It was this discovery in particular which aroused a general desire to confer the consulate upon Marcus Tullius Cicero; for before that most of the nobles were consumed with jealousy and thought the office in a way prostituted if a “new man,” however excellent, should obtain it. But when danger came, jealousy and pride fell into the background.

[24] Accordingly, when the elections had been held Marcus Tullius and Gaius Antonius were proclaimed consuls, and this at first filled the conspirators with
consternation. And yet Catiline's frenzy did not abate. On the contrary, he increased his activity every day, made collections of arms at strategic points in Italy, and borrowed money on his own credit or that of his friends, sending it to Faesulae to a certain Manlius, who afterwards was the first to take the field. At that time Catiline is said to have gained the support of many men of all conditions and even of some women; the latter at first had met their enormous expenses by prostitution, but later, when their time of life had set a limit to their traffic but not to their extravagance, had contracted a huge debt. Through their help Catiline believed that he could tempt the city slaves to his side and set fire to Rome; and then either attach the women's husbands to his cause or make away with them.

[25] Now among these women was Sempronia, who had often committed many crimes of masculine daring. In birth and beauty, in her husband also and children, she was abundantly favoured by fortune; well read in the literature of Greece and Rome, able to play the lyre and dance more skilfully than an honest woman need, and having many other accomplishments which minister to voluptuousness. But there was nothing which she held so cheap as modesty and chastity; you could not easily say whether she was less sparing of her money or her honour; her desires were so ardent that she sought men more often than she was sought by them. Even before the time of the conspiracy she had often broken her word, repudiated her debts, been privy to murder; poverty and extravagance combined had driven her headlong. Nevertheless, she was a woman of no mean endowments; she could write verses, bandy jests, and use language which was modest, or tender, or wanton; in fine, she possessed a high degree of wit and of charm.

[26] After making these preparations Catiline nevertheless became a candidate for the consulship of the following year, hoping that if he should be elected he could easily do whatever he wished with Antonius. In the meantime he was not idle, but kept laying plots of all kinds against Cicero, who, however, did not lack the craft and address to escape them. For immediately after the beginning of his consulate, by dint of many promises made through Fulvia, Cicero had induced Quintus Curius, the man whom I mentioned a little while ago, to reveal Catiline's designs to him. Furthermore, he had persuaded his colleague Antonius, by agreeing to make over his province to him, not to entertain schemes hostile to the public weal, and he also had surrounded himself secretly with a bodyguard of friends and dependents.

When the day of the elections came and neither Catiline's suit nor the plots which he had made against the consuls in the Campus Martius were successful, he resolved to take the field and dare the uttermost, since his covert attempts had resulted in disappointment and disgrace. [27] He therefore dispatched Gaius Manlius to Faesulae and the adjacent part of Etruria, a certain Septimius of Camerinum to the Picene district, and Gaius Julius to Apulia; others too to other places, wherever he thought that each would be serviceable to his project. Meanwhile he himself was busy at Rome with many attempts at once, laying
traps for the consul, planning fires, posting armed men in commanding places. He went armed himself, bade others to do the same, conjured them to be always alert and ready, kept on the move night and day, took no rest yet succumbed neither to wakefulness nor fatigue. Finally, when his manifold attempts met with no success, again in the dead of night he summoned the ringleaders of the conspiracy to the house of Marcus Porcius Laeca. There, after reproaching them bitterly for their inaction, he stated that had sent Manlius on ahead to the force which he had prepared for war, and also other men to other important points to commence hostilities, explaining that he himself was eager to go to the front if he could first make away with Cicero, who was a serious obstacle to his plans.

[28] Upon this the rest were terrified and hesitated; but Gaius Cornelius, a Roman knight, offered his services and was joined by Lucius Vargunteius, a senator. These two men determined that very night, a little later, to get access to Cicero, accompanied by a band of armed men, as if for a ceremonial call and taking him by surprise to murder the defenceless consul in his own house. When Curius learned of the great danger which threatened the consul, he hastened to report to Cicero through Fulvia the trap which was being set for him. Hence the would-be assassins were refused admission and proved to have undertaken this awful crime to no purpose.

Meanwhile Manlius in Etruria was working upon the populace, who were already ripe for revolution because of penury and resentment at their wrongs; for during Sulla's supremacy they had lost their lands and all their property. He also approached brigands of various nationalities, who were numerous in that part of the country, and some members of Sulla's colonies who had been stripped by prodigal and luxurious living of the last of their great booty.

[29] When these events were reported to Cicero, he was greatly disturbed by the twofold peril, since he could no longer by his unaided efforts protect the city against these plots, nor gain any exact information as to the size and purpose of Manlius' army; he therefore formally called the attention of the senate to the matter, which had already been the subject of popular gossip. Thereupon, as is often done in a dangerous emergency, the senate voted “that the consuls would take heed that the commonwealth suffer no harm.” The power which according to Roman usage is thus conferred upon a magistrate by the senate is supreme, allowing him to raise an army, wage war, exert any kind of compulsion upon allies and citizens, and exercise unlimited command and jurisdiction at home and in the field; otherwise the consul has none of these privileges except by the order of the people.

[30] A few days later, in a meeting of the senate, Lucius Saenius, one of its members, read a letter which he said had been brought to him from Faesulae, stating that Gaius Manlius had taken the field with a large force on the twenty-seventh day of October. At the same time, as is usual in such a crisis, omens and portents were reported by some, while others told of the holding of meetings, of the transportation of arms, and of insurrections of the slaves at Capua and in Apulia.
Thereupon by decree of the senate Quintus Marcius Rex was sent to Faesulae and Quintus Metellus Creticus to Apulia and its neighbourhood. Both these generals were at the gates in command of their armies, being prevented from celebrating a triumph by the intrigues of a few men, whose habit it was to make everything, honourable and dishonourable, a matter of barter. Of the praetors, Quintus Pompeius Rufus was sent to Capua and Quintus Metellus Celer to the district of Pisa, with permission to raise an army suited to the emergency and the danger. The senate also voted that if anyone should give information as to the plot which had been made against the state, he should, if a slave, be rewarded with his freedom and a hundred thousand sesterces, and if a free man, with immunity for complicity therein, and two hundred thousand sesterces; further, that the troops of gladiators should be quartered on Capua and the other free towns according to the resources of each place; that at Rome watch should be kept by night in all parts of the city under the direction of the minor magistrates.

[31] These precautions struck the community with terror, and the aspect of the city was changed. In place of extreme gaiety and frivolity, the fruit of long-continued peace, there was sudden and general gloom. Men were uneasy and apprehensive, put little confidence in any place of security or in any human being, were neither at war nor at peace, and measured the peril each by his own fears. The women, too, whom the greatness of our country had hitherto shielded from the terrors of war, were in a pitiful state of anxiety, raised supplicant hands to heaven, bewailed the fate of their little children, asked continual questions, trembled at everything, and throwing aside haughtiness and self-indulgence, despaired of themselves and of their country.

But Catiline's pitiless spirit persisted in the same attempts, although defences were preparing, and he himself had been arraigned by Lucius Paulus under the Plautian law. Finally, in order to conceal his designs or to clear himself, as though he had merely been the object of some private slander, he came into the senate. Then the consul Marcus Tullius, either fearing his presence or carried away by indignation, delivered a brilliant speech of great service to the state, which he later wrote out and published. When he took his seat, Catiline, prepared as he was to deny everything, with downcast eyes and pleading accents began to beg the Fathers of the Senate not to believe any unfounded charge against him; he was sprung from such a family, he said, and had so ordered his life from youth up, that he had none save the best of prospects. They must not suppose that he, a patrician, who like his forefathers had rendered great service to the Roman people, would be benefited by the overthrow of the government, while its saviour was Marcus Tullius, a resident alien in the city of Rome. When he would have added other insults, he was shouted down by the whole body, who called him traitor and assassin. Then in a transport of fury he cried: “Since I am brought to bay by my enemies and driven desperate, I will put out my fire by general devastation.”

[32] With this he rushed from the senate-house and went home. There after thinking
long upon the situation, since his designs upon the consul made no headway and he perceived that the city was protected against fires by watchmen, believing it best to increase the size of his army and secure many of the necessities of war before the legions were enrolled, he left for the camp of Manlius with a few followers in the dead of night. However, he instructed Cethegus, Lentulus, and the others whose reckless daring he knew to be ready for anything, to add to the strength of their cabal by whatever means they could, to bring the plots against the consul to a head, to make ready murder, arson, and the other horrors of war; as for himself, he would shortly be at the gates with a large army....

[36.4] At no other time has the condition of imperial Rome, as it seems to me, been more pitiable. The whole world, from the rising of the sun to its setting, subdued by her arms, rendered obedience to her; at home there was peace and an abundance of wealth, which mortal men deem the chiefest of blessings. Yet there were citizens who from sheer perversity were bent upon their own ruin and that of their country. 5 For in spite of the two decrees of the senate not one man of all that great number was led by the promised reward to betray the conspiracy, and not a single one deserted Catiline's camp; such was the potency of the malady which like a plague had infected the minds of many of our countrymen.

[37] This insanity was not confined to those who were implicated in the plot, but the whole body of the commons through desire for change favoured the designs of Catiline. In this very particular they seemed to act as the populace usually does; for in every community those who have no means envy the good, exalt the base, hate what is old and established, long for something new, and from disgust with their own lot desire a general upheaval. Amid turmoil and rebellion they maintain themselves without difficulty, since poverty is easily provided for and can suffer no loss. But the city populace in particular acted with desperation for many reasons. To begin with, all who were especially conspicuous for their shamelessness and impudence, those too who had squandered their patrimony in riotous living, finally all whom disgrace or crime had forced to leave home, had all flowed into Rome as into a cesspool. Many, too, who recalled Sulla's victory, when they saw common soldiers risen to the rank of senator, and others become so rich that they feasted and lived like kings, hoped each for himself for like fruits of victory, if he took the field. Besides this, the young men who had maintained a wretched existence by manual labour in the country, tempted by public and private doles had come to prefer idleness in the city to their hateful toil; these, like all the others, batten on the public ills. Therefore it is not surprising that men who were beggars and without character, with illimitable hopes, should respect their country as little as they did themselves. Moreover, those to whom Sulla's victory had meant the proscription of their parents, loss of property, and curtailment of their rights, looked forward in a similar spirit to the issue of a war. Finally, all who belonged to another party than that of the senate preferred to see the government overthrown rather than be out of power themselves. Such, then, was the evil which after many years had returned upon the state.
In the Second Catilinarian, after Catiline has left the city, Cicero denies having driven him out of the city himself and discusses the conspiracy and Catiline’s habit of alluring youths and befriending people.

[2.1] At length, O Romans, we have dismissed from the city, or driven out, or, when he was departing of his own accord, we have pursued with words, Lucius Catiline, mad with audacity, breathing wickedness, impiously planning mischief to his country, threatening fire and sword to you and to this city. He is gone, he has departed, he has disappeared, he has rushed out. No injury will now be prepared against these walls within the walls themselves by that monster and prodigy of wickedness. And we have, without controversy, defeated him, the sole general of this domestic war. For now that dagger will no longer hover about our sides; we shall not be afraid in the campus, in the forum, in the senate-house,—yes, and within our own private walls, he was moved from his place when he was driven from the city. Now we shall openly carry on a regular war with an enemy without hindrance. Beyond all question we ruin the man; we have defeated him splendidly when we have driven him from secret treachery into open warfare.

[2.2] But that he has not taken with him his sword red with blood as he intruded—that he has left us alive,—that we wrested the weapon from his hands,—that he has left the citizens safe and the city standing, what great and overwhelming grief must you think that this is to him. Now he lies prostrate, O Romans, and feels himself stricken down and abject, and often casts back his eyes towards this city, which he mourns over as snatched from his jaws, but which seems to me to rejoice at having vomited forth such a pest, and cast it out of doors.

[2.3] But if there be any one of that disposition which all men should have, who yet blames me greatly for the very thing in which my speech exults and triumphs,—namely, that I did not arrest so capital mortal an enemy rather than let him go,—that is not my fault, O citizens, but the fault of the times. Lucius Catiline ought to have been visited with the severest punishment, and to have been put to death long since; and both the customs of our ancestors, and the rigour of my office, and the republic, demanded this of me; but how many, think you, were there who did not believe what I reported? how many who out of stupidity did not think so? how many who even defended him,—how many who, out of their own depravity, favoured him? If, in truth, I had thought that, if he were removed, all danger would he removed from you, I would long since have cut off Lucius Catiline, had it been at the risk,
not only of my popularity, but even of my
life.

[2.4] But as I saw that, since the matter was
not even then proved to all of you, if I had
punished him with death, as he had
deserved, I should be borne down by
unpopularity, and so be unable to follow up
his accomplices, I brought the business on to
this point that you might be able to combat
openly when you saw the enemy without
disguise. But how exceedingly I think this
enemy to be feared now that he is out of
doors, you may see from this—that I am
vexed even that he has gone from the city
with but a small retinue. I wish he had taken
with him all his forces. He has taken with
him Tongillus, with whom he had been said
to have a criminal intimacy, and Publicius,
and Munatius, whose debts contracted in
taverns could cause no great disquietude to
the republic. He has left behind him others
—you all know what men they are, how
overwhelmed with debt, how powerful, how
noble.

[2.5] Therefore, with our Gallic legions, and
with the levies which Quintus Metellus has
raised in the Picenian and Gallic territory,
and with these troops which are every day
being got ready by us, I thoroughly despise
that army composed of desperate old men,
of clownish profligates, and uneducated
spendthrifts; of those who have preferred to
desert their bail rather than that army, and
which will fall to pieces if I show them not
the battle array of our army, but an edict of
the praetor. I wish he had taken with him
those soldiers of his, whom I see hovering
about the forum, standing about the senate-
house, even coming into the senate, who
shine with ointment, who glitter in purple;
and if they remain here, remember that that
army is not so much to be feared by us as
these men who have deserted the army. And
they are the more to be feared, because they
are aware that I know what they are thinking
of and yet they are not influenced by it.

[2.6] I know to whom Apulia has been
allotted, who has Etruria, who the Picenian
territory, who the Gallic district, who has
begged for himself the office of spreading fire
and sword by night through the city. They
know that all the plans of the preceding night
are brought to me. I laid them before the
senate yesterday. Catiline himself was
alarmed, and fled. Why do these men wait?
Verily, they are greatly mistaken if they think
that former lenity of mine will last forever.

[2.7] What I have been waiting for, that I have
 gained,—namely, that you should all see that
a conspiracy has been openly formed against
the republic; unless, indeed, there be any one
who thinks that those who are like Catiline
do not agree with Catiline. There is not any
longer room for lenity; the business itself
demands severity. One thing, even now, I will
grant,—let them depart, let them be gone. Let
them not suffer the unhappy Catiline to pine
away for want of them. I will tell them the
road. He went by the Aurelian road. If they
make haste, they will catch him by the
evening.

[2.8] O happy republic, if it can cast forth
these dregs of the republic! Even now, when
Catiline alone is got rid of; the republic seems
to me relieved and refreshed; for what evil or
wickedness can be devised or imagined which
he did not conceive? What prisoner, what
gladiator, what thief; what assassin, what parricide, what forger of wills, what cheat, what debauchee, what spendthrift, what adulterer, what abandoned woman, what corrupter of youth, what profligate, what scoundrel can be found in all Italy, who does not avow that he has been on terms of intimacy with Catiline? What murder has been committed for years without him? What nefarious act of infamy that has not been done by him?

[2.8] But in what other man were there ever so many allurements for youth as in him, who both indulged in infamous love for others, and encouraged their infamous affections for himself, promising to some enjoyment of their lust, to others the death of their parents, and not only instigating them to iniquity, but even assisting them in it. But now, how suddenly had he collected, not only out of the city, but even out of the country, a number of abandoned men? No one, not only at Rome, but in every corner of Italy, was overwhelmed with debt whom he did not enlist in this incredible association of wickedness.

[2.9] And, that you may understand the diversity of his pursuits and the variety of his designs, there was no one in any school of gladiators, at all inclined to audacity, who does not avow himself to be an intimate friend of Catiline,—no one on the stage, at all of a fickle and worthless disposition, who does not profess himself his companion. And he, trained in the practice of insult and wickedness, in enduring cold, and hunger, and thirst, and watching, was called a brave man by those fellows, while all the appliances of industry and instruments of virtue were devoted to lust and atrocity.

[2.10] But if his companions follow him,—if the infamous herd of desperate men depart from the city, O happy shall we be, fortunate will be the republic, illustrious will be the renown of my consulship. For theirs is no ordinary insolence,—no common and endurable audacity. They think of nothing but slaughter, conflagration, and rapine. They have dissipated their patrimonies, they have squandered their fortunes. Money has long failed them, and now credit begins to fail; but the same desires remain which they had in their time of abundance. But if in their drinking and gambling parties they were content with feasts and harlots, they would be in a hopeless state indeed; but yet they might be endured. But who can bear this,—that indolent men should plot against the bravest, —drunkards against the sober,—men asleep against men awake,—men lying at feasts, embracing abandoned women, languid with wine, crammed with food, crowned with chaplets, reeking with ointments, worn out with lust, belch out in their discourse the murder of all good men, and the conflagration of the city?

[2.11] But I am confident that some fate is hanging over these men; and that the punishment long since due to their iniquity, and worthlessness, and wickedness, and lust, is either visibly at hand or at least rapidly approaching. And if my consulship shall have removed, since it cannot cure them, it will have added, not some brief span, but many ages of existence to the republic. For there is no nation for us to fear,—no king who can make war on the Roman people. All foreign
affairs are tranquilized, both by land and sea, by the valour of one man. Domestic war alone remains. The only plots against us are within our own walls,—the danger is within,—the enemy is within. We must war with luxury, with madness, with wickedness. For this war, O citizens, I offer myself as the general. I take on myself the enmity of profligate men. What can be cured, I will cure, by whatever means it may be possible. What must be cut away, I will not suffer to spread, to the ruin of the republic. Let them depart, or let them stay quiet; or if they remain in the city and in the same disposition as at present, let them expect what they deserve.

[2.12] But there are men, O Romans, who say that Catiline has been driven by me into banishment. But if I could do so by a word, I would drive out those also who say so. Forsooth, that timid, that excessively bashful man could not bear the voice of the consul; as soon as he was ordered to go into banishment, he obeyed, he was quiet. Yesterday, when I had been all but murdered at my own house, I convoked the senate in the temple of Jupiter Stator; I related the whole affair to the conscript fathers; and when Catiline came thither, what senator addressed him? who saluted him? who looked upon him not so much even as an abandoned citizen, as an implacable enemy? Nay the chiefs of that body left that part of the benches to which he came naked and empty.

[2.13] On this I, that violent consul, who drive citizens into exile by a word, asked of Catiline whether he had been at the nocturnal meeting at Marcus Lecca’s, or not; when that most audacious man, convicted by his own conscience, was at first silent. I related all the other circumstances; I described what he had done that night, where he had been, what he had arranged for the next night, how the plan of the whole war had been laid down by him. When he hesitated, when he was convicted, I asked why he hesitated to go whither he had been long been preparing to go; when I knew that arms, that the axes, the *fasces*, and trumpets, and military standards, and that silver eagle to which he had made a shrine in his own house, had been sent on?

[2.14] Did I drive him into exile who I knew had already entered upon war? I suppose Manlius, that centurion who has pitched his camp in the Faesulan district, has proclaimed war against the Roman people in his own name; and that camp is not now waiting for Catiline as its general, and he, driven indeed into exile, will go to Marseilles, as they say, and not to that camp.

O the hard lot of those, not only of those who govern, but even of those who save the republic. Now, if Lucius Catiline, hemmed in and rendered powerless by my counsels, by my toils, by my dangers, should on a sudden become alarmed, should change his designs, should desert his friends, should abandon his design of making war, should change his path from this course of wickedness and war, and betake himself to flight and exile, he will not be said to have been deprived by me of the arms of his audacity, to have been astounded and terrified by my diligence, to have been driven from his hope and from his enterprise, but, uncondemned and innocent, to have been driven into banishment by the consul by
threats and violence; and there will be some who will seek to have him thought not worthless but unfortunate, and be considered not a most active consul, but a most cruel tyrant.

[2.15] I am not unwilling, O Romans, to endure this storm of false and unjust unpopularity as long as the danger of this horrible and nefarious war is warded off from you. Let him be said to be banished by me as long as he goes into banishment; but, believe me, he will not go. I will never ask of the immortal gods, O Romans, for the sake of lightening my own unpopularity, for you to hear that Lucius Catiline is leading an army of enemies, and is hovering about in arms; but yet in three days you will hear it. And I much more fear that it will be objected to me some day or other, that I have let him escape, rather than that I have banished him. But when there are men who say he has been banished because he has gone away, what would these men say if he had been put to death?

[2.16] Although those men who keep saying that Catiline is going to Marseilles do not complain of this so much as they fear it; for there is not one of them so inclined to pity, as not to prefer that he should go to Manlius rather than to Marseilles. But he, if he had never before planned what he is now doing, yet would rather be slain while living as a bandit, than live as an exile; but now, when nothing has happened to him contrary to his own wish and design,—except, indeed, that he has left Rome while we are alive,—let us wish rather that he may go into exile than complain of it.

[2.17] But why are we speaking so long about one enemy; and about that enemy who now avows that he is one; and whom I now do not fear, because, as I have always wished, a wall is between us; and are saying nothing about those who dissemble, who remain at Rome, who are among us? Whom, indeed, if it were by any means possible, I should be anxious not so much to chastise as to cure, and to make friendly to the republic; nor, if they will listen to me, do I quite know why that may not be. For I will tell you, O Romans, of what classes of men those forces are made up, and then, if I can, I will apply to each the medicine of my advice and persuasion.

[2.18] There is one class of them, who, with enormous debts, have still greater possessions, and who can by no means be detached from their affection to them. Of these men the appearance is most respectable, for they are wealthy, but their intention and their cause are most shameless. Will you be rich in lands, in houses, in money, in slaves, in all things, and yet hesitate to diminish your possessions to add to your credit? What are you expecting? War? What! in the devastation of all things, do you believe that your own possessions will be held sacred? do you expect an abolition of debts? They are mistaken who expect that from Catiline. There may be schedules made out, owing to my exertions, but they will be only catalogues of sale. Nor can those who have possessions be safe by any other means; and if they had been willing to adopt this plan earlier, and not, as is very foolish, to struggle on against usury with the profits of their farms, we should have them now richer and better citizens. But I think these men are the least of all to be dreaded, because they can either be persuaded to
abandon their opinions, or if they cling to them, they seem to me more likely to form wishes against the republic than to bear arms against it.

[2.19] There is another class of them, who, although they are harassed by debt, yet are expecting supreme power; they wish to become masters. They think that when the republic is in confusion they may gain those honours which they despair of when it is in tranquillity. And they must, I think, be told the same as every one else,—to despair of obtaining what they are aiming at; that in the first place, I myself am watchful for, am present to, am providing for the republic. Besides that, there is a high spirit in the virtuous citizens, great unanimity, great numbers, and also a great body of troops. Above all that, the immortal gods will stand by and bring aid to this invincible nation, this most illustrious empire, this most beautiful city, against such wicked violence. And if they had already got that which they with the greatest madness wish for, do they think that in the ashes of the city and blood of the citizens, which in their wicked and infamous hearts they desire, they will become consuls and dictators and even kings? Do they not see that they are wishing for that which, if they were to obtain it, must be given up to some fugitive slave, or to some gladiator?

[2.20] There is a third class, already touched by age, but still vigorous from constant exercise; of which class is Manlius himself; whom Catiline is now succeeding. These are men of those colonies which Sulla established at Faesulae, which I know to be composed, on the whole, of excellent citizens and brave men; but yet these are colonists, who, from becoming possessed of unexpected and sudden wealth, boast themselves extravagantly and insolently; these men, while they build like rich men, while they delight in farms, in litters, in vast families of slaves, in luxurious banquets, have incurred such great debts, that, if they would be saved, they must raise Sulla from the dead; and they have even excited some countrymen, poor and needy men, to entertain the same hopes of plunder as themselves. And all these men, O Romans, I place in the same class of robbers and banditti. But, I warn them, let them cease to be mad, and to think of proscriptions and dictatorship; for such a horror of these times is ingrained into the city, that not even men, but it seems to me that even the very cattle would refuse to bear them again.

[2.21] There is a fourth class, various, promiscuous and turbulent; who indeed are now overwhelmed; who will never recover themselves; who, partly from indolence, partly from managing their affairs badly, partly from extravagance, are embarrassed by old debts; and worn out with bail bonds, and judgments, and seizures of their goods, are said to be betaking themselves in numbers to that camp both from the city and the country. These men I think not so much active soldiers as lazy insolvents; who, if they cannot stand at first, may fall, but fall so, that not only the city but even their nearest neighbours know nothing of it. For I do not understand why, if they cannot live with honour, they should wish to die shamefully; or wily they think they shall perish with less pain in a crowd, than if they perish by themselves.
[2.22] There is a fifth class, of parricides, assassins, in short of all infamous characters, whom I do not wish to recall from Catiline, and indeed they cannot be separated from him. Let them perish in their wicked war, since they are so numerous that a prison cannot contain them.

There is a last class, last not only in number but in the sort of men and in their way of life; the especial body-guard of Catiline, of his levying; yes, the friends of his embraces and of his bosom; whom you see with carefully combed hair, glossy, beardless, or with well-trimmed beards; with tunics with sleeves, or reaching to the ankles; clothed with veils, not with robes; all the industry of whose life, all the labour of whose watchfulness, is expended in suppers lasting till daybreak.

[2.23] In these bands are all the gamblers, all the adulterers, all the unclean and shameless citizens. These boys, so witty and delicate, have learnt not only to love and to be loved, not only to sing and to dance, but also to brandish daggers and to administer poisons; and unless they are driven out, unless they die, even should Catiline die, I warn you that the school of Catiline would exist in the republic. But what do those wretches want? Are they going to take their wives with them to the camp? how can they do without them, especially in these nights? and how will they endure the Apennines, and these frosts, and this snow? unless they think that they will bear the winter more easily because they have been in the habit of dancing naked at their feasts. O war much to be dreaded, when Catiline is going to have his bodyguard of prostitutes!

[2.24] Array now, O Romans, against these splendid troops of Catiline, your guards and your armies; and first of all oppose to that worn-out and wounded gladiator your consuls and generals; then against that banished and enfeebled troop of ruined men lead out the flower and strength of all Italy instantly the cities of the colonies and municipalities will match the rustic mounds of Catiline; and I will not condescend to compare the rest of your troops and equipments and guards with the want and destitution of that highwayman.

[2.25] But if, omitting all these things in which we are rich and of which he is destitute,—the senate, the Roman knights, the people, the city, the treasury, the revenues, all Italy, all the provinces, foreign nations,—if I say, omitting all these things, we choose to compare the causes themselves which are opposed to one another, we may understand from that alone how thoroughly prostrate they are. For on the one side are fighting modesty, on the other wantonness; on the one chastity, on the other uncleanness; on the one honesty, on the other fraud; on the one piety, on the other wickedness; on the one consistency, on the other insanity; on the one honour, on the other baseness; on the one continence, on the other lust; in short, equity, temperance, fortitude, prudence, all the virtues contend against iniquity with luxury, against indolence, against rashness, against all the vices; lastly, abundance contends against destitution, good plans against baffled designs, wisdom against madness, well-founded hope against universal despair. In a contest and war of this sort, even if the zeal of men were to fail, will not the immortal gods compel such numerous and excessive
vices to be defeated by these most eminent virtues?

[2.26] And as this is the case, O Romans, as I have said before, defend your house with guards and vigilance.

I have taken care and made arrangements that there shall be sufficient protection for the city without distressing you and without any tumult. All the colonists and citizens of your municipal towns, being informed by me of this nocturnal sally of Catiline, will easily defend their cities and territories; the gladiators which he thought would be his most numerous and most trusty band, although they are better disposed than part of the patricians, will be held in cheek by our power. Quintus Metellus, whom I, making provision for this, sent on to the Gallic and Picenian territory, will either overwhelm the man, or will prevent all his motions and attempts; but with respect to the arrangement of all other matters, and maturing and acting on our plans, we shall consult the senate, which, as you are aware, is convened.

[2.27] Now once more I wish those who have remained in the city, and who, contrary to the safety of the city and of all of you, have been left in the city by Catiline, although they are enemies, yet because they were born citizens, to be warned again and again by me. If my lenity has appeared to any one too remiss, it has been only waiting that might break out which was lying hid. As to the future, I cannot now forget that this is my country, that I am the consul of these citizens; that I must either live with them, or die for them. There is no guard at the gate, no one plotting against their path; if any one wishes to go, he can provide for himself; but if any one stirs in the city, and if I detect not only any action, but any attempt or design against the country, he shall feel that there are in this city vigilant consuls, eminent magistrates, a brave senate, arms, and prisons; which our ancestors appointed as the avengers of nefarious and convicted crimes.

[2.28] And all this shall be so done, O Romans, that affairs of the greatest importance shall be transacted with the least possible disturbance; the greatest dangers shall be avoided without any tumult; an internal civil war the most cruel and terrible in the memory of man, shall be put an end to by me alone in the robe of peace acting as general and commander-in-chief. And this I will so arrange, O Romans, that if it can be by any means managed, even the most worthless man shall not suffer the punishment of his crimes in this city. But if the violence of open audacity, if danger impending over the republic drives me of necessity from this merciful disposition, at all events I will manage this, which seems scarcely even to be hoped for in so great and so treacherous a war, that no good man shall fall, and that you may all be saved by the punishment of a few.

[2.29] And I promise you this, O Romans, relying neither on my own prudence, nor on human counsels, but on many and manifest intimations of the will of the immortal gods; under whose guidance I first entertained this hope and this opinion; who are now defending their temples and the houses of the city, not afar off, as they were used to, from a foreign and distant enemy, but here on the spot, by their own divinity and present help.
And you, O Romans, ought to pray to and implore them to defend from the nefarious wickedness of abandoned citizens, now that all the forces of all enemies are defeated by land and sea, this city which they have ordained to be the most beautiful and flourishing of all cities.
Advice on Delivering Effective Speeches in Character, by Ancient Rhetoricians

_Aelius Theon_

**Think of the character** “First of all, one should have in mind what the personality of the speaker is like, and to whom the speech is addressed: the speaker's age, the occasion, the place, the social status of the speaker; also the general subject which the projected speeches are going to discuss. Then one is ready to try to say appropriate words. Different ways of speaking belong to different ages of life, not the same to an older man and a younger one; the speech of a younger man will be mingled with simplicity and modesty, that of an older man with knowledge and experience. Different ways of speaking would also be fitting by nature for a woman and for a man, and by status for a slave and a free man, and by activities for a soldier and a farmer, and by state of mind for a lover and a temperate man, and by their origin the words of a Laconian, sparse and clear, differ from those of a man of Attica, which are voluble.” (47-8)

**Consider the circumstance** “What is said is also affected by the places and occasions when it is said: speeches in a military camp are not the same as those in the assembly of the citizens, nor are those in peace and war the same, nor those by victors and vanquished; and whatever else applies to the persons speaking. And surely each subject has its appropriate form of expression. We become masters of this if we do not speak about great things vulgarly nor about small things loftily nor about paltry things solemnly nor about fearful things in a casual manner nor about shameful things rashly nor about pitiable things excessively, but give what is appropriate to each subject, aiming at what fits the speaker and his manner of speech and the time and his lot in life and each of the things mentioned above.” (48)

**Emphasize the positive** “In exhorting then, we shall say that what we are urging is possible and easy and noble and appropriate; that it is beneficial, just, reverent—and the latter is of two sorts, either toward the gods or toward the dead—; that it is pleasant; that we are not the only ones doing it or the first; or that even if we are the first, it is much better to be the beginners of noble deeds; and that when done it brings no regret.

**Make a personal connection** One should also mention any previous relationship of the exhorter to the person being exhorted, and if the latter at sometime was benefited by being persuaded. The same manner of treatment will be used if we are making some criticism, but if dissuading we shall use the opposite arguments.” (48-9)

**Make excuses** “Whenever we seek forgiveness we shall have starting points from the following: first, that the action was unintentional, either through ignorance or chance or necessity; but if it was intentional, one should say that it was reverent, that it was customary, that it was useful.” (49)

_Hermogenes_
**Be appropriate** “Throughout the exercise you will preserve what is distinctive and appropriate to the persons imagined as speaking and to the occasions; for the speech of a young man differs from that of an old man, and that of one who rejoices from that of one who grieves. Some personifications are ethical, some pathetical, some mixed. Ethical are those in which the characterization of the speaker is dominant throughout; for example, what a farmer would say when first seeing a ship; pathetical are those in which there is emotion throughout; for example, what Andromache would say over the dead Hector; mixed are those which have a combination of ethos and pathos; for example, what Achilles would say over the dead Patroclus; for there would be pathos because of the slaughter of Patroclus and ethos in Achilles’ plans for the war.” (85)

**Use of past, present, and future** “The elaboration proceeds by the three times. Begin with the present, because it is difficult; then run back to earlier times. Because they have a large share of happiness; then change to the future, because what is going to happen is much more dreadful. Let both figures and diction contribute to the portrayal.” (85)

**Nicolaus the Sophist**

**Use of past, present, and future** “We shall, therefore, begin from the present and run back to past time, then from there again return to the present; for we shall not immediately come to the future, but shall make brief mention of present constraints and in this way we shall consider what is going to follow. For example, the ethopoeia, “What words Peleus would say when hearing of the death of Achilles.” He will not right off recall his former happiness, but he will lament his present misfortune before contrasting it with the good things that came upon him in the past—marriage with a goddess, honor from the gods, many valiant deeds--; then he will weep for what has now befallen him, adding what circumstances, and from what sources, surround him, and thus, as it were, he will prophesy how many evils will likely befall him through the loss of one to aid him.” (165)

**Proper Style** “The expression should be in rather short phrases and, as it were, natural, not in full periods; for to be fussy about style is alien to emotion, and it is characteristic of those in joy and grief to say one thing after another, concisely, and in few words. A person careful of beauty in diction will not seem to have suffered on such an occasion.” (166)

**John of Sardis**

**Proper Style** “You will elaborate the characterization in a style that is clear: The style, he is saying, of speeches of characterization should confirm to the nature of the supposed persons and subjects. A style without contrivance fits ethopoeias; for the speaker will say what is acknowledged universally in a scattered fashion, in short phrases and without connectives. And it ought to be wholly consistent with the character and the subject. Concise: Vigorous, forceful; for that is the style of commonly accepted ideas and what each person knows. Speaking concisely is characteristic of both
those who are happy and those who mourn, as is adding one thing to another in few words, which Aphthonius makes clear by saying syntomos. *Fresh*: i.e. extemporaneous. *Pure*: i.e. ranging at will, free, clear. For he will not seem to have suffered anything if he takes trouble about the beauty of his language in such circumstances. Free from any inversion and figure. “Inversion” means metaphorical diction; for the diction ought to fit the subjects...An ethopoeia should avoid metaphorical language and varied figures, by which I mean periods [complex sentences] and the like. The expression should be mostly in short phrases and nor be filled out in periods. Over all, through the style of expression the speech should be proper to those supposed to be speaking, so that pathetic things are expressed pathetically, painful things epideictically, ethical things ethically, and each of the others similarly.
[1] I should be troubled and angered by your abuse, Marcus Tullius, if I were sure that your impudence was the result of intention rather than of a disordered mind. But since I perceive in you neither moderation nor any modesty, I shall answer you; so that if you have derived any pleasure from reviling, you may lose it by listening to censure.

Where shall I make complaint, Fathers of the Senate, that our country is being rent asunder and is the victim of all the most reckless of men; to whom shall I appeal? Shall I turn to the Roman people, who are so corrupted by largess that they offer themselves and all their fortunes for sale? Shall I appeal to you, Fathers of the Senate, whose authority is the plaything of all the basest and most criminal of men? Wherever Marcus Tullius is, is he the defender of the laws, the courts and the state, and does he lord it in this assembly as if he were the sole survivor of the family of the illustrious Scipio Africanus and not a parvenu citizen but recently grafted upon this city?

[2] Or pray, Marcus Tullius, are your deeds and words unknown to us? Have you not lived such a life from childhood, that you thought nothing a disgrace to your body which any other's desire prompted? Did you not in fact learn all your unchecked torrent of language under Marcus Piso at the expense of your chastity? It is, therefore, not at all surprising that you trade upon it shamefully, when you acquired it most shamefully. But, I suppose, your spirits are raised by the brilliance of your home, by a wife guilty of sacrilege and dishonoured by perjury, by a daughter who is her mother's rival and is more compliant and submissive to you than a daughter should be to a parent. Even your house, fatal to yourself and your family, you obtained by violence and robbery; doubtless in order to remind us how our country has changed, when you, vilest of men that you are, live in the house which was once the property of that most distinguished man Publius Crassus. And in spite of all this, Cicero declares that he was present at the council of the immortal gods, from which he, a man who makes disaster to his country the means of his own glorification, was sent as a protector to this city and its citizens, and not as its executioner. As if, forsooth, your consulship was not the cause of that conspiracy, and as if the reason why the commonwealth was not rent asunder at that time was because it had you for a protector.

But, I suppose, you are raised to a higher pinnacle by what you planned for the state after your consulship, in company with your wife Terentia, when you were holding trials under the Plautian law at your own home and condemning some of the conspirators to pay fines; when one built your country house at Tusculum, another that at Pompeii, and still another bought your house for you. But the man who could do nothing for you was the most liable to false accusation; he it was who had come to attack your house, or who had plotted against the senate; in short, you were quite convinced of his guilt. 4 If my charges are false, render an account of the amount of the patrimony which you inherited, and of what has come to you from lawsuits, and tell us where you got the money to buy your house and build your villas at Tusculum and Pompeii regardless of expense. If you are silent, who can doubt but that you amassed that wealth from the blood and wretchedness of the citizens?

[3] But, I suppose, a parvenu Arpinate of the breed of Marcus Crassus imitates that great man's merits, scorns the enmity of the nobles, holds the state dear, and is deflected from the truth neither by fear nor by favour, such are his loyalty and virtuous spirit. On the contrary, he is the most unstable of men, a suppliant to his enemies, insulting to his friends, an adherent now of this party and now of that, loyal to no one, an unstable senator, a mercenary counsel, free from disgrace in no member of his body, with a false tongue, thievish hands, a bottomless gullet, fleeing feet; most dishonoured in that part of his body which cannot honourably be named. And although such is his character, he yet has the assurance to say, "Fortunate Rome, born in my consulate." "Fortunate in having you for her consul," Cicero? Nay, ill-starred and wretched in having endured
that most ruthless proscription, when after embroiling your country and filling all virtuous citizens with fear, you forced them to obey your cruel mandates; when all the courts and all the laws were subservient to your will; when after annulling the Porcian law and robbing us all of our freedom, you alone took the power of life and death over all of us into your own hands. 6 And not content with having done all this with impunity, you even insult us by recalling it, and you do not allow these men to forget their slavery. Do, Cicero, I beseech you, have done, have accomplished, what you wish: it is enough for us to have endured it; will you also burden our ears with your hatred, and even pursue us with the tiresome refrain, "Let arms yield to the toga, the laurel to the tongue"? Just as if it were in the toga and not in arms that you did what you boast of, and as if there were any difference between you and a dictator like Sulla except the mere title of your office.

[4] But why should I enlarge upon your presumption, when you declare 7 that Minerva taught you all the arts, that Jupiter, greatest and kindest of the gods, admitted you to their council, and that Italy brought you back from exile upon its shoulders? I beseech you, O Romulus of Arpinum, who by your transcendent merit surpass every Paulus, Fabius and Scipio, what place, pray you, do you hold in this state? What part in public life do you desire? Who is your friend and who your enemy? You play maidservant to the man against whom you plotted in the state. You follow the one through whose influence you returned from your exile at Dyrrachium. You truckle to the power of those whom you formerly called tyrants. Those who once seemed to you the best of citizens you now call mad and frenzied. You plead the cause of Vatinius, you think ill of Sestius, you assail Bibulus with impudent language, you praise Caesar, you are most obsequious to him whom you most hated; you think one thing about the state when you stand up, another when you sit; you revile some, hate others, vile turncoat that you are, showing loyalty neither to one side nor to the other.
Vergil — *Aeneid*, Book 8.666–670
(c. 19 BC)

In Aeneas' shield, Catiline is shown fearing punishment by the Furies, with Cato dispensing judgment.

Far apart
on the shield, what's more, he forged the homes of hell,
the high Gates of Death and the torments of the doomed,
with you, Catiline, dangling from a beetling crag,
cringing before the Furies' open mouths. And set apart,
The virtuous souls, with Cato giving laws.

Cicero — *de Consulato Suo***
(60 BC)

Cicero's poem about his consulship, in which he writes about saving Rome from those who would destroy it.

See how almighty Jove, inflamed and bright,
With heavenly fire fills the spacious world,
And lights up heaven and earth with wondrous rays
Of his divine intelligence and mind;
Which pierces all the inmost sense of men,
And vivifies their souls, held fast within
The boundless caverns of eternal air.
And would you know the high sublimest paths
And ever revolving orbits of the stars,
And in what constellations they abide,—
Stars which the Greeks erratic falsely call,
For certain order and fixed laws direct
Their onward course; then shall you learn that all
Is by divinest wisdom fitly ruled.
For when you ruled the state, a consul wise,
You noted, and with victims due approach'd,
Propitiating the rapid stars, and strange
Concurrence of the fiery constellations.
Then, when you purified the Alban mount,
And celebrated the great Latin feast,
Bringing pure milk, meet offerings for the gods,
You saw fierce comets bright and quivering
With lights unheard of. In the sky you saw
Fierce wars and dread nocturnal massacre;
That Latin feast on mournful days did fall,
When the pale moon with dim and muffled light
Conceal'd her head, and fled, and in the midst
Of starry night became invisible.
Why should I say how Phoebus' fiery beam,
Sure herald of sad war, in mid-day set,
Hastening at undue season to its rest,
Or how a citizen struck with th' awful bolt,
Hurl'd by high Jove from our a cloudless sky,
Left the glad light of life; or how the earth
Quakes with affright and shook in every part?
Then dreadful forms, strange visions stalk'd abroad,
Scarce shrouded by the darkness of the night,
And warn'd the nations and the land of war.
Then many an oracle and augury,
Pregnant with evil fate, the soothsayers

---


Pour'd from their agitated breasts. And e'en
The Father of the Gods fill'd heaven and earth
With signs, and tokens, sand presages sure
Of all the things which have befallen us since.
So now the year when you are at the helm,
Collects upon itself each omen dire,
Which when Torquatus, with his colleague
Cotta,
Sat in the curule chairs, the Lydian seer
Of Tuscan blood breathed to affrighted Rome.
For the great Father of the Gods, whose home
Is on Olympus' height, with glowing hand
Himself attack'd his sacred shrines and temples,
And hurl'd his darts against the Capitol.
Then fell the brazen statue, honour'd long,
Of noble Natta; then fell down the laws
Graved on the sacred tablets; while the bolts
Spared not the images o' the immortal gods.
Here was that noble nurse o' the Roman name,
The Wolf of Mars, who from her kindly breast
Fed the immortal children of her god
With the life-giving dew of sweetest milk.
E'en her the lightning spared not; down she fell.
Bearing the royal babes in her descent,
Leaving her footmarks on the pedestal.
And who, unfolding records of old time
Has found no words of sad prediction
In the dark pasges of Etruscan books?—
All men, all writings, all events combined,
To warn the citizens of freeborn race
To dread impending wars of civil strife,
And wicked bloodshed; when the laws should fall
In one dark rain, trampled and o'erthrown:
Then men were warn'd to save their holy shrines,
The statues of the gods, their city and lands,
From slaughter and destruction, and preserve
Their ancient customs unimpair'd and free.
And this kind hint of safety was subjoin'd,
That when a splendid statue of great Jove,
In godlike beauty, on its base was raised,
With eyes directed to Sol's eastern gate;
Then both the senate and the people's bands,
Duly forewarn'd, should see the secret plots
Of wicked men, and disappoint their spite.
This statue, slowly form'd and long delay'd,
At length by you, when consul, has been placed
Upon its holy pedestal;—'tis now
That the great sceptred Jupiter has graced
His column, on a well-appointed hour:
And at the self-same moment faction's crimes
Were by the loyal Gauls reveal'd and shown
To the astonish'd multitude and senate.
Well then did ancient men, whose monuments
You keep among you,—they who will maintain
Virtue and moderation; by these arts
Ruling the lands and people subject to them:
Well, too, your holy sires, whose spotless faith,
And piety, and deep sagacity
Have far surpass'd the men of other lands,
Worshipp'd in every age the mighty Gods.
They with sagacious care these things foresaw,
Spending in virtuous studies all their leisure,
And in the shady Academic groves,
And fair Lyuceum; where they well pour'd forth
The treasures of their pure and learned hearts.
And, like them, you have been by virtue placed,
To save your country, in the imminent breach;
Still with philosophy you soothe your cares,
With prudent care dividing all your hours
Between the muses and your country's claims.
The underworld is in a state of civil war,
and while Cato is upset, Catiline is enjoying it.

...Scipio bewailed
The scion of his race about to fall
In sands of Libya: Cato, greatest foe
To Carthage, grieves for that indignant soul
Which shall disdain to serve. Brutus alone
In all the happy ranks I smiling saw,
First consul when the kings were thrust from Rome.
The chains were fallen from boastful Catiline.
Him too I saw rejoicing, and the pair
Of Marii, and Cethegus’ naked arm.
The Drusi, heroes of the people, joyed,
In laws immoderate; and the famous pair
Of greatly daring brothers: guilty bands
By bars eternal shut within the doors
That close the prison of hell, applaud the fates,
Claiming the plains Elysian: and the King
Throws wide his pallid halls, makes hard the points
Of craggy rocks, and forges iron chains,
The victor’s punishment.
The satirist Juvenal (late first century AD) describes some of the perils that poor face living in Rome.

“I must live in a place, where there are no fires, no nightly alarms. Already is Ucalegon shouting for water! already is he removing his chattels: the third story in the house you live in is already in a blaze. Yet you are unconscious! For if the alarm begin from the bottom of the stairs, he will be the last to be burnt whom a single tile protects from the rain, where the tame pigeons lay their eggs. Codrus had a bed too small for his Procula, six little jugs the ornament of his sideboard, and a little can besides beneath it, and a Chiron reclining under the same marble; and a chest now grown old in the service contained his Greek books, and mice gnawed poems of divine inspiration. Codrus possessed nothing at all; who denies the fact? and yet all that little nothing that he had, he lost. But the climax that crowns his misery is the fact, that though he is stark naked and begging for a few scraps, no one will lend a hand to help him to bed and board....

Now revert to other perils of the night distinct from these. What a height it is from the lofty roofs, from which a potsherd tumbles on your brains. How often cracked and chipped earthenware falls from the windows! with what a weight they dint and damage the flint-pavement where they strike it! You may well be accounted remiss and improvident against unforeseen accident, if you go out to supper without having made your will. It is clear that there are just so many chances of death, as there are open windows where the inmates are awake inside, as you pass by. (Lewis Evans, translator)
Valerius Maximus — *Memorable Doings and Sayings (Facta et dicta memorabilia)*

*Valerius Maximus references the financial impacts of the Catilinarian episode.*

[Book 4, 8.3] When the commonwealth was thrown into shock by Catiline's madness, so that even the rich could not pay their creditors the money they owed because property values had sunk in the upheaval, [Q. Considius] would not let his agents call upon any of his debtors (he had fifteen million sesterces out on load) either for principal or interest.

*Valerius Maximus discusses a father's reaction to his son's following Catiline.*

[Book 5, 8.5] A. Fulvius, a man of senatorial rank, recalled his son who was on his way to fight with no less spirit than Scaurus rebuked his as he fled from battle. The young man, who shone among his peers in talent and letters and looks, had misguided followed Catiline's friendship and was hurrying to his camp on a rash impulse. His father dragged him back in mid journey and put him to death, first observing that he had not begotten him for Catiline against his country but for his country against Catiline. He might have kept him shut up until the rage of civil war passed over. But this would have been the story of a wary father, this is the account of a stern one.

*Valerius Maximus shares an anecdote about Catiline's lust.*

[Book 9, 1.9] But especially criminal was the lust of Catiline. Seized with an infatuation for Aurelia Orestilla, he saw his son, an only child already past puberty, as the only obstacle to their union in marriage. He removed the lad by poison, kindling the nuptial torch from his pure and offering his own childlessness as a gift to his new bride. Then playing citizen in the same spirit as he had played father, he paid penalty equally to the shades of his son and to the country he had wickedly assailed.

*Valerius Maximus relates an episode that may show Catiline's conscience.*

[Book 9, 11.3] As M. Cicero was talking in the senate about the fire started by L. Catilina, “I feel it,” said the latter, “and if I can't put it out with water, I'll do it with the falling house. What are we to think but that driven by the goads of conscience he proved himself guilty of the parricide he had begun?

---
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Glossary of Terms

**Client**: Roman social relationships outside of the family were defined in part by the system of [patronage](#) or [clientela](#), which established a complex set of interrelated obligations between a [patron](#) and his many [clients](#). A patron was expected to protect, mentor, and support his clients. In return the client was expected to support the patron to the best of his abilities, often by voting for him and his friends. Powerful Romans typically had many clients in inferior classes, but more experienced nobles could also serve as the patrons of other nobles. The number of clients was one of the manifestations of the social authority or [dignitas](#) wielded by powerful Romans. The early development of the system of patronage in Rome may have contributed to the creation of the [patrician](#) and [plebeian](#) classes.

**Curia Cornelia**: the formal meeting place of the Roman Senate during the 70s, 60s and 50s BC. It was built by Sulla to accommodate his enlargement of the Senate. As a symbol of the Senate’s greater authority under the Sullan reforms, the large building in the Forum occupied a large portion of the Comitium, the open air space near the Rostra, or the principal platform for public speech in the Forum.

**Cursus honorum** (‘course of offices’): The sequence of elected Roman offices that began with the [quaestorship](#) and culminated in the [consulship](#). After Sulla’s reforms in the early 70s BC, each office had a minimum age requirement and candidates had to satisfy and a minimum number of years since their last successful election. But these restrictions being waived.

**Discessio** (‘separation, division’): the voting method used by the Roman Senate; see “Rules and Procedures.”

**Equites** (‘Knights’): In early Rome, members of the equestrian class served in the calvary, and so had to be wealthy enough to supply their own horses and armor. By the late republic, equites were part of the Roman elite, along with the senators. Many equites were involved in business and trade class, and were often as, if not more, wealthy than members of the Senate.

**Gens** (‘clan’): A large family, often with more than one branch, that claims descent from a common ancestor; e.g. the Julii, the Corneli, the Metelli.

**Imperium** (‘power to command’): a formal authority conveyed on a magistrate to act in the interests of the state within his jurisdiction. A curule magistrate carried a distinctive ivory baton topped by an eagle and was escorted by [lictors](#) who carried the [fasces](#), or bundles of rods that symbolized the magistrate’s [imperium](#). Outside of Rome, an axe was added to the [fasces](#) to indicate his power to authorize capital punishment.

**Intercessio**, the right of a [tribune](#) to veto political action by interposing his sacrosanct body.
Magistrate: any of the powerful Roman political offices.

Mos maiorum ('Custom of the Ancestors'): a general term used to refer to the established customs, behaviors, and traditions of the Roman people. Although it implied traditions of great antiquity, it could refer to any precedent, even those set quite recently.

Novus homo ('a new man'): a designation given to the first man in a family to serve in the Roman Senate (and so be elected to the quaestorship). Often used to refer to the first man in a family to attain the consulship, and so the pinnacle of Roman political power.

Optimates ('the best men'): entrenched aristocrats who sought to advance the political prerogatives of the senatorial aristocracy.

Patricians: families who trace their descent from senatorial families in the time of the kings. In the early republic, they came to monopolize important magistracies and religious offices. Even in the late republic, a limited set of offices and priesthhoods could only be held by patricians.

Perduellio ('high treason'): according to the Law of the Twelve Tables, a man is treasonous if he stirs up an enemy or betrayed a citizen to the enemy. By the late republic it was an obsolete law, but it was revived by Julius Caesar for the prosecution of Rabirius in early 63 BC.

Plebeians: all families which are not Patrician.

Pontifex Maximus ('greatest pontiff'), chief priest of the Roman state religion dedicated to preserving the pax deorum ('the peace of the gods'). An elected office that was held for life. The Pontifex Maximus enjoyed enormous prestige, as well as the use of the Domus Publica ('State House') in the Roman Forum. Among his many duties, the Pontifex Maximus consecrated all new sacred spaces and objects, regulated the calendar, oversaw laws related to the dead, marriage, and adoption, and supervised public morals.

Patron: see “Client.”

Princeps senatus ('chief of the Senate'): a position of enormous prestige in the Roman Senate, although by the late republic most of its official powers had been transferred to other offices. Retained the right to speak early in debate. Selected for a renewable five year term by the censors, the princeps senatus was usually an elderly patrician senator who had served as consul, and often as censor.

Populares ('favoring the people'): Politicians who claimed to support democratic prerogatives and the interests of “the people”, including land distribution, cancellation of debt, subsidized distribution of food, and expansion of the vote.

Promagistrate: a military or administrative post filled by a magistrate after their term in elected office is complete; e.g. propraetor, proconsul.
**Proscription:** the publication of a written notice. In Roman politics, proscription referred to the publication of a list of Roman citizens by the Senate. Citizens on this list were deprived of their citizen rights and any protection under the law and their property was subject to confiscation. During the dictatorship of Sulla (82–81 BC), hundreds and perhaps thousands of Romans were proscribed and executed. Rewards were given to informers who contributed to the death of the proscribed. Anyone who killed a proscribed man was entitled to a share of his property, with the remainder going to the state. As a result the children of the proscribed were disinherited. Their wives were forbidden from remarrying. At first most of the proscribed had previously opposed Sulla. But soon the list of the proscribed expanded to include individuals who were targeted for their wealth or even to settle minor personal grudges. This state-sanctioned terror left a deep scar on the Roman psyche. Decapitated heads of many of the proscribed were displayed in the Roman Forum. Men, especially those from the wealthy equestrian class, were dragged from their homes in the dead of night.

**Relatio:** a matter presented for formal discussion before the Senate.

**Rex:** a king, monarch. A word hateful to the Romans.

**Senatus Consultum:** recommendation of the Senate to a magistrate.

**Senatus Consultum Ultimum:** the “ultimate decree of the Senate” (see Appendix).

**Sententia:** an opinion delivered in the Senate.

**Struggle of the Orders:** a centuries long process through which plebeians won the full rights of citizenship and access to Rome’s legal and political system.

**Triumph:** a civil ceremony of enormous spectacle that celebrated a great military success, especially the successful conclusion of a foreign war. Dressed in a manner like the statue of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, the *triumphator* was paraded through the city in a chariot, followed by his soldiers, and captives and riches captured during the war. The festive atmosphere was often finished with a great feast for the inhabitants of the city and even neighboring towns, the celebration of athletic games and other public entertainment. To commemorate his triumph, a *triumphator* may issue special coinage or dedicate a temple or other monumental building.
ALLITERATION — Repetition of the same sound beginning several words in sequence.

Before you sits a cackling clique of criminals, slithering snakes aiming to poison the People.

AMBIGUITY — A word or expression that can have two or more meanings.

I hope that, in this crisis, no one will lose their head. (i.e. this warning not to panic or a threat of execution).

ANACOLUTHON — A change in the grammatical construction within the same sentence, leaving the first part broken or unfinished. Although technically a grammatical error, anacoluthon indicates excitement among the eloquent (and idiocy among the mocked).

Do you have the sense of shame—a thing that you you utter lack.

APOSIOPESIS — a form of anacoluthon in which a speaker comes to an abrupt halt, seemingly overcome by passion (fear, excitement, etc.) or modesty.

ANASTROPHE — inversion of normal word order; most often found in Latin in the case of prepositions and the words they control. Anastrophe is a form of hyperbaton.

I will not endure this attack on the state. I will not endure this attack on the Senate. I will not endure this attack on the people.

ANTICLIMAX — An abrupt lapse from growing intensity to triviality. Where the effect is unintentionally feeble or ridiculous it is termed BATHOS.

He must be praised, be must be honored, be must be tolerated. (Cicero on Octavian)

ANTONOMASIA — When a proper name is replaced by an epithet. E.g. “The Fiend” for Catiline.

ASYNDETON: omission of conjunctions yielding an emphatic brevity.

I came, I saw, I conquered.

POLYSYNDETON — The repetition of conjunctions in a series of coordinate words, phrases, or clauses. And I came and I saw and I conquered.

HENDIADYS — Use of two words connected by a conjunction, instead of subordinating one to the other, to express a single complex idea.

With iron and the sword I will defend my liberty. (i.e. ‘with an iron sword…)

HYPERBOLE: Extravagant exaggeration.

You are the most vile, vicious, monster ever spawned by mother earth in the history of the human race!

IMAGERY — The use of words or figures of speech to create a mental picture. Imagery exploits all five senses to produce a single powerful impression or to create a cluster of impressions that convey a dominant mood.

The republic is threatened. Do you smell the smoke, see the flames, feel the heat from this conflagration?

LITOTES — A special form of understatement in which a negative implies the strong affirmative. I was not raised a fool. (implying that the speaker is quite clever).
METAPHOR — In a metaphor a word or expression that normally denotes one thing is applied to a different thing, without explicitly making a comparison (as in a SIMILE).

METONYMY — When object is used to symbolize another idea,

He seeks not the consulship but the crown (where ‘crown’ symbolizes monarchical power).

PRAETERITIO — When a speaker emphasizes something by pretending to pass over it.

I will not mention Catiline’s innumerable and shocking vices...

OXYMORON — Apparent paradox achieved by the juxtaposition of words which seem to contradict one another. Festina lente “hasten slowly”

PARALLELISM — The arrangement of similarly constructed clauses, sentences, or verse lines in a pairing or other sequence suggesting some correspondence between them.

PARAPROSODIKIAN — A surprise or unexpected ending of a thought.

He must be praised, be must be honored, be must be tolerated. (Cicero on Octavian)

PROSOPOPOEIA — Impersonating a character. E.g. Cicero pretends to speak as Rome.

PERSONIFICATION: attribution of human characteristics to something not human.

The buildings and hills of Rome shout out for justice!

REPETITION

ANAPHORA — The repetition of a word or phrase at the beginning of successive phrases, clauses or lines.

ANADIPLOSIS — (“doubling back”) the rhetorical repetition of one or several words; specifically, repetition of a word that ends one clause at the beginning of the next.

Will you stand to defend the People? The People must not be enslaved!

ANTISTROPHE — Repetition of the same word or phrase at the end of successive clauses.

EPIZEUXIS — A rhetorical figure by which a word is repeated for emphasis, with no other words intervening: e.g. "sick, sick, sick"

SIMILE — An explicit comparison between two distinctly different things, using the word “like” or “as.”

Cicero sits at the feet of Pompey as a dog his master.

TRICOLON — Three parallel elements occurring together. Can be as simple as three words (blood and death and murder) or can include lengthy, complex phrases and/or clauses. The elements of a TRICOLON need not be of the same length (ISOCOLON) and can demonstrate crescendo, where the elements are progressively lengthened, or decrescendo, where the elements are progressively shorter.

ZEUGMA — the joining of two or more parts of a sentence with a common verb or noun. A zeugma employs both ellipsis, the omission of words which are easily understood, and parallelism, the balance of several words or phrases.

I carry my grief at the loss of liberty and a sword to restore it.

SYLLEPSIS — Use of a word with two others, with each of which it is understood differently.
Roman Virtues

How should a Roman behave? To what standards of conduct was he held? What was considered a good life?

Perhaps the most revealing and succinct source for the Roman conception of the “good life” were, ironically, the eulogies or laudationes funebres delivered at the funerals of aristocratic Romans. These eulogies praised the accomplishments of the deceased, often in the context of the notable achievements of the family’s most illustrious ancestors.

In a eulogy delivered in 221 BC, Quintus Caecilius Metellus praises his father, Lucius Caecilius Metellus (twice consul and pontifex maximus), for accomplishing the “ten greatest and most excellent things.” According to Metellus, these were:

1) being a champion warrior
2) being the best orator
3) being the bravest general
4) holding command in the greatest undertakings
5) attaining the highest political office
6) being a leader in (public) wisdom
7) being considered a leading senator
8) gaining great wealth by honest methods
9) leaving many children
10) and being the most distinguished man of the state.

Here we find a concise vision of the best Roman life, distilled into 8 public and 2 private achievements: the ideal Roman was accomplished in the full range of manly pursuits, devoted to public service, and preeminent among his peers.

In the pursuit of these achievements, good Romans strived to be recognized for displaying a set of personal virtues. One’s own behavior was paramount; but all of these virtues were thought to have a hereditary component as well. The degree to which a Roman attained these standards of virtue exerted enormous influence on his public worth (virtus), his image (dignitas), his influence (auctoritas), and his ability to forge lasting relationships with other Romans (amicitia). These “MASTER CONCEPTS” are discussed below.

Note: each of the terms outlined below contains a complex bundle of meanings and implications; the simple English translation might be considered the best fit term, but be sure to read the description to get a better sense of the virtue and how it functioned in Roman society.
**MASTER CONCEPTS**

*Amicitia — “Alliance”*

*Amicitia* is generally translated as “friendship” but it is important to remember that it only gradually gained the sense that we associate with contemporary friendship. In the republic, it primarily referred to the network of relationships and obligations that bound together families and personal relationships among people of like social status.

*Virtus — “Excellence”*

A Roman valued valor, manliness, courage, and character in the *public* sphere. A man might be thought to possess *virtus* if he displayed *prudentia, iustitia, temperantia,* and *fortitudo* in his public dealings.

Note: the highest female virtue was *pudicitia*: “modesty” or “chastity”, although on rare occasions, women, children, and even non-Romans could demonstrate *virtus*.

*Dignitas — “Worth”*

The sum of a Roman's personal clout and influence because of his personal reputation, visual impressiveness or distinction, dignity of style and gesture, rank, moral standing, and achievement. It also incorporates the obligations that flow from these. The basis of one's *auctoritas*.

*Auctoritas — “Prestige”*

*Auctoritas* represented a Roman's ability to influence others and to direct the political process. The ability to put one's *dignitas* into action. One's *auctoritas* is the prestige that an individual had accumulated through the standing of his family, his personal experiences, material power, the strength of his *amicitia*, and the perception of this virtue. The great historian Theodor Mommsen describes the “force” of *auctoritas* as “more than advice and less than command, an advice which one may not safely ignore.”

**ROMAN VIRTUES**

*Comitas — “Appropriateness”*

A Roman should display good taste, decorum, and courtesy at all times when interacting with someone of lower social status. It might be easier to understand by reference to its opposite: a Roman should never be boorish, crass, inconsiderate, or discourteous. His *comitas* is one of the aspects of *Romanitas* that distinguishes him from the bestial barbarian and the obsequious Greek. Some more traditional Romans believe that *comitas* is a dangerous modern disposition, and that social inferiors should be treated with *severitas*.

*Clementia — “Mercy”*

The prudential granting of tolerance, forbearance, and gentleness to the humbled weak. Its opposite is “savageness”, the indiscriminate application of violence and force on the undeserving.

*Constantia & Firmitas — “Tenacity”*

A Roman is confident in his positions. He abhors fickleness. He possesses the strength of character to maintain ones’ convictions in the face of any challenge.

*Fortitudo — “Courage”*

A Roman is courageous in confronting dangers to himself, his family, and to the state.
Frugalitas — “Frugality”

A Roman should have simple tastes, economical with his resources and embracing a simplicity of style; but was never miserly, which would be a violation of comitas. Many think virtue is needed more than ever if the crisis of the republic is to be resolved.

Gravitas — “Weight”

The sense of responsibility, dignity, and earnestness that a Roman projects; his intellectual substance gained from years of experience and his depth of personality, austerity, and moral rectitude. The manifestation of a harmony between one's actions and emotions. Closely related to severitas.

Humanitas — “Grace”

Like comitas, humanitas acquired importance only in the later stages of the republic. It referred to the refined manners, tact, education, and style of an urbane Roman aristocrat in his dealings with other members of the same social rank. Whereas comitas regulated relationships between social unequals, humanitas described proper behavior within the bounds of amicitia.

Industria — “Industriousness”

A Roman should work hard for the betterment of the state and his family and friends. Even leisure should be productive, never slothful or lazy.

Iustitia — “Fairness”

A Roman should behave towards others in accordance with the principles of justice.

Pietas — “Dutifulness”

The moral purity attained by fulfilling one's obligations. A Roman respects all the obligations that he has—to the gods, to the state, to his parents, and to other blood relations.

Prudentia — “Discretion”

A Roman avoids unnecessary risk through the judicious application of foresight and wisdom.

Salubritas — “Wholesomeness”

It is no surprise that a Roman coined the phrase “sound mind in a sound body” (mens sana in corpore sano). Physical and mental health permit the attainment of virtue and arise in turn from its cultivation.

Severitas — “Sternness”

A Roman disciplined himself and exercised self-control in all fields. This extended to the strict regulation of his household, which reflected his own virtue (or vice).

Temperantia — “Moderation”

The balance in life and character that comes when actions are guided by knowledge and wisdom. A Roman resists the easy temptation of sensual pleasure.

Veritas — “Truthfulness”

A Roman is as good as his word.
During times of extreme crisis in the early republic, Romans would routinely grant extraordinary powers to a *dictator*, who would serve as supreme political and military leader for a single term of six months. This office, however, fell into disuse after the conclusion of the Second Punic War in 202 BC. In part, there was less need for the dictatorship, since Rome was experienced a period of political stability and rapid growth; but as Rome began to conduct most of its wars abroad, often against very wealthy enemies, the Senate grew concerned about concentrating that much authority away from their watchful eyes.

In the late second and early first centuries BC, however, renewed civil unrest often required swift and decisive action. Instead of creating a dictator during times of crisis, the Senate could issue the following decree or *Consultum*:

> “let the consuls see to it that the state suffer no harm”

*consules darent operam ne quid detrimenti res publica caperet*, Sallust *Bellum Catilinae* 19

This decree empowered the consul to take whatever steps were necessary to preserve the republic. Because these actions generally included extra-legal and unconstitutional acts that violated the traditional rights of Roman citizens, the legality of this ultimate decree, known as the *Senatus Consultum Ultimum*, was highly contested. Did a magistrate have the ability—or indeed the obligation—to protect the state from suffering irreparable harm by taking actions that would otherwise be illegal? It could be argued that once Roman citizens constituted themselves as a private army and attempted to overthrow the state, it was self-evident that they were no longer citizens (*cives*) but enemies of the state (*hostes*), and so no longer enjoyed the legal protections that forbade the slaying of citizens without trial and granted them the right of appeal. Although Roman citizens had enjoyed protections against abusive magistrates since the time of the early republic, in times of crisis an older law took precedence: “let the well-being of the people be the ultimate law” (*salus populi suprema lex esto*).

Opponents, such as Julius Caesar, who coined the term *Senatus Consultum Ultimum* as a rebuke of its dangerous power (*Bellum Civile* 1.5.3), argued that the decree simply enjoined the consul to act within the traditional legal and political framework provided by Rome’s constitution, not to violate the essential rights of Roman citizens. A magistrate, such opponents would argue, may take extraordinary action in stopping an insurrection or apprehending riotous citizens. But once the rebels were in custody and so no longer posing an *immediate* threat to the state or public order, they were again merely citizens and deserving of citizen rights, until such time as a trial determined their guilt or innocence.
Uses of the Senatus Consultum Ultimum

- **121 BC**, by the consul L. Opimius against the ex-tribune C. Sempronius Gracchus and the tribune M. Fulvius Flaccus (the only ex-consul to hold the tribuneship). Gracchus, out of office and so a private citizen, had assembled a personal body guard, which killed a servant of Opimius. Opimius then led a group of senators and equites against Gracchus and his supporters on the Aventine, resulting in the deaths of Gracchus, Flaccus, and around 3,000 other people. Opimius was tried by a tribune “among the people” (apud populum). He did not deny that he had violated the law against executing Roman citizens. But he claimed that doing so was justified because it was in accordance with the interests of the senate and was necessary to protect the “well-being of the people” (salus populi). Opimius was acquitted. A precedent had been established that a magistrate could take extra-legal action to secure the continuance of the state when he was advised to do so by an official motion of the senate.

- **100 BC**, by the consul C. Marius against the tribune L. Appuleius Saturninus and the praetor C. Servilius Glauca. Saturninus had fomented mob violence in an attempt to force passage of a legislative program.

  (Gaius Rabirius was prosecuted for treason and convicted his role in killing Saturninus and Glauca in 63 BC; Cicero speech in his defense, the Pro Rabirio, survives).

- **77 BC**, by the consul Q. Lutatius Catulus against the proconsul M. Aemilius Lepidus, who had raised a revolt in Etruria and was marching on Rome from his province of Cisalpine Gaul. When the bulk of his army defected to Pompey, Lepidus fled to Sardinia, where he died of natural causes.

- **63 BC**, by Cicero against Catiline and his followers.
A Guide to Roman Names

During the late republic and early imperial periods most elite Roman men had three names: the praenomen, nomen, and cognomen. Each of these three names, known collectively as the “three names” or tria nomina, had different significance and could be used in different combinations depending on the social status of the speakers and the social context in which the name was used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRAENOMEN</th>
<th>NOMEN</th>
<th>COGNOMEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARCUS</td>
<td>TULLIUS</td>
<td>CICERO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUCIUS</td>
<td>SERGIUS</td>
<td>CATILINA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**given name**
Bestowed by parents on their child when he was infant. Like a “first name” in English.

**hereditary clan name**
Indicating the extended family or clan (gens) to which the individual belonged. The most important and most frequently used name. Name of the family or branch of the clan to which the individual belonged. Less noble Romans, like the famous general Gaius Marius, may not possess an inherited cognomen.

In contrast to modern “first names,” only a few traditional praenomina were used by Roman nobles (see below). Originally a nickname (often humorous or derogatory: Calvus ‘baldy’, Crassus ‘fatty’, Cicero ‘chickpea’) but then began to be passed from father to son.

Praenomens were only used by close friends and family members.

The fifteen most common **praenomina** and their abbreviations:

- Aulus A.
- Decimus D.
- Gaius C.
- Gnaeus Cn.
- Lucius L.
- Manius M'.
- Marcus M.
- Numerius N.
- Publius P.
- Quintus Q.
- Servius Ser.
- Sextus Sex.
- Spurius Sp.
- Tiberius Ti.
- Titus T.

**Using the tria nomina:**

- Close Friends and Family would use the nomen or cognomen in addressing one another.
- Friends: friends would use the nomen or cognomen in addressing one another.
- Colleagues: In public settings it was polite to address fellow senators by praenomen and nomen.
- Formal contexts: Using all three names was considered very formal. Conversely, using a familiar name in a formal setting or when such familiarity is warranted could be a great insult.

**History of the tria nomina:** Early Romans, like most peoples of the ancient Mediterranean, had only one name: e.g. Romulus or Remus. But soon Romans added a second name, or *patronymic*, that indicated the head of their household. In time, this developed into the inherited NOMEN (cf. Ericsson). In the early republic, some elites began to specify their section of the clan or gens by means of a COGOMEN, although this only came into official use in the second century BC, and became widespread in the first century. Less elite Romans eventual adopted this system as well, although never as consistently as among the senatorial elite. During the late first and second centuries AD naming conventions change considerably.
**Naming conventions:** A father usually named his first-born son after himself. For example, the orator Marcus Tullius Cicero was the son of Marcus Tullius Cicero, and the orator named his son Marcus Tullius Cicero. The orator's younger brother was Quintus Tullius Cicero (probably named “fifth” for the month in which he was born, not for his birth order), and he named his son Quintus Tullius Cicero. Additional sons would receive a different praenomen.

Certain families of the upper nobility had more than two inherited names and adopted sons often combined the names of their families: thus when Publius Cornelius Scipio Nasica was adopted by Quintus Caecilius Metellus Pius, he took the name of Quintus Caecilius Metellus Pius Scipio Nasica (!).

**Roman women:** Daughters generally used only the feminine form of the nomen, the daughter of Marcus Tullius Cicero was named Tullia. The daughter of Gaius Julius Caesar was Julia. Additional daughters could be given a nickname indicating the order of their birth (Prima, Secunda, Tertia) or simply be called ‘Older’ and ‘Younger’ (Maior/Minor). In formal or legal contexts girls might be referred to with a patronymic, or the name of their father: e.g. Tullia M. Tulli (“Tullia, the daughter of Marcus Tullius”) or Julia Caesaris (“Julia, the daughter of Caesar”). Married women were often designated by their husband’s nomen in the same manner. So when Claudia Pulchra Prima, the daughter of Appius Claudius Pulcher, married Quintus Caecilius Metellus Celer, she came to be called Claudia Metelli.

**Agnomen ex virtute:** Men could be officially awarded an additional, non-hereditary honorific known as an agnomen. Sometimes this additional name was awarded by senatorial decree: e.g. Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus (“conqueror of Africa”). It might at others it was an informal nickname that entered into common usage: e.g. Gnaeus Pompeius Magnus (“the Great”) or Publius Cornelius Sulla Felix (“the Lucky”). Occasionally an agnomen may be converted into a hereditary cognomen.

**Full legal name:** The full legal name of an elite Roman, as might be used on a legal document or an inscription, included two additional pieces of information that served to confirm that he was a freeborn Roman citizen: filiation, or an indication of the person’s male ancestors, and his voting tribe. Given the length of such full names, it was common to abbreviate some elements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PRAENOMEN</strong></th>
<th><strong>NOMEN</strong></th>
<th><strong>FILIATION</strong></th>
<th><strong>VOTING TRIBE</strong></th>
<th><strong>COGNOMEN</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.</td>
<td>TULLIUS</td>
<td>M F M N M PR</td>
<td>COR</td>
<td>CICERO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus</td>
<td>Tullius</td>
<td>Marci Filius Marci Nepos Marci Prenepos</td>
<td>CORnelia Tribu</td>
<td>CICERO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus</td>
<td>Tullius</td>
<td>Son of Marcus, Grandson of Marcus, Great-grandson of Marcus</td>
<td>Of the Cornelian Tribe</td>
<td>Cicero</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Timeline for the Crisis of Catiline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Cicero prosecutes Verres for extortion. Later in the same year, the praetor L. Aurelius Cotta passes legislations reforming the juries for such cases; henceforth they will be drawn equally from senators, *equites*, and the *tribunii aerarii* (the third property class).  
64 senators, including Lentulus Sura and C. Antonius expelled from Senate for corruption. They are subsequently restored to the Senate. |
| 69 BC | Cicero serves as aedile. |
| 68 BC | Catiline serves as praetor. |
| 67 BC | Under the expansive powers of the *lex Gabinia*, Pompey rids the Mediterranean of pirates.  
Catiline governs the province of Africa.  
*Lex Acilia Calpurnia* requires permanent exclusion from office of those convicted of electoral corruption (*ambitus*). |
| 66 BC | Cicero serves as praetor.  
*Lex Manilia* grants Pompey extraordinary command to fight against Mithridates in the East. He will campaign in the east until 62 BC.  
The election of the consuls-designate, P. Cornelius Sulla and P. Autronius Paetus, is overturned when they are convicted of bribery.  
Catiline prevented from running for consulship when a delegation from Africa accuses him of abuses when serving as governor of the province. |
| 65 BC | *Lex Papia* expels all foreigners from Rome because of their appropriation of citizenship rights. |
| January | *The First Conspiracy*? After the elections of P. Autronius Paetus and P. Cornelius Sulla are overturned under the *lex Acilia Calpurnia*, a set of disgruntled nobles (Autronius and Piso? Caesar and Crassus? Catiline? All of the above?) plot to assassinate the new consuls Cotta and Torquatus and seize power themselves. Cancelled when this and further plans are revealed.  
Catiline tried for abuse of power and exonerated with support of leading Senators (including Torquatus and others that he was supposedly conspiring to kill). Catiline refuses Cicero’s help during the trial. |
64 BC  Catiline, Antonius Hybrida, Cicero and four other candidates run for the consulship. Cicero allies to Antonius against Catiline and Hybrida, who were supported by Crassus and Caesar.

Cicero elected consul with Antonius. Cicero is the first novus homo elected consul in 30 years.

63 BC  After three years of waiting, L. Licinius Lucullus celebrates his triumph.

The Second Conspiracy

July  Catiline runs again for the consulship. Ran on a radical platform that called for cancellation of debts (novae tabulae), the redistribution of wealth, and other popular measures.

Cicero requests that the Senate postpone the elections and provide him with a bodyguard. The Senate delays elections for a few days but refuses Cicero a bodyguard. During the vote, Cicero appears wearing a breastplate under his toga, protected by his own bodyguards. Catiline is defeated. Julius Caesar elected pontifex maximus.

Manlius begins collecting troops in Etruria; he encourages impoverished Sullan veterans to rise against propertied interests in Rome. Minor disturbances in other parts of Italy.

October 18  An anonymous letter warns Crassus and other members of the Senate to flee Rome before violence Oct. 27. Crassus and other nobles deliver these letters to Cicero.

October 21  Cicero presents the letters to the Senate and accuses Catiline and Manlius of being threats to the safety of the Roman people. The Senate passes Senatus Consultum Ultimum, granting Cicero the authority and responsibility to deal with any and all threats to the safety of the republic. Cicero in turn empowers the praetor Metellus Celer to protect Rome from the threat posed by Manlius. The city braces for revolution on Oct. 27.

October 27  When the 27th passes without incident, suspicion grows that Cicero may have fabricated the plot and invented the crisis to strengthen his political position.

October 28  Cicero’s prestige is restored when reports of Manlius’ actions arrive in Rome. Under the auspices of the lex Plautia de vi, Cicero orders the indictment of Catiline.

Catiline offers to place himself in the custody of Cicero or Metullus Celer (custodia libera) as a sign of his innocence. Both declined his offer.

Late October  Cicero sends quaestor P. Sestius to secure the strategically vital city of Capua.
November 1  Attempt by conspirators to seize Praeneste fails. Reports of slave revolts in Capua and Apulia. Military commanders dispatched to threatened areas. The Senate approves rewards for the betrayal of conspiratorial acts.

November 6  Meeting of Catilinarians at the house of M. Porcius Laeca in the Street of the Scythemakers. Catiline supposedly decides join army and march on Rome. Cornelius and Vargunteius agree to assassinate Cicero at his house the following morning.

November 7  Warned by Curius and Fulvia, Cicero avoids assassination by staying home and refusing all visitors.

November 8  Cicero delivers *First Catilinarian*, denouncing Catiline, in the Temple of Jupiter Stator. Catiline responds to Cicero, calling for the senators to look at his ancestry and the absence of proof to support Cicero’s allegations.

---

**Start of the Game**

The Senate shouts down Catiline, who departs from Rome. He claims he is heading for exile in Massilia, but he joins Manlius’ army, carrying the insignia of the consul and the silver eagle standard of Rome.

November 9  Cicero delivers his *Second Catilinarian*.

Mid-November  Catiline claims he is championing the oppressed in letter read to the Senate by Catulus.

Senate declares Catiline and Manlius *hostes* (public enemies); dates set for amnesty for deserters; consuls assigned to levy army, Antonius directed to crush rebellion.

At the house of Sempronia, the P. Gabinus attempts to recruit support from the Allobroges, a restive tribe in Gaul. They betray Lentulus’ negotiations to Cicero.

November 15  Catiline and his army arrived in Faesulae.

Late November  Catiline’s lieutenants start small uprisings in Gaul, Picenum, Bruttium and Apulia, but they were captured, tried, and imprisoned. Catiline continues to arm his soldiers in Etruria in preparation for march on Rome.

December 2  Envoy sent to Allobroges with letter from Catiline. Cicero notifies the praetors who ambush the group on the Mulvian bridge. The Allobrogian envoys surrender themselves and the letters. Cicero at last has proof of Catiline’s intentions.
December 3

The main conspirators in Rome (Lentulus, Cethegus, Statilius, Gabinius, and Caeparius) are found guilty before Senate at the Temple of Concord and placed under arrest.

Cicero hailed as a hero, is voted thanks and a supplicatio is declared. The city rejoices as Cicero delivers his Third Catilinarian.

December 4

The Senate rejects Lucius Tarquinius' attempts to implicate Crassus in the conspiracy.

An attempt to rescue the conspirators under house arrest fails.

December 5

Senate meets to decide the fate of the conspirators; Caesar speaks out against putting them to death. Cicero delivers the Fourth Catilinarian, followed by a rousing speech from Cato in favor of immediate execution. The conspirators are executed.

Cicero makes a brief speech to crowd and is given triumphal escort home by torchlight.

December 15

Many of Catiline's supporters desert him after hearing the news of the executions and the failure of the plot in Rome. Catiline's flight to Gaul blocked by Metellus Celer. Cicero is hailed by a hero by some and a tyrant by others.

December 31

The tribune Q. Metellus Nepos vetoes Cicero’s attempt to address the people as he steps down from his consulship. Ordered by Nepos to swear the oath that he obeyed all laws during his time as magistrate, Cicero agrees but adds that he alone saved the state.

January 3, 62 BC

Metellus Nepos accuses Cicero of violating the law by executing Lentulus Sura and the other conspirators. In response, the Senate grants indefinite amnesty to everyone involved in the suppression of the conspiracy. Proposal by tribune Q. Metellus Nepos and Julius Caesar to recall Pompey is vetoed by Cato. Cicero is hailed by the people as “father of the country.” Riots break out in Rome. The Senate passes a senatus consultum ultimum and Nepos flees Rome to Pompey in the East.

Early January

Catiline is blocked from crossing the Apennines by Metellus Celer. Antonius and his army close from the rear. Catiline makes rousing speech to his 3,000 remaining followers and leads them into battle against Antonius’ army under command of legate M. Petreius. All of the Catilinarians are killed including Catiline, who dies heroically in battle.

Cicero leaves office. He is honored with the title pater patriae (“Father of the Fatherland”) for saving the country from ruin.
Timeline for the Crises of the Late Republic

135 BC  First Sicilian Slave Revolt.

134–133 BC Ti. Gracchus proposes a controversial land reform program; he and his followers were murdered by senators and equites; riots grip Rome.

129 BC Scipio Aemilianus, the conquerer of Carthage and opponent of the land reformers, dies under mysterious circumstances. The commissioners in charge of the land reforms are stripped of power.

122–121 BC C. Gracchus passes a more radical land reform law and passes a law that would subsidize the purchase of grain by the urban poor. After the Senate passes a Senatus Consultum Ultimum empowering the consul to ensure the safety of the state, Gracchus is killed (or commits suicide). A flurry of treason trials grips Rome.

110 BC A scandalous military defeat in N. Africa reveals widespread corruption and foreign influence among the Roman elite. A special commission condemns 4 ex-consuls among many other senators.

107 BC C. Marius enrolls the poor in the army, who became increasingly dependent on and loyal to their generals, rather than the Roman state.

105 BC Germanic tribes kill destroys two consular armies at the Battle of Arausio, resulting the death of over 80,000 Romans (perhaps the most deadly single day of combat is history). In response, Romans elect C. Marius to an unprecedented four successive consulships. He eventual is able to annihilate the Germanic Tribes.

104 BC Titus Vettius leads a minor revolt in Campania.

103–99 BC Second Sicilian Slave Revolt begins when Romans briefly begin releasing slaves from allied countries, with the hope that these countries will support Roman operations against the Germanic Tribes. When it becomes clear that releasing so many slaves will have immediate economic consequences, the local magistrate in Sicily reverses course, and orders the slaves returned to their masters. They band together and revolt against their Roman masters.

100 BC The tribune L. Appuleius Saturninus and the praetor Glauceia foments mob violence in an attempt to force passage of a radical legislative program. When Saturninus’ supporters kills a consular candidate during the vote, Saturninus is declared a public enemy by a Senatus Consultum Ultimum, Marius defeats Saturninus in a bloody brawl in the Forum. Saturninus surrenders to Marius, who plans to arraign him and his supporters. Enraged nobles claim on the room of the senate house, in which Saturninus was being held, and stone him and his supporters to death with roofing tiles. Glauceia is dragged from his house and lynched.
95 BC  A law is passed the expels non-citizen Italians from Rome, causing significant resentment among the Italian Allies.

92 BC  A corruption scandal undermines the authority of the court system.

91–90 BC  Drusus passes a set of democratic reforms but fails to enfranchise the Italians. When Drusus is murdered, many of the Italian allies revolt from Rome in the so-called the Social War or the War of the Allies (socii). The political crisis has now become a full-blown civil war.

88 BC  The tribune P. Sulpicius Rufus is killed after he passes legislation diluting the power of the aristocracy over voting and deprives Sulla and his colleague of their provinces and appoints Marius to the command in Asia Minor. Sulla marches on Rome, forcing Marius and his supporters to flee.

87 BC  Widespread repression of reformers in Rome by Sulla. Sulla departs for the East to wage war against Mithridates, King of Pontus. Marius’ follower Cinna is elected consul.

86 BC  Marius is consul for the seventh time; he dies in the same year. His followers undertake widespread suppression of the supporters of Sulla.

84 BC  Cinna, consul for the fourth consecutive year, is murdered by his troops as he prepares to fight Sulla.

83–82 BC  Sulla lands in Italy and routs Marian forces. Thousands of captured soldiers are executed without trial. Strife in Rome leads to the burning of the Capitoline Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus and the books of the Sibylline Oracle that were housed therein. Q. Sertorius flees Italy and establishes a rebel kingdom in Spain.

81 BC  Sulla, as dictator, unleashes “proscriptions” opponents and wealthy Romans.

79 BC  Sulla reforms the Roman constitution to limit the power of tribunes and the power of ambitious politicians.

78 BC  Sulla dies. Dissent between the consuls Catulus and Lepidus over preservation of Sulla’s constitution leads to open conflict.

77 BC  The proconsul M. Aemilius Lepidus raised a revolt in Etruria and was marching on Rome from his province of Cisalpine Gaul, when the bulk of his army defects to Pompey. Lepidus flees to Sardinia, where he died of natural causes. His supporters flee to Sertorius in Spain.

76 BC  Cn. Pompey defeats and kills M. Brutus, the legate of Lepidus in Cisalpine Gaul. He is despatched to Spain to tackle Sertorius. The powers of the tribunate are restored.

72 BC  Third and final slave revolt begins under Spartacus, who defeats both the consuls of the year and a proconsul. Sertorius assassinated by the treachery of Perperna, who is defeated and killed by Cn. Pompeius.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71 BC</td>
<td>Spartacus destroyed near Regium with most of his followers by M. Crassus (praetor). 20,000 slaves crucified along Via Appia from Capua to Rome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 BC</td>
<td>Cicero, still a novice politician, prosecutes C. Verres for corruption during his service as governor of Sicily. So compelling was Cicero’s case that Verres fled into exile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 BC</td>
<td>Pompey touts the pirates and, by the lex Manila, is sent against Mithridates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64–63 BC</td>
<td>Crisis of Catiline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 BC</td>
<td>Refusal of Senate to ratify the actions of Pompey in the East drives Pompey into a secret compact with Julius Caesar and M. Crassus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 BC</td>
<td>Caesar’s consulship is a farce, after his co-consul and opponent M. Bibulus simply declares all days inauspicious for political action. Caesar departs to wage war in Gaul. Clodius elected tribune, begins agitating for political and social reforms. Urban violence common for next seven years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 BC</td>
<td>Crassus killed at Battle of Carrhae by Parthians, who capture the standards of Crassus’ legions, a great insult to Roman honor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 BC</td>
<td>Clodius ambushed and assassinated. Riots during his funeral.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 BC</td>
<td>Senate attempts to strip Caesar of his command. The tribune veto but are driven from the city. Caesar crosses Rubicon inaugurating another round of civil war.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 BC</td>
<td>Caesar defeats Pompey and the senatorial forces at Pharsalus. Pompey executed by King Ptolemy XIII of Egypt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 BC</td>
<td>Caesar defeats remaining senatorial forces under Cato; returns to Rome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 BC</td>
<td>Caesar assassinated on Ides of March.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 BC</td>
<td>Caesar’s killers, led by M. Brutus and Cassius, are defeated at the Battle of Philippi. Sextus Pompey, continues war from Sicily until 35 BC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 BC</td>
<td>Lepidus is ousted from the Triumvirate. M. Antony and Octavian divide empire between them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32–31 BC</td>
<td>Open conflict between Octavian and M. Antony, who is joined by Cleopatra, the Queen of Egypt. Octavian defeats the pair at the Battle of Actium, bringing the civil war to a close.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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